



# QCEC Response to Draft 2 Consultation on Stage 2 Senior Syllabuses

3 March 2017

---

## Introduction

Queensland Catholic Education Commission (QCEC) again welcomes the opportunity to provide input to the draft two consultation on three Stage two senior syllabuses being redeveloped: **Agricultural Science, Design and Psychology**. QCEC is the peak strategic body for the 300 Catholic schools in Queensland which are operated by 22 different Catholic school authorities and include 107 secondary schools impacted by changes to senior secondary assessment and tertiary entrance processes.

The significant time constraints continue to be an issue for the consultation phase in the syllabus redevelopment process which QCEC believes is a risk to the integrity of this process. Two Catholic school authorities, which together represent about half of the senior secondary students in Queensland Catholic schools, organised teacher meetings and provided feedback that has informed QCEC's response. Schools and teachers are encouraged to submit their own responses to QCAA surveys.

The QCEC response to this consultation on Stage two syllabuses focuses on high level issues across syllabuses. The feedback provided to QCEC acknowledged that this second draft reflects consideration given to issues and concerns raised in the draft one consultation. However, there do remain some overarching areas of concern.

## High level issues across the curriculum

### Continued concern about risks in syllabus consultation processes

Two of these three syllabuses available for consultation are new and therefore require greater consideration in responding, this is not supported by the tight timelines for consultation.

### Issues re-raised

Feedback highlighted the need for significant further work to enable teachers to teach the Design syllabus as a composite class due to the spiralling nature of the content. It was suggested that as this was named as one of the syllabus documents for further work to support delivery in a composite class setting there was an expectation of evidence of this work in this draft for consultation.

The amount of content was again named as a concern in the Design syllabus, it was felt that this posed a risk to depth of learning.

### Introduction of new subjects

In respect to the two new subjects, Psychology and Design, feedback highlighted the need for considerable professional development for teachers to support them in teaching these subjects and

recommended ongoing opportunities for upskilling teachers. The requirement of investment in new technology, such as 3D printers, laser cutters and CNC routers, to support the Design subject was identified in the feedback as a resourcing implication for schools considering implementation of the syllabus.

Feedback suggested that, where relevant, pathways be made evident from Year 10 Science to Psychology to ensure the potential of Psychology as a subject choice in Year 11. Greater clarity of links to demonstrate the pathway from Technologies into specialist senior subjects was highlighted in the feedback.

### **Design syllabus**

Feedback recommended the design process and relevant design thinking references included in this syllabus be adopted across other Technologies subjects.

### **Assessment**

Feedback raised several issues in regard to aspects of summative assessments:

- Analysis of data (statistics) in Agricultural Science, similar to that in Biology, was identified as something new and connections to the relevant content taught in Year 10 science would need to be made.
- A potential issue may arise with external assessment in Agricultural Science trying to keep the content authentic to the 'production systems' concept.
- The summative internal assessment 1 for Design, objective 2, did not provide evidence of prototyping within the specification which impacts on the ISMG. Conditions listed in the assessment specifications may not be possible across all school contexts due to timetabling or special considerations.
- The summative internal assessment 2 for Design should focus on objectives 4 – 8 as it was felt that there was not any real opportunity to demonstrate objectives 1 – 3. Weighting of the ISMG in Design needs to match the emphasis evident in the task.
- The use of the term 'innovative' in the Design synthesizing and evaluating criterion and its definition in the glossary may not be easy to discern when making judgements. In the Design communication criterion reference to the pitch component of the task should be included. Use of cognitive verbs to develop shared understanding of ISMGs will only be successful if the definitions provided result in additional clarity.

### **Glossary**

Feedback sought assurance that terms used are defined consistently across syllabus documents, particularly across the Technologies suite of subjects. It was suggested that the hyperlinking of terms when the syllabuses are presented in an online format would improve usability.

### **Conclusion**

QCEC welcomes all opportunity to input into the process of syllabus redevelopment and will be happy to discuss further any issues raised in this response.



**Dr Lee-Anne Perry AM**  
Executive Director