

National Curriculum Board

# **Framing Paper Consultation Report: English**

**May 2009**

## COPYRIGHT

© Commonwealth of Australia 2009

This work is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal, non-commercial use or use within your organisation. All other rights are reserved. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to:

Commonwealth Copyright Administration  
Copyright Law Branch  
Attorney-General's Department  
Robert Garran Offices  
National Circuit  
Barton ACT 2600  
Fax: 02 6250 5989

or submitted via the copyright request form on the website <http://www.ag.gov.au/cca>.

**CONTENTS**

- 1. Introduction 4**
- 2. Consultation 4**
- 3. Feedback affirming the directions in the English Framing Paper 6**
- 4. Feedback requiring further examination 7**
- 5. Addressing feedback requiring further examination 11**
- 6. Summary of submissions 18**
- 7. Appendix: What the community said in response to NCB survey questions 19**

## 1. Introduction

The National Curriculum Board has been charged with developing a single, world-class national curriculum for all Australian students from kindergarten to Year 12, starting with the key learning areas of English, mathematics, the sciences and history.

On 20 November 2008, the National Curriculum Board released for public consultation the set of curriculum framing papers for English, mathematics, the sciences and history. The consultation period officially closed on 28 February 2008. The purpose of the consultation was to obtain feedback from stakeholders that would inform the rewriting of the framing papers to the point where they would be foundational documents for writing the national curriculum.

The framing papers were developed from advice obtained through an extensive consultation process involving national forums, guidance from individual experts and focus groups, input from teachers and academics, and direct feedback through the Board's website.

This report provides a brief description of the consultation process, the process of data analysis, and a summary of the analysis of all feedback received. The summary analysis outlines affirmations for the directions in the framing papers, and matters requiring further examination.

The feedback analysis is representative of more than 1100 responses, 333 of which were in relation to the English Framing Paper. Feedback was received in two forms – via completion of surveys (most through online lodgement) responding to questions asked by the Board, and via formal submissions lodged either electronically or by mail. It represents the contributions of education authorities, professional education associations, individual educators, business and industry, community groups and individuals. The report also provides tabulated data indicating the spread of responses across the many stakeholder groups.

The Board acknowledges with appreciation the contributions of all respondents to the consultation. Many written submissions were extraordinarily detailed, while others provided briefer more indicative input, clearly waiting to contribute further as the curriculum writing process gets under way.

## 2. Consultation

### Process

The National Curriculum Board has committed to an open curriculum development process with substantial consultation with the profession and the public. Stakeholder groups include government, education authorities (national, state and territory, government, Catholic and Independent, and local school authorities where such bodies exist), parent bodies, professional educational associations, academics, business and industry groups, wider community groups and interested individuals from the wider community.

The Board's primary consultation instrument was a survey seeking stakeholder responses to questions posed by the Board in relation to each framing paper. The survey instrument was placed on the Board's website to permit online completion and lodgement. Respondents for whom this was not suitable chose to either mail, email (to the Board's feedback box ([feedback@ncb.org.au](mailto:feedback@ncb.org.au)) or fax the survey responses in to the Board.

Many stakeholders chose to respond by preparing formal submissions. These were received by the Board through mail, email or fax.

All online survey responses and submissions through the Board's electronic feedback mailbox triggered an immediate electronic message of acknowledgment and appreciation for the contribution. All other submissions were responded to individually by staff of the Office of the Board.

Section 5 of this report contains a summary of framing paper survey responses and submissions by respondent group.

The consultation period officially closed on 28 February 2009. At this point in time, the online survey environment was closed. However, significant numbers of responses continued to flow in after that date, and were being entered into the data base as late as the end of March. During March, a gap analysis of major stakeholders was prepared, and direct contact was made with those stakeholders, to ensure that submissions were still forthcoming and would be taken into account in the data analysis process.

In addition to this formal consultation process, a range of consultation forums were held to ensure that specific concerns also within the Board's curriculum development responsibilities are met. These include:

- equity and diversity
- futures-orientation
- stages of schooling
- continua for literacy, numeracy and ICT
- needs of Indigenous children and incorporation of Indigenous perspectives
- Asia-literacy and
- sustainability.

### **Data Analysis**

Upon receipt, every submission and survey response was formally recorded. Those not received through the online process were either scanned (in the case of submissions) or entered manually into the database. A single record of the details of all responses was updated as they were received and weekly summary reports prepared.

Every submission was read by relevant Board staff, and a summary of significant points in each submission was noted for consideration in the collation and analysis of the data. At the same time, the full text of all submissions was recorded for analysis.

The outcomes of the data analysis have been documented in two main forms – feedback that affirms the directions (broad and specific) of the individual framing papers, and feedback that indicates matters that require further examination. In the latter case, additional processes have been put in place to conduct that further examination.

From the data analysis, major affirmations and major areas for examination have been identified in the report. These have been identified both by the strength and frequency of their presence in the responses. Minority insights from individuals or groups of respondents were respectfully taken into account but may not necessarily appear in the report. This does not indicate a rejection of their value as contributions, but recognition of the major directions and concerns emanating from the larger body of data.

### **3. Feedback affirming the directions in the English Framing Paper**

The quantitative data, provided in the Appendix, indicates a broad level of support for the English Framing Paper as a whole. In particular, the following aspects of the paper received strong endorsement:

#### **3.1 Introduction and Aims**

Respondents affirmed aspects of the Introduction which attempted to acknowledge diversity and promote equity. More than 80 per cent of respondents affirmed the aims of English.

#### **3.2 A Futures Orientation**

Respondents supported the forward looking nature of the Framing Paper. They noted its references to the diverse skills needed for successful engagement and involvement in society and applauded the paper's statement of the role played by English in preparing students for their lives both in and beyond school.

#### **3.3 Beginnings and 'basics'**

Respondents endorsed the embedding of 'basics' in authentic language, literacy and literacy tasks rather than reducing English to a 'back to basics' approach.

#### **3.4 The teaching of grammar in English.**

There was very strong support for the position adopted by the Framing Paper in relation to the study of language. Respondents applauded the focus on teaching grammar in use and in context. They supported the paper's explicit rejection of the teaching of grammatical knowledge in isolation and its statements concerning the need for careful attention to the ways this knowledge about language is to be assessed.

#### **3.5 The Texts of English**

Statements relating to the breadth and diversity of texts in English were supported. In particular references to the range of texts emerging from new technologies were endorsed as well as the use of and creation of these texts in English.

#### **3.6 Literature and Australian Literature**

The strong presence of Literature was endorsed with many particularly pleased to see a clear statement of its place in the primary English curriculum.

The study of Australian literature in the English Curriculum was strongly supported.

#### **3.7 General Capabilities across the Curriculum**

Statements concerned with General Capabilities were supported, particularly the cross curriculum responsibility for the development of literacy.

#### **3.8 Pedagogy**

The Framing Paper's recognition of the need for teachers to employ a wide range of pedagogical approaches was endorsed.

## 4. Feedback requiring further examination

### 4.1 General Recommendations

Respondents asked that the following aspects be addressed throughout the Framing Paper:

- show that the Elements are integrated and interdependent, not separate sets of knowledge
- highlight the link between language and meaning-making
- situate the student at the centre of learning
- expand the kinds of texts to be studied in English
- expand and clarify what is meant by 'literature'.

### 4.2 Introduction

Respondents asked that the Introduction foreground the link between the study of language and the making of meaning so that the focus is on how students apply knowledge in responding to and composing text.

Also highlighted in the feedback was the necessity for a statement that situated the student at the centre of learning and provided a recognition that 'students bring to their study of English a range of experiences, knowledge and literary practices and that the curriculum needs to build on and add to these resources'. (Professional Associations)

### 4.3 Aims

Several respondents requested a qualification that acknowledged that 'although English and literacy remain central to an English curriculum, literacy teaching and learning take place in all curriculum areas.' (Professional Associations)

Concern was expressed at the apparent lack of acknowledgement (paragraph 15) of the range of other areas with which English has also been traditionally associated – for example, cultural studies, critical literacy and personal growth. It was argued that these areas should also be considered 'in terms of providing a broad sense of what constitutes English as a discipline'. (Professional Associations, Academics)

### 4.4 Terms

Many respondents suggested that there was a need for clarification and definition of terms used in the Framing Paper. In particular, it was argued that English should be defined as Standard Australian English, that 'subject English' would be better termed 'the English curriculum' and that other key terms such as 'literacy' and 'language' need clear definitions; in addition the description of what constitutes the 'texts of English' needs to be consistent across the Paper.

While some argued for definitions expressed in 'plain language', one professional association expressed the opinion that 'it is the definition and explanation that need to be written in plain accessible language'.

### 4.5 The teaching of grammar in English

The inclusion of the study of grammar was strongly affirmed, but opinion was divided as to whether one specific kind of grammar should be mandated. Most respondents believed it should, but the question of which kind of grammar was only occasionally answered. One extensive submission argued that a functional approach is an appropriate model of language for the curriculum; another submission argued that a blend of traditional and functional grammar would be suitable and another argued in favour of traditional grammar on the grounds that this would lessen the demand for professional development because of the likelihood that more teachers would be familiar with this type of grammar. Respondents supported the Framing Paper's emphasis on the importance of developing a 'common language for (grammatical) strategies and conventions'. Respondents also

mentioned the need to include a grammar for visual design to provide a language for discussing how visual texts work, since the range of texts in English includes visual and multimodal texts.

Other issues related to the teaching of grammar focussed in particular on the methodology, and there was a very strong view that the emphasis should be on grammar in use, rather than on grammar as an isolated skill. The associated concern about the way in which NAPLAN might test grammar was voiced by several respondents.

Respondents particularly endorsed the need for teacher professional development in this area.

#### **4.6 The texts of English**

Many respondents took issue with the apparent privileging of Literature texts and argued for students to read, view, compose and produce a wider range of texts including spoken, written, visual, electronic, multimedia, digital, film and everyday, on the understanding that the emphasis on print texts should be retained.

There was general agreement that the choice of texts should be made by teachers, taking into account the needs and interests of their cohorts, and that text lists should not be mandated.

#### **4.7 The place of Literature and Australian Literature**

Respondents provided general endorsement of the place of both Literature and Australian Literature in the English curriculum, but took issue with the definition of the term 'Literature', which they believed provided a narrow definition of the function of Literature and seemed to endorse a canonical approach. (These issues related to Literature emerged again when respondents discussed Element 2.) An 'appropriate balance' of Australian Literature and the literature of other traditions/ and cultures was endorsed.

#### **4.8 Structure of the curriculum**

The division of English into three Elements was the cause for some concern among respondents. The submissions, in particular, did not endorse the apparent separation of knowledge and its application, or the lack of acknowledgement of English as a discipline which focuses on process and the application of knowledge, rather than on content knowledge. Alternative structures were suggested, including one structure which focused on two 'interrelated and interdependent dimensions – 'Language' and 'Literature and other texts'.

Some respondents suggested the need for a 'unifying principle', while others requested that the definitions of each of the Elements be further developed. They mentioned in particular: the need to take account of changing literacy practices, the need to make more explicit the links between language and thinking, learning, and making meaning; the critical literacy perspective; the need for an expanded definition of the role of Literature and an expanded range of texts.

#### **4.9 Stages of schooling**

One professional association argued that it would be better to 'describe (the stages) in terms of the cognitive and social development of young people rather than discipline content', while several other respondents asked for an acknowledgement of what students bring with them to school in terms of language understandings and requested more information about the proportion of time to be allocated to each of the elements at each stage. Gaps were identified in the descriptions of content across the stages and it was suggested that a continuum of learning could help to rectify this.

At Stage 1 respondents wanted to see a reference to early oral language skills, a clear description of how students would actually learn to read, and an emphasis on the need to make texts at this level 'real and related to the child's prior experiences', as well as an acknowledgement of the importance of creative and imaginative experiences. It was also noted that there is a mixture in this

level description of developmental statements and statements of a more summative nature. A more consistent approach was urged.

Some of the descriptions of content at Stages 3 and 4 were seen as too simple and failing to reflect the 'sophisticated levels of English experience expected at this stage'. (Professional Association). At Level 4 students should be expected to compose more than just 'creative texts'. The role of Literature in senior years was also raised by respondents, some of whom argued that not all students are students of Literature at this level while others argued that Literature should be part of every student's experience regardless of their chosen pathway.

There was broad agreement about the range and nature of Senior Year courses that should be available to students. Emphasis was on access to a variety of pathways and meeting the needs of specific cohorts of students. Suggested courses included ones designed for tertiary entrance, for the workforce and for EAL/D students, as well as a Literature course and an English Language course. One Education Authority argued for a wide variety of courses based largely on its current practice and one school argued for the retention of the Creative Writing course that currently operates in its jurisdiction. The form of assessment that should operate at this level was raised by one submission from respondents who argued for a retention of their status quo and an absence of external examinations.

#### **4.10 Pedagogy**

There was a strong feeling among the submission respondents that the Framing Paper should draw its understanding of pedagogy in secondary English from a wider research base, and that more guidance was needed about the range of available pedagogies and more emphasis on the need to select pedagogies that support the needs of a diverse range of learners.

It was suggested, however, that more appropriately a curriculum should guide rather than prescribe pedagogy. Resource material regarding pedagogy considered as best practice (including pedagogy to support teachers of EAL/D students) could be provided in addition to the curriculum.

#### **4.11 Assessment**

This section of the Framing Paper was seen to present a narrow focus on formalised summative assessment. Respondents urged the inclusion of reference to formative assessment (assessment for and as learning), as endorsed in the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians.

The curriculum was seen to have implications for NAPLAN. Respondents particularly emphasised the need for the curriculum to drive testing rather than the reverse. For that reason it was suggested that the literacy test in the NAPLAN program would need a wider range of texts and more variety in the way in which students can respond. In particular, if the emphasis of the curriculum is on grammar 'in use' then NAPLAN will need to reflect this.

One professional association argued for an additional assessment tool for EAL/D students.

#### **4.12 English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D)**

Feedback indicated that while indications of the diversity of EAL/D student population is present in the Framing Paper, the implications of this diversity are not explored. Respondents requested that separate support documentation and supplementary English language and literacy learning continua be developed for recently arrived EAL/D students which take into account different levels of entry to Australian schools.

#### **4.13 Clarity of language**

Respondents noted the repeated references to 'body of knowledge' which is unfamiliar to English teachers who do not conceive of English in this way. This term constructs a view of English as content rather than process and works to marginalise the learner who should be central.

Element 1 is labeled differently in the Aims (Knowledge about the English Language) and The Elements p.12 (Knowledge about English). These mean different things and are problematic.

Use of 'English' in titles and throughout paper can lead to conflation /confusion of subject English and English (as in Standard Australian English etc)

'Beginnings' and 'Basics' were both seen as problematic terms. Respondents commented on the term 'beginnings' as disregarding the wealth of language and literacy practices and experiences that children bring with them when they begin schooling. 'Basics' was seen as signifying that literacy develops through a hierarchy of building blocks separate from other aspects of language in its authentic uses.

#### **4.14 Other Considerations**

Several respondents drew attention to what they regarded as "deficit" comments – a perceived negativity about, for example, the teaching of grammar, pedagogy, and what students 'bring' to school. They asked that these be amended.

The Framing Paper acknowledges the need for systematic and ongoing professional development of current teachers as well as sound preparation of pre-service teachers. Respondents agree with this perceived need but seek clarification of the nature, delivery and funding of this training.

## 5. Addressing feedback requiring further examination

The analysed data from the consultation is summarised in tabular form below organised according to recurring themes arising from the feedback data. The numbering system below correlates to the elements of section 4 above.

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
4.2	<b>Introduction</b>	Emphasise the link between the study of language and the making of meaning.	Academics Teachers Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual	A specific statement has been included in the Introduction.
		Acknowledge the complexity of language experience that students bring to the study of English (Also of significance in the Aims).	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities Teachers	A section on equity and opportunity has been included in the Considerations Section which acknowledges the broad range of language backgrounds of Australian students.  In the K – 2 section a statement has been included about valuing students’ out-of-school language and literacy experiences.
4.3	<b>Aims</b>	Clarify that literacy is a cross-curricular responsibility.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Academics Teachers	A section on General Capabilities has been included which emphasises that teachers in all learning areas must take responsibility for literacy.  Reference to this has also been included in the section on Connections to other learning areas.
		Increase references to enjoyment, imagination and creativity both in writing as well as reading/viewing.	Education Authorities Academics Teacher Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national)	A section on General Capabilities has been included which emphasises that teachers in all learning areas must take responsibility for literacy.  Reference to this has also been included in the section on Connections to other learning areas.

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
4.4	<b>Terms</b>	Define key terms to clarify intention and provide examples where necessary.	Teachers Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Education Authorities Parents	A statement has been included in the Aims to emphasise this.
		Produce a glossary of other terms used in the paper.	Teachers Professional association – teachers (national) Professional association – principal	Definitions have been written for English (Standard Australian English) , Grammar , Creating and Strands
4.5	<b>The teaching of grammar in English</b>	Provide advice on the type of grammar that should be taught in schools.	Academics Teachers Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Principal Union	A paper was commissioned on the nature of grammar to be included in the curriculum. Advice has been provided which includes grammar terms at word, sentence and text levels. This advice will be considered by curriculum writers and advisory panel.
		Provide advice about the methodology of the teaching of grammar.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Teachers Education Authorities Academics Union	This is to be considered in the writing process.
		Provide a grammar for visual design.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Teachers	Reference to visual grammar has not been included in the paper. This will be considered by curriculum writers and advisory panel.
		The way in which the NAPLAN tests grammar should reflect the curriculum.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Education authorities Education Authorities – individual Teachers Academics Union	Comment has been noted by the Board.

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
4.6	<b>The texts of English</b>	Widen the range of texts for students to read, view, compose and produce.	Teachers Academics Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Parent Union	The definition of texts has been broadened in Terms section, and references to texts throughout the paper broadened to include a wider range.
		Drama, visual images etc are legitimate texts for study in their own right not just as part of Arts-enriched activities.	Professional association – teachers (state) Professional association – teachers (national) Teachers	Comment accepted but not included in paper.
		Confirm that there will be no set text list.	Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities Teachers	Comment has been noted. The English curriculum will indicate that the responsibility for text selection will remain the responsibility of schools and jurisdictions.
4.7	<b>The place of Literature and Australian Literature</b>	Clarify the definition of the term 'Literature' including an expansion of the range of texts to be considered Literature texts.	Teachers Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual Community members Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Union	The definition of literature has been broadened in Terms section, and references to literature throughout the paper broadened to include a wider range.
		Clarify the description of the functions of Literature and approaches to its study.	Academics Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Teachers	This will be considered in the writing process

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
4.8	<b>Structure of the curriculum (The Elements)</b>	Emphasise the inter-relationship between knowledge and its application.	Teachers Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Academics	Statements have been provided to emphasise this relationship.
		Consider reframing the structure and clarifying the relationship between the strands.	Professional association – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Academics	The structure of the English curriculum remains as the three strands of Language, Literature and Literacy. 'Elements' has been renamed 'Strands'. Subtitles have been amended to clarify content. A section on relationships between the strands has been included.
		Provide enhanced definitions of the Elements.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional Association – principals Teachers Academics Education Authorities	Descriptions of the Strands have been redrafted in plain English to provide clarity about the scope of each of the three strands.
4.9	<b>Stages of Schooling</b>	Describe in terms of cognitive and social development of young people rather than discipline content (not helpful guidelines as they stand).	Professional associations – teachers (national)	Advice is accepted but not included as it is not in keeping with the purpose of the paper. A statement about learner characteristics has been included in the Considerations section.
		Make more reference to oral language, particularly in Stage 1.	Academics Education Authorities Education authority – individuals Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Teachers Parent Union	References to oral language have been included throughout the paper.
		Consider role of Middle Years and how it fits with the stages of schooling.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities Teacher Union	The English advisory panel and writers will discuss and resolve issues raised regarding the Middle Years.

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
		Provide further detail in Stage 1 and 2 descriptions.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities Education Authorities – individual Teachers	Descriptions of content in the three strands for the stages of schooling have been reviewed. Further detail has not been included. Writers and English advisory panel will consider content in the three strands for the stages of schooling.
		Define the role of Literature in the senior school.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Teachers	Advisory panel and writers will consider this in the writing process.
		Examine lack of complexity and detail in Stages 3 & 4.	Academic Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities	Advisory panel and writers will consider this in the writing process.
		Provide a variety of pathways at Stage 4.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education Authorities Teachers Parents Principal	Board to decide number and type of courses such as English, ESL, Literature, etc. Further advice for writers about the nature of the curriculum in the senior secondary years will be provided.
4.10	<b>Pedagogy</b>	Draw on a wider and more recent research base in order to describe the range of available English pedagogies.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Undergraduate Teacher Parent	Comment is accepted but not in keeping with the purpose of this paper.
		Guide rather than prescribe pedagogy.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Teachers	Comment is accepted but not in keeping with the purpose of this paper.
		Emphasise the need to select pedagogies that support the needs of a diverse range of learners.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Education authority – individuals Academic Teachers	A statement has been included regarding the use of pedagogies that support the needs of a diverse range of students.

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
4.11	<b>Assessment</b>	Framing Paper focus is on summative assessment and does not reflect the range and nature of assessment as it currently exists in English.	Teachers Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Education Authorities Education Authorities – individuals Parent Principal	Advice is accepted and the point about assessment is valid but it is not appropriate to the purpose of the paper.
		Concern expressed at the relationship between the curriculum and NAPLAN.	Teachers Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Education authorities Education authority – individuals Parent Principal	Advice has been noted and will be provided to Board.
		Consider the use of an additional assessment tool for EAL/D students.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Teachers	Advice has been noted and will be provided to Board.
4.12	<b>EAL/D</b>	Explore the implications of the diversity of the EAL/D population.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Professional association – principals Education authorities Education Authorities – individual Teachers Union	A statement has been included acknowledging the linguistic and cultural diversity of the EAL/D population.
		The Framing Paper carries statements that may be seen to position issues relating to EAL/D, Indigenous students and diversity of student population in deficit terms or as problematic.	Education Authority Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Teacher	A statement has been included stating that the English curriculum will acknowledge and build on the language experiences of EAL/D students.  Board to consider how to build on existing work in states and territories to assist EAL/D students and the resources available to support the National Curriculum.

No	Item	Feedback summary	Source	Actions
		Supplementary English language and literacy learning continuum should be developed for recently arrived EAL/D students which take into account different levels of entry to Australian schools.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Education Authorities – individual Teachers	When developing the literacy continuum that underpins the National Curriculum, advice is to be sought from EAL/D representatives regarding literacy and language learning.  A separate course for EAL/D students in the senior years has been proposed with clear entry requirements.
4.13	<b>Clarity of Language</b>	Repeated references to 'body of knowledge' which are unfamiliar to English teachers.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Teachers Union	Comment noted but term remains, as it is integral to the disciplinarity of English: explicit knowledge about language, literature and texts.
		Use of 'English' in titles and throughout paper confusing as to whether subject English or English language.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Education authority – individuals	Revisions have been made to eliminate possible confusion.
		Concerns about terms 'Beginnings' and 'Basics'.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Teachers Academics	Revisions have been made in the light of feedback.
		Language used in the paper is too academic and dense at times.	Professional associations – teachers (state) Education authorities Parents Teachers	An edit focusing on plain English, succinctness and clarity has been undertaken.
4.14	<b>Other considerations</b>	Concerns were expressed as to how existing and future teachers will become skilled in the areas that are different and/or new in approach or content. (Grammar, Literature in Primary).	Professional associations – teachers (state) Professional associations – teachers (national) Education authorities Education Authorities – individual Teachers Academics Union Principal Undergraduate Teacher	Undertake further collaboration with States and Territories about the nature, delivery and funding of the ongoing professional development which will be necessary to implement the new English curriculum.

## 6. Summary of submissions

### *The National English Curriculum: Framing Paper*

Consultation period: October 2008 – February 2009

Data as at 27 March 2009

Submissions	
English	87
Mathematics	67
Science	78
History	82
	<b>314</b>

  

Surveys	
English	246
Mathematics	159
Science	192
History	220
	<b>817</b>

  

Total of all feedback	
English	333
Mathematics	226
Science	270
History	302
	<b>1131</b>

## 7. Appendix: What the community said in response to NCB survey questions

The English Framing paper invited responses to 42 questions via an online survey. 19 of these provided an opportunity for respondents to rate their agreement to the statements in each section of the paper using a four point scale. The aggregated data for 243 surveys are provided in the tables below in the rows titled 'Surveys'.

In addition, 83 submissions to the English framing paper were received. While these did not always rate the sections of the paper, the analysis of responses included a summary of positions on the level of agreement for particular proposals. These data are included for comparative purposes in the rows titled 'Submissions'. It should be noted that the data in the 'Agree' category include submissions that indicated 'partially agree' or 'mainly agree'. The majority of submissions in this category expressed reservations about particular proposals and provided suggestions for improvement or requested clarification.

### Question 2: To what extent do you agree with the aims of the national English curriculum proposed in this paper?

#### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	5%	49%	43%
Submissions		11%	86%	3%
Total	2%	8%	67%	23%

#### Qualitative responses

The proposed aims of the English curriculum were strongly endorsed by respondents, although suggestions were made for further inclusions or changes of emphasis:

- *We support the balanced approach... which recognises the importance of foundational literacy, the vital role of literary studies for all students, including well-recognised works of prose, poetry, drama and film, new directions in multimedia, and an awareness of critical literacy. The ability of students to communicate effectively in the diverse contexts of contemporary society is crucial.* (Association)
- *Some reframing of the language in this section would achieve giving greater emphasis to students as central to the learning process.* (Professional Association)
- *Qualify that 'although English and literacy remain central to an English curriculum, literacy teaching and learning take place in all curriculum areas.'* (Professional Association)
- *Seems to focus on functional literacy; there needs to be a stronger focus on the aesthetic creative.* (School)
- *a lack of focus on visual literacy...* (Individual education professional)

#### Question 4: To what extent do you agree with English being framed by these 3 Elements?

##### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	4%	6%	44%	47%
Submissions		60%	37%	3%
Total	2%	33%	40%	25%

##### Qualitative responses

The structure of the English curriculum through the three elements was endorsed.

- *in the three well-chosen elements of English: language, literature and literacy – Australia has an admirable track record. We believe that the National English Curriculum: Framing Paper reflects and builds on these successes, while responding to challenges of curriculum and pedagogy in this vital area of student learning.* (Academics)

However, many of the submissions commented on the way in which the Elements appeared to separate knowledge and its application – ‘the holistic sense is not captured strongly enough’ (Individual education professional).

- *concern about them being seen as hierarchial... vital that the inter relationship is clear.* (Education Authority)
- *At the very least, a diagram is required to represent how the three elements work in an integrated fashion* (Professional Association)

They also wanted to see an acknowledgment of English as a discipline which focuses on process and the application of knowledge, rather than on content knowledge. Several respondents requested that the definitions of each of the Elements be further developed to take account of several aspects of current English practice which they thought were missing from the descriptions.

- *seems to be focused on knowledge as the end of learning... the elements should be more focused on the application of knowledge* (Education Authority)
- *Possible confusion between Elements 1 and 3 – are they the same?* (Association)

Alternative organisers were suggested as follows:

- *... two interrelated and interdependent dimensions: Language (including... literacy, as well as language in use in context and so on) and Literature and Other Texts (including texts produced by others for the engagement and response of students, and texts produced by students themselves.* (Academics)
- *There are four domains in which language enters in to work in English. We can think of these as inviting different kinds of knowledge which can be shortened as flows; ‘know about’, ‘know through’, ‘know how’ and ‘know why’.* (Academic)

**Question 6: To what extent do you agree that this section adequately describes a futures orientation to be taken by a national English curriculum?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	5%	6%	47%	41%
Submissions		8%	72%	20%
Total	3%	7%	59%	31%

**Qualitative responses**

This section was strongly endorsed by both the surveys and the submissions, but several respondents expressed the view that the ‘features of a futures orientation are not reflected in a coherent way through the document’. (Professional association)

Further additions were also suggested:

- *Para 19 discusses globalisation only in the context of work and does not consider how globalisation is impacting on how students see themselves in relation to the world, the role of English as a global language and the place of Australian literature in a global context.* (Professional Association)
- In order to support the focus on new media as an integral aspect of the futures orientation of the document, teachers felt it was imperative that the definition of literature in the Framing Paper be revised and broadened to encompass a wider range of what constitutes literature. (Association)
- Needs more emphasis on listening, speaking and viewing to accommodate 21st Century learning and the shift from writing and reading to ICT. ‘Oracy and listening comprehension is important and needs to be more explicitly recognised in the national English curriculum. (Organisation)
- *The first language literacy skills, language awareness and appreciation of oral or written literature could be emphasised along with the need to support and affirm this knowledge while supporting and resourcing these students’ acquisition of English.* (Academics)
- Recognition of the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait learner’s identities and cultures has not been clearly defined. Assumption is made that they are part of a subset of students from multicultural backgrounds. (Education Authority)
- *(A) commitment to equity and equality is essential but also needs further articulation in order to move beyond rhetoric.* (Individual education professional)
- *The word ‘critically’ only appears once, and not in an analytical context. Surely here, if anywhere, critical literacy should be at least mentioned?* (Individual education professional)

**Question 9: Beginnings and ‘basics’ – To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	4%	3%	35%	58%
Submissions		6%	75%	19%
Total	2%	4%	55%	39%

## Qualitative responses

This section was seen by some respondents as a refusal to reduce the English curriculum to a ‘back to basics’ approach and received endorsement for that reason. Other respondents were concerned about the very use of the word ‘basics’, fearing that it sent the wrong message.

- *the word ‘beginnings’ is very problematic. the first year of compulsory schooling...is not the beginning of language and literacy development* (Professional Association)
- *Yes, phonics, spelling, punctuation are important (but) The prime focus for teachers and learners should be on meaning.* (Individual education professional)

Again, respondents offered suggestions to enhance this section of the Framing Paper.

- *References to the Early Years Learning Framework will strengthen the intent of this section.* (Professional Association)
- *Reiterate here that students bring a range of experiences, knowledge and skills to their study of English in school and that learning should be built on such experiences, knowledge and skills.* (Professional Association)
- *The stress of phonics in this section comes at the expense of the focus on a balanced reading program that has been emphasised in syllabuses around the country for decades (and) in research ...All three cueing systems (should be) explicitly named.* (Professional Association)
- *In para 5 of Item 30, and in item 31, you make the most important point of all. It should be made at the outset, not tucked away...* (Community member)
- *This section stresses reading and writing which may overshadow the role that speaking and listening play in language development and learning about English.* (Education Authority)
- *... the persistent use of passive voice tends to undermine the strength of the comments in this section.* (Education Authority)
- *Focus on decoding and encoding needs to be ‘augmented with a stronger emphasis on engagement in creative and critical textual practices. At this foundational level, there needs to be an emphasis on students’ development of a repertoire of strategies that allow them to read and engage with a range of texts of increasing complexity with increasing independence.* (Academics)

## Question 11: The teaching of grammar in English – To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?

### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	2%	4%	34%	60%
Submissions		3%	78%	19%
Total	1%	3%	56%	40%

### Qualitative responses

The vast majority of respondents (96 per cent) strongly and enthusiastically endorsed the inclusion of the teaching of grammar in the national curriculum. However, *the ‘deficit’ view of English teaching (was) deemed offensive. Grammar has long been a significant aspect of curriculum documents across Australia and implying this is a completely new area for consideration by teachers is not correct.* (Professional Association)

There were a variety of views on the question of whether one specific form of grammar should be mandated:

- *(Grammar) must be common across all states.* (Individual education professional)
- *I hope the curriculum will avoid favouring either traditional or functional approaches...* (Individual education professional)

- ... a complementary/blended 'functional' and 'traditional' grammar (Academic, Professional Associations)
- ...avoid advocating one kind of grammar and emphasise the role of grammar as a way of describing how language works (Academic)
- ... the Knowledge about Language element (must) be underpinned by a model of language that is functional, comprehensive and relevant to students' lives and academic success. (Teachers, Academics, Professional Associations)
- teaching of grammar in a decontextualised manner is to be avoided – this could be more explicitly stated here (Academics)
- endorse ... the notion of grammar that emphasises word, sentence and text level structures and functions and the connections between them (Professional Association)
- Concern was expressed about the way in which grammar might be tested in national tests. (Grammar should be seen as) 'a tool for using and not an isolated skill to be tested on' (Professional Association) On the question of methodology, respondents urged that the focus should be on 'grammar in use' and the curriculum should 'not endorse the adoption of just one grammar teaching methodology'. (Professional Association)
- EAL/D students will require a 'highly contextualized, learner-centred approach to the teaching of grammar' (Professional Association)

**Question 13: The texts of English – To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	4%	5%	47%	44%
Submissions		25%	70%	5%
Total	2%	15%	59%	24%

**Qualitative responses**

Respondents were anxious to ensure the inclusion of texts that have historically been the province of subject English:

- Subject English has for a long time included texts other than print...some rewording to make this clear is needed in order to position the concept that this changed with the advance of digital technologies. (Professional Association)
- include non-print texts... but... reinforce the primary role played by print and language-based texts (Professional Association)
- ensure there is a balanced approach to the study of texts; provide guidance about the balance of spoken and written tasks
- Suggest employment of the modes (Speaking, Listening, Reading, Writing, Viewing, and Constructing) as organizers for discussing the range of texts (Professional Association)
- Arts-enriched activities do not accompany English – they are regarded as an inherent part of subject English. For example, plays and films (Education Authority)
- there is value in recognising that poetry, novels and other literature are important but high order thinking can also accompany the discussion of symbols (Education Authority)

With reference to the content of this section, the following observation was made:

- This section creates significant tensions for the Literature element. If the texts and activities outlined in this section truly have 'an important place in a national English curriculum' then it is very difficult to understand why the second element is not labelled Texts: informed understanding and appreciation of texts (or something similar) and made inclusive of literary and other texts. (Professional Association)

**Question 15: Understanding, analysing, appreciating and constructing – To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	2%	5%	45%	48%
Submissions		29%	53%	18%
Total	1%	17%	49%	33%

**Qualitative responses**

Paragraph 36 was thought by some respondents to capture ‘a sense of English that accords with current practice’ (Professional Association) better than the three element structure, but the use of the singular form of ‘vantage point’ was deemed to ‘exclude the possibility of students evaluating different interpretations’ (Professional Association).

An Education Authority went further and said:

- This section includes some of the ideas relating to a critical literacy perspective but uses terminology which makes the study obscure. (Education Authority)

Other comments and suggestions included:

- ... give due weight to the construction and evaluation of texts. (Professional Association)
- ...the first sentence (in #36) includes four skills that relate to reading but only one that relates to writing... (Teacher)
- ... the names of these roles may need changing. (Professional Association)
- ... acknowledge the essential notion that the composition and comprehension of texts will be influenced by the assumptions, values and beliefs of writers/speakers and readers/listeners respectively.
- Echoes of the text analyst role / resource and the critical literacy perspective are present herein. This should be less bashful and written as a stronger statement in support of these vitally integral aspects of literacy for C21st. (Professional Association)

**Question 17: The place of literature and Australian literature – To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	1%	9%	47%	43%
Submissions		17%	71%	12%
Total	1%	13%	59%	27%

**Qualitative responses**

- The place of ‘an appropriate balance of Australian literature and literature from other countries and traditions’ (Professional Association) was endorsed by the majority of surveys and submissions. However several respondents took issue with the description of Literature, its aims and its texts. ‘Literature is a cognitive as well as an imaginative encounter’. (Individual education professional)
- ‘It would strengthen (this section) were the Framing paper to include the following issues – that literature can provide students with: enjoyment, greater information about a deeper understanding of the human experience; enhanced awareness of socio-cultural values, attitudes and beliefs; a richer understanding of how, in diverse ways, writers use language;

- exposure to ideas and values which challenge their own ideas and values; and the realisation that readers can respond to texts in various ways as influenced by their own experiences and context. (Academics)
- Lacks 'proper recognition of texts other than traditional print texts'.
- The reference to the study of Australian literature and 'traditions' of Aboriginal culture is in the past tense, inferring that Aboriginal histories will be taught in a historical perspective only. References to Aboriginal contemporary issues need to be made as well. (Education Authority)
- Australian literature has an important role in English but balance is the key. It remains imperative that Australian literature is taught from a modern international perspective and context. While many teachers agreed in principle with the study of Australian literature they also acknowledged that there is debate over what constitutes 'Australian literature', especially contemporary Australian literature and commented on how much of our traditional literature is in fact culturally outdated.

The mandating of lists of texts for students to study was not endorsed:

- The ability of teachers to foster an interest and genuine engagement with Australian literature will require that the national curriculum allow teachers considerable autonomy to match their students with the most suitable works and to teach them in a way that caters for the needs of individual students. (Professional Association)

### **Question 19: Pedagogy and disciplinarity – To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?**

#### **Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	7%	46%	44%
Submissions	5%	26%	64%	5%
Total	4%	16%	55%	25%

#### **Qualitative responses**

The English professional associations in particular registered their opinion that recent research into the pedagogies of subject English needed further consideration in the framing of this section.

- the binaries presented in the first sentence – explicit/discovery teaching and correctness/imagination – are unsustainable upon close examination of literature in the field. (Professional Association)
- The possibilities of the range of pedagogical strategies available to the English practitioner are not represented and there is a lack of current research for substantiation. (Individual education professional)
- Understanding of the term English in terms of disciplinarity might be interpreted differently by Primary and Secondary educators ...the 'debates' ...sometimes are around how Primary and Secondary teachers conceptualize English and that drives the difference or disjunction in the pedagogies they may use. Now is the opportunity write a curriculum that is cyclical and builds on what has gone before with pedagogies that reflect, for example, explicit but contextual teaching with authentic purposes, using approaches such as collaborative learning.
- Pedagogical approaches should reflect the needs of the cohort.
- The expectations of the community based in most instances on personal, prior experience are that schools will use formal teaching methods to transmit knowledge. These classic teaching techniques are not conducive to the learning of students who speak a language other than English
- Being able to maintain a flexible approach to both teaching pedagogy and methodology is the crucial element here as it supports student-centred learning, allows for a broad range of experiences to cater for the diversity of students in our schools and encourages greater engagement (Association)

**Question 21: General capabilities across the curriculum - To what extent do you agree with the comments in this section?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	1%	5%	40%	53%
Submissions	5%	19%	67%	9%
Total	3%	12%	54%	31%

**Qualitative responses**

The majority of the responses that provided comments focused on cross-curricular literacy demands. While acknowledging that all teachers need to teach the literacy requirements of their subjects, some respondents also wanted to acknowledge:

- *the role of English as having a distinctive responsibility to help develop students’ literacy. (This) could be more clearly stated in a manner similar to the statements clarifying the relationships of history, science and mathematics to literacy in the framing papers for those curricula. (Professional Association)*
- *The concept of the student as an imaginative, reflective individual, engaged in fulfilling endeavours within and beyond school needs to be strengthened. (Education Authority)*
- *Whilst it is acknowledged that certain skills and understandings advanced in subject English will translate to skills and understandings in other key learning areas, it is not the remit of teachers in subject English to take responsibility for skills and understandings in key learning areas that have their own specialised literacy demands.*

**Question 23: This section describes Element 1: Language: Knowledge about English. To what extent do you agree with the description of this Element?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	5%	42%	50%
Submissions		50%	40%	10%
Total	2%	27%	41%	30%

**Qualitative responses**

While there was strong endorsement of the inclusion of this element, the submissions in particular indicated the need for further refinement of its description. Several suggestions were made:

- *A coherent model of language is strongly implied and it should be explicitly stated that the understandings here are based on a functional model of language ...which would then drive a stronger coherence across sections of this paper. (Professional Association)*
- *The knowledge building process mentioned here needs to involve the consideration of the students’ prior linguistic and cultural knowledge and the EAL/D students who enter the curriculum at different times, with different levels of SAE proficiency. (Professional Association)*
- *...include spoken language as a specific means of presenting argument, opinions etc. (Education Authority)*
- *Knowledge about language goes beyond knowing ‘grapheme-phoneme correspondence, phonological and phonemic awareness, alphabetic knowledge, spelling, conventions of punctuation, comprehension, and so on.’ It should also include ‘understanding how all levels of language ...interact to create meaning; how language is used differently in creating spoken and written texts; how language is*

involved in comprehension, appreciation, interpretation and critical analysis of a wide variety of texts; how language is used to create and interpret digital and visual texts.’ (Education Authority)

- ...doesn't make direct links to the other two elements. (Individual education professional)
- This section would be strengthened if it more firmly acknowledged the diverse range of learners and hence the diverse range of strategies needed.
- notions of appropriateness and effectiveness of language features be preferred over those of 'correctness'
- Learning about language needs to be related to authentic purposes....(and) the need to develop competence in spoken language throughout the years of schooling needs greater emphasis.

**Question 25: This section describes Element 2: Literature: Informed appreciation of literature. To what extent do you agree with the description of this Element?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	8%	45%	45%
Submissions	14%	43%	43%	
Total	8%	25%	44%	23%

**Quantitative responses**

The description of Element 2 was possibly the most controversial of the three descriptions, mainly because of the roles attributed to Literature here and in the section on the place of Literature and Australian Literature, the nature of the Literature texts and the descriptions of what students might do with these texts. These are some of the comments that were made:

- Element 2 should be broadened to include a wider range of print and non-print texts and be renamed 'Literature and other texts'. (Academics)
- ...articulate the relationships between the study of literature and students' cognitive development and cultural understandings. (Academics)
- The notion of students as composers of their own literature has not been considered in this section. (Education Authority)
- Adding Literature into the primary curriculum will increase crowding. (Professional Association)
- in this section needs to include specific mention of the critical literacy perspective that forms an important aspect of current senior secondary courses. (Education Authority)
- an 'informed appreciation of literature' excludes 'the possibility of responding to texts in valid ways, other than with appreciation.' (Education Authority)
- Something of a canonical, cultural heritage model of literature is implied, with terms like 'recognised' or 'are judged' – we find this quite problematic.
- Is it to be a situation whereby selection of texts can be contextualised? Or, will those texts that are valued by one element of society be mandated as the texts that are to be valued by all?
- Some thought also needs to be given to the place of literature ...in different courses catering for the diverse needs, interests and abilities of students in the final years of schooling. (Education Authority)

**Question 27: This section describes Element 3: Literacy: Evolving repertoires of English usage. To what extent do you agree with the description of this Element?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	1%	5%	43%	51%
Submissions		33%	67%	
Total	1%	19%	55%	25%

**Qualitative responses**

The surveys generally regarded this description favourably, but the submissions asked for a clearer and expanded definition.

- *(This) is one aspect of literacy – that of being a text user. All four roles or practices are involved in literacy.* (Individual education professional)
- *Oracy (needs to be) highlighted more throughout this section.* (Professional Association)
- *The Board needs to give much more detailed consideration to the nature of the subject English in the light of the way multimedia and digital communication technologies are changing literacy practices.* (Academic)
- *...this aspect of the curriculum must also focus on the higher order literacy skills necessary for students to deal with increasingly complex language situations in a variety of mediums on a daily basis.* (Education Authority)
- *This whole section needs a stronger focus on students creating texts* (Professional Association)
- *The inclusion of an active mode partnering ‘viewing’ (such as designing or representing) and an overarching statement about the relationships between the modes would make a significant contribution to the curriculum’s futures orientation.* (Professional Association)
- *... affirm the role and importance of out-of-school experiences informing literacy development of students* (Education Authority)

**Question 29: To what extent do you agree with the proposed descriptions of the Elements for Stage 1 of schooling?**

**Quantitative responses**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	4%	6%	57%	33%
Submissions		11%	89%	
Total	2%	8%	73%	17%

**Qualitative responses**

Dissatisfaction with the Elements as the organisers of the curriculum meant that a number of respondents did not comment in detail on the descriptions of the Elements for each of the stages of schooling. Often survey respondents only indicated their agreement or disagreement, without providing any further comment.

- *Oral language should be strengthened at Stage 1* (Professional Association)
- *needs to include the notion of drama and play* (Professional Association)
- *systematic phonics instruction (should not be) interpreted as optional.* (Education Authority)
- *there seems to be no clear description of how students will learn to read.* (Academic)
- *more emphasis on making... experiences with texts real and related to the child’s prior experiences.* (Individual education professional)

'The St'...does not pay due regard to the position of students within the curriculum and the complex negotiations that they undertake as they move between home and school.

- *In the early years of schooling children's knowledge of English is predicated on a broad range of experiences in hearing and using language. It should be emphasized that students' developing abilities to analyse sound units and their knowledge of letters and letter combinations should be based on these rich experiences. Similarly understandings of the features of print develop from authentic and meaningful contexts of use.*
- *The opportunity for students to represent their ideas through the creation of spoken, written and multimodal texts and to create texts individually and in groups should be included in Stage 1 (as it is in other Stages) (Association)*
- *what exactly is the foundational grammatical toolkit given to students in Stage 1? (Academic)*
- *Students should learn to discuss text structures as well as language features (Education Authority)*
- *Stage 1 of schooling goes over four years. A lot of learning happens in those years and this does not give it justice. (Individual education professional)*

### Question 31: To what extent do you agree with the proposed descriptions of the Elements for Stage 2 of schooling?

#### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	4%	57%	36%
Submissions		33%	60%	7%
Total	1%	18%	59%	22%

#### Qualitative responses

- *Both Stages 1 and 2 could emphasise the importance of creative and imaginative experiences more (Professional Association)*
- *There are no clear links to the previous stage; they appear to be discrete entities. (Individual education professional)*
- *Students aren't just 'exposed to' an expanding range of literary texts, they comprehend and respond to them in a variety of ways. (Individual education professional)*
- *the purposes for writing ...need to be wider and more encompassing. (Education Authority)*
- *Teachers liked the inter-connectedness, the 'learning to read' and 'reading to learn' aspect and the basis of a wide range of literature for enjoyment and pleasure (Association)*

### Question 33: To what extent do you agree with the proposed descriptions of the Elements for Stage 3 of schooling?

#### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	2%	6%	56%	37%
Submissions		50%	50%	
Total	1%	28%	53%	18%

### Qualitative responses

- *Fundamental to the subject at all stages and in all its aspects is the search for meaning.* (Academic)
- *the definition of work undertaken at this Stage 3 seems to be too simple* (Professional Association)
- the outline of the study also needs to include critical, metacognitive and reflective elements
- *more depth is needed in characterising the learners and the tremendous differences/range in all aspects through these years* (Individual education professional)
- *'students are introduced to literary works' should be replaced with 'students extend their knowledge of...'* (Education Authority)
- concern that the Stage 3 description for literature did not marry with the Element 2 definition. The use of the term 'text types', (which has specific connotations in some states) as opposed to "texts" suggests students will focus on formulaic writing rather than subversions and experimentation in the construction of texts. Again this highlights the need for a development of a consistent metalanguage for English. (Association)
- Teachers supported the need to encourage differentiation and consider a more challenging continuum of learning to cater for the diverse needs and interests of adolescent learners. (Association)
- Element 1 is non-specific for Stage 3. This element particularly needs greater detail for teachers in Secondary Schools

### Question 35. To what extent do you agree with the proposed descriptions of the Elements for Stage 4 of schooling?

#### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	6%	59%	33%
Submissions		53%	47%	
Total	1%	29%	53%	17%

#### Qualitative responses

- *introductory statement... does not pick up on the sophisticated levels of English experience expected at Stage 4 given the description of Element 3.* (Professional Association)
- *#86 should also include an appreciation of, and capacity to use, language devices, strategies and forms which intentionally persuade and influence readers.* (Individual education professional)
- *no mention of creating any kind of text other than creative ...should be involved in creating a wide range of text forms for a wide range of purposes and audiences including authentic texts and purposes.* (Education Authority)
- *the description of the learners here... lacks recognition of the cognitive maturation and developmental expectation of many student – young adults* (Individual education professional)
- *It is recommended that a number of options be developed providing alternate pathways for ESL learners in Stage 4.*
- Regardless of the possible options of courses at this stage, teachers felt a blend of both analysis and creativity should be included in each; teachers felt that responding and composing elements be retained in whatever study options are provided. (Association)
- Element 1 needs to be of a more demanding level for some students at this stage. References need to be included as to the shaping of meaning and the exploration of how language forms and features and structures of text relate to purpose, audience and context. Context is particularly important as Element 2 requires a comparative study of literature from the past and present. (Association)
- These aspects of the curriculum must be introduced in earlier stages: our introduction to critical literacy processes begins in early childhood classes (Education Authority)

### Question 38: To what extent do you agree with the comments on pedagogy?

#### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	3%	9%	46%	42%
Submissions		27%	73%	
Total	1%	18%	60%	21%

#### Qualitative responses

Disagreement in relation to this section focussed on the need to expand the research base and to describe more fully the range of available pedagogies. The need to make pedagogy inclusive and relevant to the diverse needs of students was also mentioned.

- *Endorse equitable and culturally appropriate and inclusive pedagogies with regard to indigenous and other Australian or overseas born students from families in which English is not the main language of the home.* (Professional Association)
- *Resource material regarding pedagogy considered as best practice could be provided in addition to the curriculum.* (Professional Association)
- *Avoid the mention of negative practices as a comparison for good pedagogy.* (Education Authority)
- *the final document (should) draw its understanding of pedagogy in secondary English from a wider research base.* (Professional Association)
- *As a parent I want to see a range of approaches to teaching literacy that are based on evidence, sound research and what teachers know 'works'* (Community member)
- *endorse that the framing paper recognises the need for explicit teaching* (Association)
- *pleasing emphasis on flexible and critical thinking and on raising students' understanding of the processes of knowledge acquisition*
- *The paper needs to focus on pedagogical issues of the English classroom such as the design of teaching for active movement between responding to texts and creating and composing texts; the place of explicit teaching of types of texts, and how this is orchestrated in the classroom; the integration of critical literacy and eLearning.*

### Question 40: To what extent do you agree with the comments on assessment?

#### Quantitative responses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Surveys	1%	9%	59%	31%
Submissions	4%	64%	32%	
Total	2%	36%	46%	16%

#### Qualitative responses

Those who did not agree with the comments in this section did so for the same reason: the apparent emphasis on summative assessment and a lack of reference to formative assessment practices:

- *a very narrow view of assessment. The whole section... needs to be reviewed in the light of... assessing as, of and for learning, which is included in the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians.* (Education Authority)
- *a failure to consider assessment more broadly in terms of the role of the teacher and the individual learning needs of students*

Further clarification was sought about the relationship between the curriculum and forms of assessment which might be mandated:

- *English teachers in Queensland would strongly oppose the assumption by some that external examinations must necessarily be part of the educational landscape, particularly at the senior secondary level. (Academic)*
- *student results from pencil and paper tests on their own are a narrow and archaic way to determine the extent to which schools, teachers and students are meeting curriculum goals in the 21st century. (Professional Association)*
- *so much of the curriculum that the framing papers allude to that simply cannot be measured, expressed or evaluated during a closed-book pencil and paper test. Many of these curriculum elements are important intellectual drivers for the growth of a 'knowledge economy'*
- *curriculum MUST guide external tests such as NAPLAN, and not the other way around*
- *An additional assessment tool, or menu of EAL/D validated diagnostic tools is needed to capture the progress of EAL/D learners. This could be implemented as parallel or complementary testing to NAPLAN*