

# Queensland response to the Stage 2 draft F–10 Australian Curriculum: Languages

---

Arabic, French, German, Indonesian, Japanese,  
Korean, Modern Greek, Spanish and Vietnamese

July 2013



# Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Overall strengths and key issues.....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Overall strengths.....	1
2.2 Key issues .....	2
<b>3. Rationale, aims, and organisation of the curriculum.....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Rationale and aims .....	4
3.2 Learning area organisation .....	5
<b>4. Arabic.....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Context statement.....	9
4.2 Band descriptions .....	9
4.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	10
4.4 Achievement standards .....	13
<b>5. French.....</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Context statement.....	15
5.2 Band descriptions .....	15
5.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	16
5.4 Achievement standards .....	23
<b>6. German.....</b>	<b>24</b>
6.1 Context statement.....	24
6.2 Band descriptions .....	24
6.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	25
6.4 Achievement standards .....	29
<b>7. Indonesian .....</b>	<b>30</b>
7.1 Context statement.....	30
7.2 Band descriptions .....	30
7.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	31
7.4 Achievement standards .....	35
<b>8. Japanese.....</b>	<b>36</b>
8.1 Context statement.....	36
8.2 Band descriptions .....	36
8.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	38
8.4 Achievement standards .....	41

<b>9. Korean</b> .....	<b>43</b>
9.1 Context statement.....	43
9.2 Band descriptions .....	43
9.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	44
9.4 Achievement standards .....	47
<b>10. Modern Greek</b> .....	<b>49</b>
10.1 Context statement.....	49
10.2 Band descriptions .....	49
10.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	49
10.4 Achievement standards .....	53
<b>11. Spanish</b> .....	<b>54</b>
11.1 Context statement.....	54
11.2 Band descriptions .....	54
11.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	55
11.4 Achievement standards .....	61
<b>12. Vietnamese</b> .....	<b>63</b>
12.1 Context statement.....	63
12.2 Band descriptions .....	63
12.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations .....	65
12.4 Achievement standards .....	68

# 1. Introduction

The Queensland Studies Authority (QSA), in partnership with Education Queensland (EQ), Queensland Catholic Education Commission (QCEC) and Independent Schools Queensland (ISQ), appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Stage 2 draft *Foundation (F)<sup>1</sup> to Year 10 Australian Curriculum: Languages* (draft Languages curriculum). Queensland supports the development of an Australian Curriculum that will provide consistent and explicit curriculum expectations across the nation.

This response is a summary of the collated Queensland feedback from:

- representative curriculum and learning area committees of the QSA
- professional associations
- representatives and advocates of the three schooling sectors, representing 1400 EQ schools, 296 Catholic schools and 188 Independent schools.

Queensland's consultation identified a range of strengths, key issues and concerns, and also provided some suggested ways forward for the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting's (ACARA) consideration when redrafting the *F–10 Australian Curriculum: Languages*.

This response has been organised to reflect the structure of the consultation survey in the following way:

- overall strengths of the draft curriculum and key issues with a suggested way forward
- feedback on the rationale and aims, and structure of the curriculum with a suggested way forward
- feedback for each of the nine language subjects, including feedback on the context statement, band descriptions, content descriptions, content elaborations and achievement standards with suggested ways forward.

The stakeholders who contributed to the Queensland response support the development of an Australian Curriculum in Languages and acknowledge that inherent in its development is the redefining and refocusing of the study of Languages in Australian schools.

In addition to contributing to the Queensland response, QCEC and ISQ have elected to submit their own responses to ACARA. These responses contain detailed feedback on each aspect of the draft curriculum.

## 2. Overall strengths and key issues

### 2.1 Overall strengths

Consultation participants identified the following overall strengths.

- The overall structure and intent of the draft Languages curriculum are supported and consultation participants felt that the essential elements of the learning area have been elaborated.
- Overall, the draft Languages curriculum provides a framework through which to develop language proficiency and intercultural understanding.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Foundation Year (F) of the Australian Curriculum is Prep (P) in Queensland and refers to the year before Year 1. Children beginning Prep in January are required to be five years of age by 30 June.

- The curriculum provides a platform to build knowledge, understanding and skills in communication with a range of audiences, contexts, mediums and modes.
- The draft rationale provides a justification for learning an additional language.
- The language specificity is acknowledged.
- Consultation participants strongly supported the structuring of the band descriptions over two years in order to enable students to affirm their learning from the previous year.
- The glossary is comprehensive.
- The scope and sequence tables are useful to see all of the content descriptions together.

## 2.2 Key issues

Consultation participants raised the following key issues.

- The F–10 Australian Curriculum: Languages curriculum has been developed using the constructs identified in the *draft Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages*. Stage 1 consultation sought feedback about the effectiveness of the organisation of the Languages learning area in the context of the languages Chinese and Italian. At the time ACARA indicated this would be the only opportunity to comment on the curriculum structure.
- The Queensland response to the *F–10 Australian Curriculum: Languages (Stage 1)* identified key flaws with the curriculum structure at the organisation, architecture, strand, sub-strand and program levels. These issues were not addressed after the Stage 1 consultation and have been again identified during Stage 2 consultation.
- Feedback was collected about eleven languages during the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation. Participants from all eleven languages identified the curriculum structure at the organisation, architecture, strand and sub-strand level as being flawed.
- In general, the language of the document is impenetrable. It is too academic, uses jargon and is not accessible to its audience of F–10 teachers. The document needs to be rewritten using plain English as the jargon and tone prevent understanding of much of what is written. A plain English approach may resolve issues about pitch and allow for a better alignment of the content to the capacity and age of the students.
- The term “understanding” is used in multiple ways and for different purposes in the:
  - key concepts and understandings
  - understanding language learning and literacy
  - understanding language, culture and their relationship
  - understanding: analysing language as a source of making meaning
  - the nature of knowledge, skills and understanding.
- Consultation participants indicated that the draft Vietnamese curriculum is not as complete as the other language documents. More work is required by ACARA to:
  - make the documents accessible to the target audience of teachers
  - make the content less traditional and more contemporary and reflective of contemporary society and culture
  - clarify the “version” of Vietnamese that is the context for the curriculum. The context statement states that Modern Standard Version of Vietnamese is taught, however, this is in conflict with examples throughout the curriculum which are formal and traditional

- embed the general capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities.
- The focus of the content is biased towards intercultural understanding, which is only one of the three aims set out for the curriculum. This bias comes at the cost of communicating in the target language given the time on task.
- The emphasis on identity issues as a component of intercultural understanding is too sensitive for F–10 and is not necessary in a Languages program.

### ***Strands and sub-strands***

- The two strands Communicating and Understanding are not clearly defined.
- While it is clear that Communicating includes knowledge and application of language skills, the intent of the Understanding strand is less clear.
- Higher order thinking skills are poorly represented in the Communication strand, particularly in Levels 1 and 2.
- The sub-strand structure is problematic as a second-level organiser of the curriculum as the sub-strands are poorly named, overlap in purpose, are too numerous and are not relevant enough to stand alone.

### ***Content descriptions and content elaborations***

- What teachers are to teach and students are expected to learn is unclear. Content descriptions are too general to be useable for planning and teaching purposes. For example, terms used are vague, imprecise and uninformative. This is evident in the number of content descriptions that depend on the specificity of the content elaborations for understanding. This is a major issue as the content elaborations are not mandatory.
- Some content descriptions do not specify the level of language difficulty expected at each level.
- Key concepts and processes are not provided in a systematic or consistent way, they are scattered throughout the content descriptions; this renders them uninformative for teaching and learning. The key concepts and processes accompanying each content description should be organised or sequenced to make clear how they are to be used.
- The elaborations do not always accurately represent the content description.
- A statement is needed to specify that the elaborations are examples and not mandatory components of the syllabus.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

## Achievement standards

- The achievement standards are problematic, uneven and some overemphasise Understanding.
- The achievement standards align to both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- An achievement standard is required for each band. A single achievement standard for five year levels (F to Year 4) is too broad.
- There is a lack of alignment between content descriptions and the key concepts, processes and texts.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.

# 3. Rationale, aims, and organisation of the curriculum

Feedback on the rationale, aims, and organisation of the draft Languages curriculum is treated separately from the specific feedback for the individual language subjects. This recognises that these sections apply to all *Australian Curriculum: Languages* under development.

Subject-specific examples are provided in separate sections of this report.

**Please refer to the Ways forward provided in the *Queensland response to the draft F–10 Australian Curriculum: Languages (Stage 1)* which remain relevant to the Stage 2 languages draft curriculums and have not been repeated here.**

## 3.1 Rationale and aims

The rationale provides a justification for learning an additional language. The aims are thorough and encapsulate what all learners should be able to do as a result of studying a language.

In addition to, and consistent with, Queensland's feedback for the Stage 1 draft Languages, consultation participants highlighted the following concerns.

- The rationale is long-winded and repetitive — the key messages will be lost unless the reader is committed to reading the entire section.
- The first three dot points of the rationale repeat the Languages learning area aims and do not justify the inclusion of Languages in the curriculum offerings at a school.
- The higher order thinking opportunities afforded by the Languages learning area are not given adequate emphasis.



## 3.2 Learning area organisation

### Strands

Feedback from consultation participants highlighted the following concerns.

- It is unclear how the strand, Understanding, differs from the Communicating strand. The two strands are not clearly defined.
- A clear statement is needed about the inter-relationship of the two strands, Understanding and Communicating, and how understanding grows through communication.
- Understanding language as a system is a more appropriate way to organise the curriculum provided it does not override an emphasis on the use of language.
- The emphasis on linguistics in the Understanding strand is too strong.
- The Communicating strand should be confined to actual use of the target language.
- Any classroom talk/reflection/activity about language use legitimately belongs under the Understanding strand.
- The strand, Understanding, is not the same as the achievement standard organiser, “Understanding”. The two constructs of understanding create misunderstanding and complicate the curriculum:
  - the Strands: Communicating and Understanding
  - the achievement standard organiser: Understanding and Skills

### Sub-strands

Feedback from consultation participants highlighted the following concerns.

- The sub-strand structure is problematic as a second-level organiser of the curriculum as the sub-strands are poorly named, overlap in purpose, are too numerous and are not relevant enough to stand alone.
- There are too many sub-strands. This fact makes structuring the curriculum, at the content description, elaboration and achievement standard levels, overly complex, detailed and repetitive.
- The large number of sub-strands presents an atomised view of languages and language learning, and makes planning and assessment unnecessarily complex.
- Redundant Communicating sub-strands need to be identified and the structure revised.
- Understanding sub-strands need to be collapsed into broader categories that reflect the systematic knowledge students will acquire, i.e. base lexicon, grammatical capacity and flexibility, an awareness of textual features and genre patterns, some use of register, and an appreciation of language and culture.
- The following sub-strands provide teachers with a clear indication of the types of tasks and language use that students need to engage in and develop:
  - Socialising and taking action
  - Obtaining and using information
  - Responding to and expressing imaginative experience.
- The following sub-strands sit more comfortably in the Understanding strand:
  - Moving between/translating
  - Reflecting on intercultural language.

- The rationale and the sub-strands do not align. Although the rationale indicates that the learning area provides opportunities for higher order thinking, cognitive words that reflect this in the sub-strand descriptions are lacking.

### Way forward

#### In addition to the suggested ways forward provided for the Stage 1 Languages:

- Describe Communicating and Understanding in the context of active language use that realistically reflects the intellectual and linguistic capacity of the learners in terms of age and pathway.
- Ensure that the complementary relationship between Communicating and Understanding is evident in terms of description and purpose, and ensure that the differences between the two are easily observable and readily understood.
- Revise the sub-strand structure for each strand as follows:
  - Communicating:
    - Socialising and taking action
    - Obtaining and using information
    - Responding to texts and expressing real and imagined experiences
  - Understanding systems of language and culture:
    - Moving between/translating
    - Variability in language use
    - Language awareness
    - Reflecting on intercultural language.

### ***Context statement, band descriptions, content descriptions, content elaborations and achievement standards***

Feedback from consultation participants highlighted the following concerns.

- The band descriptions, content descriptions and achievement standards are not always aligned. The relationships between the beginning, middle and end of the document should be obvious and clear.
- Realistic band descriptions would better describe the capabilities of students at each band level. If content and achievement are to be appropriately described, the bands must be age, pathway, content and concept appropriate.
- The content descriptions:
  - are too broad to describe a useful continuum of learning, both within and across the bands. A useful continuum of learning would support teacher planning and consistent provision across schools
  - need to stand alone as repositories of meaning and not rely on the elaborations for understanding
  - need to be contextualised to a language application rather than be described conceptually.
- The achievement standards:
  - are uneven, not applicable to a communicative context and, in some instances, overemphasise Understanding

- are a summary of content rather than showing progression of learning and quality of performance
- are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated
- include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations
- include examples — which leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only
- are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format
- lack reference to higher order thinking cognitions.
- An achievement standard is required for each band.

### **Student diversity**

Consultation participants agree that all students should have access to learning a language and that the interests of students should be considered when planning for language learning.

Feedback from consultation participants highlighted the following concerns.

- In the Phase 1 learning areas — English, Mathematics, Science and History — the Student diversity section uses the heading “Diversity of learners”. For consistency, sections that are common to all learning areas should use the same headings.
- The Gifted and talented students section should be written in the context of language learning.

### **General capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities**

Consultation feedback indicates that, in the main the general capabilities are well explained and exemplified and that the described relationship between the Languages learning area and each of the cross-curriculum priorities is clear and appropriate.

Feedback highlighted the following concerns.

- Literacy:
  - The inclusion of examples that are specific to the Language learning area would be beneficial.
  - The use of the word “strangeness” has negative connotations in the sentence: “The strangeness of the additional language requires scaffolding”.
- Information and communication technology (ICT) capability:
  - The benefits of using digital devices in Languages teaching and learning programs should be highlighted.
  - The terms “synchronous” and “asynchronous” are not readily understood by the generalist teachers that often teach languages.
  - The description needs to be broadened beyond just using and accessing multimodal resources, digital environments and technologies.
- Critical and creative thinking:
  - Additional higher order thinking verbs should be included.
- Intercultural understanding:
  - The intent of this capability is clearly expressed in the *Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages* and the relevant text should be repeated here.

## *Links to other learning areas*

This section is important for Languages teachers to support their efforts in ensuring that the Languages learning area is integrated and interrelated to other school curriculum offerings. The examples provided, while narrow, are appropriate.

Feedback from consultation participants highlighted the following concerns.

- The section is not succinct. The layout of the Links to other learning areas section in the Phase 1 F–10 Australian Curriculum learning areas is preferred as it is clear and uncluttered.
- None of the provided examples link to the Phase 1 F–10 Australian Curriculum learning areas.
- The links to the English learning area need to be emphasised.

## 4. Arabic

### 4.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Arabic language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

Consultation participants identified the following about the context statement.

*The nature of Arabic language learning* section discusses the place of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and colloquial Arabic. Whilst this distinction is important, consultation participants expressed concern that care needs to be taken not to present non-standard forms of Arabic too early in the curriculum. Students should be exposed to colloquial dialects of Arabic from Level 2 and not before.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message
  - ensure colloquial forms of Arabic are not used before Level 2.

### 4.2 Band descriptions

#### General feedback

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” Considering this, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the band descriptions provide a clear overview, descriptions of the types of learners and appropriate expectations of learners. In particular, the Foundation to Year 10 sequence band descriptors are considered to be age and pitch-appropriate statements.
- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.
- The band descriptions are lengthy and repetitive.
- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.

#### Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback

Consultation identified the following specific concerns for the Foundation entry band descriptions.

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - it cannot be assumed that “Arabic is a language they (students) have interacted with linguistically or culturally”.
  - “Students learn six one-direction connectors”. It is unclear what is being referred to. The six one-direction connectors need to be defined or explained.

### Way forward

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions are age appropriate and aligned to the content descriptions
  - define or explain the six one-direction connectors in Foundation to Year 2.

## 4.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### *General feedback*

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”. With this in mind, concerns raised include the following.

- The volume of content is excessive for the time on task.
- A spiralling curriculum is not modelled through the draft Arabic curriculum.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- The content elaborations are intended to illustrate and exemplify content and assist teachers to develop a common understanding of the content descriptions. However many of the content elaborations are descriptions of teaching activities and describe pedagogy.
- The content descriptions should include higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse etc. (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced, nor is it made clear how they are to be used.
- To improve the user-friendliness of documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X

- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
- Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

The majority of consultation participants indicated that in general, the pitch of the content descriptions and the content elaborations is realistic. In particular, the Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) content descriptions and elaborations were considered to provide excellent opportunities for metalanguage development.

Some concerns were raised about the content descriptions and content elaborations. Illustrative examples include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - In general, the skills developed in this band should be engaged with orally until Year 2. Descriptions that used other forms of engagement include:
    - Content descriptions 1.1, 1.13 and 1.14**
    - **Content description 1.2**
      - it cannot be assumed that students at this level are able to draw on prior knowledge to meet the requirements of this content description. In reality many students will not have prior knowledge of formal or colloquial Arabic
      - care needs to be taken not to present non-standard forms of Arabic, apart from MSA, too early in the curriculum. Students should not be exposed to colloquial dialects of Arabic before reaching the Level 2 curriculum. The form of colloquial Arabic will depend on the teacher. Additionally, if Arabic is their second language, the teacher may not have knowledge of colloquial Arabic.
    - **Content description 1.8**
      - content elaborations should contain more details about Arabic style gestures such as inter gender-interactions, personal space and eye contact.
    - **Content description 1.12**
      - the content elaboration “repeating aloud authentic material such as poems and songs to develop correct pronunciation, intonation and stress” should be expanded upon to include Quran and Hadith texts for authentic aloud reading.
    - **Content descriptions 1.13 and 1.14**
      - these should be considered only in oral form for learners at this level.
    - **Content description 1.17**
      - differences between standard Arabic and dialects are as different as “Received English” and English dialects. The comparison to English is redundant and misleading.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 2.8**
    - this content description needs to be addressed earlier in the Foundation to Year 2 band.

- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 3.11**
    - an additional content elaboration should be added: *Scaffolding and modelling of appropriate forms of language for use in speeches, oral presentations and debates.*
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content description 4.1**
    - the content elaboration “exploring the language of debating, experimenting with voice effects (tone, volume, pace)” could include poetry recitals as another example.
  - **Content description 4.13**
    - the content elaboration “using meaning and context when spelling words and differentiating between homophones such as dog- heart بلق بلك (emphatic letters)” should be placed in the Years 5 and 6 band.
  - **Content description 4.17**
    - the content elaboration “engaging in learning activities that highlight the importance and history of the Arabic language and culture”, could include poetry recitals as an example.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.17**
    - the first content elaboration should be expanded to include the use of specific vocabulary.
  - **Content description 5.18**
    - an additional content elaboration should be added: *Arabic as a scientific and liturgical language in historical and contemporary contexts.*
  - **Content description 5.18**
    - an additional content elaboration should be added: *Dialect features and vocabulary differences across the Arab world, expressions, idioms and structures in language.*

### **Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

Limited feedback was received during consultation for the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) Arabic draft curriculum. Consultation participants indicated:

- the volume of content is excessive for the time on task
- the sequence contains content that should be replicated in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence but is currently missing. This case is also true in reverse
- consideration should be given to “cross-fertilising” concepts and content descriptions and elaborations across the two sequences:
  - the levels in the Foundation to Year 10 scope and sequence could be labelled Level 1A, 1B, 2, 3 and 4
  - the levels in the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 entry) scope and sequence could be labelled Level 1A for Year 7, 1B for Year 8, level 2 for Year 9 and Level 3/Level 4 for Year 10



- the concepts should spiral from a lower level to be re-explored at higher levels. Processes and skills in the Year 7 entry sequence should be replicated in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence, and vice versa.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to:
  - ensure the concepts spiral from a lower level to be re-explored at higher levels and that processes and skills in the Year 7 entry sequence are replicated in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence, and vice versa
  - make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - ensure higher order thinking is evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations)
  - focus on oral engagement with Arabic in the Foundation to Year 2 band
  - include colloquial dialects of Arabic from Level 2.
- Revise the content elaborations to ensure:
  - they illustrate and exemplify content and assist teachers to develop a common understanding of the content descriptions and are not descriptions of teaching activities and describe pedagogy
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Undertake a scan of the Arabic curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.

## 4.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- The achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.

- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

The following specific concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- Foundation to Year 4 (Level 1)
  - “Students present factual information”, however imaginative texts are explored.

### **Way forward**

#### **For both entry points**

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students’ understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

#### **For Foundation to Year 10 sequence**

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.

## 5. French

### 5.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of French language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message.

### 5.2 Band descriptions

#### *General feedback*

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” Considering this, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the band descriptions provide a clear overview, descriptions of the types of learners and appropriate expectations of learners.
- The band descriptions are lengthy and repetitive.
- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.
- Some contexts and examples are inappropriate or unlikely to be engaging for students in the band for which they are suggested.

#### *Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback*

Consultation identified the following specific concerns for the Foundation to Year 10 band descriptions.

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - it is not realistic to expect students in this band to “talk about how they feel ... decentre ... become aware of themselves as cultural participants”
  - it is unclear what is meant by the term “meta-dimension”.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - the expected range of vocabulary needs to be clarified, as opposed to using terms such as “more”, “wider”, “increasing”
  - most students do not have access to “French speakers” or “young people of the same age in French-speaking communities”
  - students would not have the language skills in the target language at this level to engage in debate and discussion.

- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - the expected range of vocabulary needs to be clarified, as opposed to using terms such as “more”, “wider”, “increasing”
  - most students do not have access to French speakers in “immediate and local contexts”, virtually or online.

#### Way forward

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - remove repetition
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - make curriculum expectations clear
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions:
    - are aligned to the content descriptions
    - take into account the language ability of learners in each level.

## 5.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### *General feedback*

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”.

Considering this, the following concerns were raised.

- In general, the Year 7–10 (Year 7 Entry) scope and sequence has a more appropriate balance between language development and cultural specific understandings, is more explicit about grammar and vocabulary requirements and is more age-appropriate than the Foundation to Year 10 scope and sequence.
- There are many spelling errors of French words. Corrections have been provided below.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- A list of verb tenses should be included indicating that students at the end of Year 10 should have covered the following tenses:
  - present
  - passé composé
  - imperfect
  - near future
  - future
  - imperative.

- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- The expectations of the curriculum are ambitious and assume that all schools have highly-qualified French teachers.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced, nor is it made clear how they are to be used.
- The prominence of communication with people of the same age in French-speaking communities is recognised as being valuable and also problematic to establish and maintain. Many French-speaking communities exist in different time zones which also poses a complication for real time discussions. Students at the same age tend to be more advanced in their understanding of English than the Australian students will be in the understanding of French which also makes it difficult to sustain a connection between students.
- Clarification is needed of when discussion is to be in French and when it is to be in English.
- Stereotypes are included in many of the elaborations. Peoples' experience of culture in French speaking countries varies with the age of the person, and the region they are from, just as it does in Australia. These generalisations need to be treated with caution, and can prove problematic when they link to the teacher's own misconceptions.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

Illustrative examples of content descriptions and content elaborations that are pitched too high or lack clarity include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - the grammatical cues are too ambitious for students at this age.
  - **Content description 1.2**
    - add the word “simple” so students are “asking and responding to simple questions...”
  - **Content description 1.7**
    - the use of the correct negative form needs to be represented and used. The students should not be exposed to informal language at this level “*ça va pas, non! Je veux pas aller à l'école*”
    - there is a misrepresentation of the rule for the adjective-noun order, i.e. most of the adjectives are placed after the noun but there are a few exceptions with monosyllabic adjectives like: grand, petit, beau, etc.
    - *Moi, toi, lui ...* are emphatic pronouns but not subject pronouns.

- **Content description 1.8**
  - the content elaborations are ambitious and better suited for Year 4 if the goal is for students to use and understand the target language rather than parroting what they hear.
- **Content description 1.15**
  - describing how it feels to use French is inappropriate and irrelevant. Additionally, students of this age do not have the self-awareness for this.
- **Content description 1.17**
  - the grammar listed will be challenging for students, particularly if they are not aware of grammatical structures in English.
- **Content description 1.23**
  - it is possible to explore a general definition and notion of culture, but producing detailed lists of “how people think about themselves and what they value” is problematic
  - it is unclear what “shopping itinerary” means in this context.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 2.13**
    - the concept of identity being explored here is too complex for students of this age
    - the graphic organiser examples are France-centred and reinforce stereotypes.
  - **Content description 2.20**
    - the terms of endearment are not used by contemporary children.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - it is unclear as to when present regular verbs and the most common irregular verbs are to be introduced.
  - **Content description 3.13**
    - schools do not have access to students or French friends they could access to engage in the suggested activities.
  - **Content description 3.17**
    - *Passé composé* and the future *proche* are introduced but not the present tense. It is too early to introduce the *passé composé*, *imparfait* and the future *proche* at this level.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content description 4.1**
    - *si construction* (*s’il faut redouble...*) is pitched too high for students in this band and level.
    - students would need sufficient background in their own culture in order to compare it to French-speaking communities, an appropriate balance between culture and language learning needs to be maintained.
  - **Content description 4.8**
    - students do not have the language skills in the target language to successfully engage in process drama.
  - **Content description 4.17**
    - this content description indicates that the students learn the imperative form and this is pitched too high for students in this band and level.

- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.17**
    - the requirements of this content description are clearly expressed. This level of detail and clarity needs to be applied to all content descriptions.
  - **Content description 5.21**
    - it is unlikely that students in this band will be auditing their own social, personal and educational worlds
    - it is unclear why students would be auditing their own social, personal and educational worlds.

### **Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

- Years 7 and 8 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.4**
    - students do not have the language skills in the target language for the introduction of both the imperative, without have learned the present tense, and future *proche*.
    - at this level students will not have enough variability in language use to create and perform unscripted language production.
  - **Content description 1.13**
    - “monitoring” and “reflecting” is challenging for students at this level of engagement with the target language.
  - **Content description 1.17**
    - the imperfect and the near future should not be introduced at this level. The near future, the imperfect along with the *passé composé*, the imperative, and the future tenses should be introduced in the Years 9 and 10 band.
  - **Content description 1.18**
    - “analysing spoken ... and register” is too demanding for students at this level of engagement with the target language.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 2.10**
    - “Mediate own interactions ... of intercultural experience” is not realistic for students at this level of engagement with the target language.
  - **Content description 2.14**
    - “Incorporate an observational and reflective dimension to own French language use and interactions, noticing reactions and responses to differences in language use which reflect cultural perspectives and practices” is not realistic for students at this level of engagement with the target language.
  - **Content description 2.15**
    - “Reflect in action when communicating in French, mediating own performance as a language user, and noticing and responding to own and others’ assumptions and attitudes” is not realistic for students at this level of engagement with the target language.

## French spelling errors Foundation to Year 10 sequence

Content description	Error	Correction
1.7	Ça va pas non — Je veux pas aller à l'école	Ça <b>ne</b> va pas non — Je <b>ne</b> veux pas aller à l'école
1.9	Bouff!	Bof!
1.12	Je suis italien-australien	Je suis <b>Italien-Australien</b>
1.16	...-ion	...-tion
1.23	Pâtisserie	<b>pâtisserie</b>
2.1	Hafiz	<b>This word was not recognised by native French-speakers</b>
2.3	croques monsieur	croque <b>e</b> -monsieur
2.3	mon boisson merveilleux	<b>ma</b> boisson <b>merveilleuse</b>
2.3	une charme magique	un charme magique
2.4	qu'est-ce que tu prefers	qu'est-ce que tu <b>préfères</b>
2.5	mes sports prefers	mes sports <b>préférés</b>
2.6	il est chinois/espagnol/australien (name not adjective)	il est <b>Chinois/Espagnol/Australien</b>
2.7	Age	<b>âge</b>
2.7	Intelligent (ascent present)	<b>intelligent</b>
2.7	Pouff	<b>This word was not recognised by native French-speakers</b>
2.16	Aigü	aigu
2.16	...-ion	...-tion
2.17	vâche	<b>vache</b>
2.23	pâtisserie, les mille feuilles, la boule chocolate	<b>pâtisserie, les mille-feuilles, la boule au chocolat</b>
3.4	Je suis italien-australien	Je suis <b>Italien-Australien</b>
3.4	deux pains chocolat	deux pains <b>au</b> chocolat
3.11	boff!	bof!
3.12	je suis australienne	je suis <b>Australienne</b>
4.1	..., c'est les maths/	..., <b>ce sont</b> les maths/



Content description	Error	Correction
4.1	<i>l'environnement digitale</i>	<i>l'environnement <b>digital</b></i>
4.4	<i>...allongez...</i>	<i>...longez...</i>
4.7	<i>L'enseignement public</i>	<i><b>L'enseignement</b></i>
5.1	<i>le doublage</i>	<i>le <b>redoublage</b></i>
5.4	<i>, en directe de</i>	<i>, en <b>direct</b> de</i>
5.5	<i>les sports compétatifs</i>	<i>les sports <b>compétitifs</b></i>
5.6	<i>Le president</i>	<i><b>Le président</b></i>
5.6	<i>Elle a dit qu'elle voulait changer son avis</i>	<i>Elle a dit qu'elle voulait changer <b>d'</b> avis</i>
5.7	<i>qui crée un atmosphere</i>	<i>qui crée <b>une</b> atmosphère</i>
5.7	<i>adverbs</i>	<i><b>adverbes</b></i>
5.8	<i>la casse-croûte</i>	<i><b>le</b> casse-croûte</i>
5.12	<i>États Unis</i>	<i>États-Unis</i>
5.12	<i>je suis sensible and affectueuse</i>	<i>je suis sensible <b>et</b> affectueuse</i>
5.17	<i>Arretez</i>	<i><b>Arrêtez</b></i>

### French spelling errors Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence

Content description	Error	Correction
1.1	<i>aux jeux videos</i>	<i>aux jeux <b>vidéo</b></i>
1.5	<i>les jeux videos</i>	<i>les jeux <b>vidéo</b></i>
1.6	<i>vous vous sentez bien chez Macdo! *</i>	<i>vous <b>mangez</b> bien <b>à</b> MacDo?</i>
1.12	<i>Je suis ita/7lien-australien</i>	<i>Je suis <b>Italien-Australien</b></i>
1.12	<i>Je déteste le silence and les prunes</i>	<i>Je déteste le silence <b>et</b> les prunes</i>
1.16	<i>...-ion</i>	<i>...-<b>tion</b></i>
1.16	<i>chaser !</i>	<i><b>chasser</b></i>
1.17	<i>avoir envie</i>	<i>avoir envie <b>de/d'</b></i>
1.17	<i>la reorganization</i>	<i>la <b>réorganisation</b></i>
1.19	<i>, l'orale,</i>	<i>, <b>l'oral,</b></i>

Content description	Error	Correction
1.20	<i>la creole</i>	<b>le</b> créole
Level 1 achievement standard	<i>Je suis italien-australien</i>	Je suis <b>Italien-Australien</b>
2.1	<i>le monde digitale,</i>	le monde <b>digital,</b>
2.2	<i>c'est a qui?</i>	c'est <b>à</b> qui?
2.2	<i>Qu'est que tu vas faire...</i>	Qu'est- <b>ce</b> que tu vas faire...
2.2	<i>si on préparait un presentation</i>	si on préparait <b>une</b> présentation
2.5	<i>Végétaliste ou carnivore?</i>	<b>Végétarien</b> ou carnivore?
2.7	<i>Fais pas çï, fais pas çà</i>	Fais pas <b>ci</b> , fais pas çà
2.17	<i>les adjéctifs</i>	les <b>adjectifs</b>
2.19	classroom <i>orale</i> presentations	classroom <b>oral</b> presentations
2.21	<i>... avec le didgeriddo on YouTube</i>	<i>... avec le didgeriddo</i> <b>sur</b> YouTube

## Way forward

### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Revise the content descriptions and content elaborations to ensure:
  - the focus of content descriptions is clear
  - spelling is correct
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - the pitch of examples is appropriate for the entry level into the target language
  - examples are age and culture appropriate
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations
  - stereotypes are removed.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Include a list of verb tenses to be taught.
- Undertake a scan of the French curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised, or sequenced, and how they are to be used.

- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.

## 5.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- The achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

The following level-specific concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - the achievement standard expectations include the use of the present tense but this does not align to the content descriptions.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - add *in French*, i.e. “students interact ... in French”.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students’ understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

#### For Foundation to Year 10 sequence

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.

## 6. German

### 6.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of German language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

Consultation participants identified the following about the context statement.

*The place of the German language in Australian education* section mentions the Bavarian Youth Ring. If this is essential, similar groups from across the country should also be included.

*The diversity of learners of German* section statements regarding the diversity of learners of German was particularly supported by consultation participants. Adding a reference to bilingual and/or immersion programs in schools would capture the wider scope of learners.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message
  - make reference to bilingual and/or immersion programs.

### 6.2 Band descriptions

#### General feedback

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” Considering this, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the band descriptions provide a clear overview, descriptions of the types of learners and appropriate expectations of learners.
- The band descriptions are lengthy and repetitive.
- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.
- The importance of reflection in the process of learning the German language is acknowledged.
- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.
- Some contexts and examples are inappropriate or unlikely to be engaging for students in the band for which they are suggested.

### Way forward

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - remove repetition
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions:
    - are aligned to the content descriptions
    - take into account the language ability of learners in each level.

## 6.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### *General feedback*

Consultation participants highlighted the following strengths.

- There is a clarity and simplicity in the German content descriptions, more so than in other languages.
- The progression of “Communicating” strand content descriptions is appropriate.

Considering that the purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn” and that the content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”, the following concerns were raised.

- The Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence is considered to be clearer and easier to work with than the Foundation to Year 10 sequence.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- The content descriptions of both sequences should include an expectation for higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to those verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- Content descriptions should not be about explaining to family and friends, this is not suitable for the classroom context — it is unclear how a teacher would make this happen and how this learning could be assessed. This raises equity concerns about students’ home and family lives.
- Content elaborations based on “pretend” situations do not model quality teaching practice.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised, or sequenced, nor is it made clear how they are to be used.

- The prominence of communication with people of the same age in German-speaking communities is recognised as being valuable and also problematic to establish and maintain. Many German-speaking communities exist in different time zones which also poses a complication for real time discussions. Students at the same age tend to be more advanced in their understanding of English than the Australian students will be in the understanding of German, which also makes it difficult to sustain a connection with the other students.
- There was concern about the suggestion for young students (Years 5 and 6) to be involved in social networks. To monitor the nature of interactions, schools would need to have a closed networking system available, with careful supervision from teachers.
- Jargon is used regularly within the content descriptors, which makes phrases difficult to interpret.
- Stereotypes are included in many of the elaborations. Peoples' experience of culture in German speaking countries varies with the age of the person, and the region they are from, just as it does in Australia. These generalisations need to be treated with caution, and can prove problematic when they link to the teacher's own misconceptions.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the Scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### ***Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback***

The majority of consultation participants indicated that the pitch of the content descriptions and the content elaborations is realistic, however, some concerns were raised. Illustrative examples of content descriptions and content elaborations that are pitched too high or lack clarity include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.3**
    - “contribute to the planning of group events” would be challenging for students in this band.
  - **Content description 1.6**
    - at this level students do not have the language ability in the target language to “create and perform a dialogue”
    - conduct a scan of the Mathematics curriculum to ensure students have developed the skills to “represent results pictorially on a graph” at this level.
  - **Content description 1.7**
    - “expressing a personal opinion of a text” is pitched too high for students in this band.
  - **Content description 1.8**
    - students in the band would not have the language skills in the target language to “create and perform a dialogue”. It is reasonable to expect them to “perform a dialogue”.

- **Content description 1.11**
  - an additional content elaboration could be added: *collaboratively produce bilingual picture books, alphabet books.*
- **Content description 1.12**
  - “eliciting and giving personal information that signals identity within a school context” could be rewritten to state more simply *express personal information in the school-based context.*
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 3.23**
    - the wording of the content description is complex it could be reworded to simply state: *examine generalisations about culture.*
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content description 4.7**
    - the television shows used as examples are dated. The German speaking genres would also be a challenge for students at this level.
  - **Content description 4.12**
    - the notion of multiple identities in the content description: “explore and reflect on the reciprocal nature of identity and the notion of an individual expressing multiple identities in different settings” would be better understood by teachers if references to research were provided
    - “creating a text such as a poster depicting the various aspects of own identity” is not appropriate for this age group.
  - **Content description 4.13**
    - it is not appropriate to ask students in this age group to “reflect on and problematise own sense of personal identity”.
  - **Content description 4.23**
    - “knowing that German speakers are often direct” should be revised to *knowing that German speakers often seem direct.*
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.4**
    - the examples are too complex for students in this band. The examples would be challenging for the students to complete in English and even more difficult in German.
  - **Content description 5.7**
    - students in this band would not have developed the language skills to “critique a film, considering how features such as camera angles, use of music, imagery, setting and shot selection contribute to highlighting an aspect such as plot, main theme or character construction”.
  - **Content description 5.14**
    - the content elaboration “considering how own cultural practices, values and body language may be interpreted, for example, through personal and family habits and behaviours such as showering daily” is not an appropriate example.

## Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback

- Years 7 and 8 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.5**
    - the information to be obtained by students should be from authentic texts or modified texts.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 2.14**
    - the content elaboration “considering how own cultural practices, values and body language may be interpreted, for example, through personal and family habits and behaviours such as showering daily” is not an appropriate example.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Revise the content descriptions to ensure higher order thinking expectations are evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Revise the content descriptions and content elaborations to ensure:
  - the focus of content descriptions is clear
  - jargon is removed
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - the pitch of examples is appropriate for the entry level into the target language
  - examples are age and culture appropriate
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations
  - remove stereotypes.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Undertake a scan of the German curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.



## 6.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- The achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

The following level-specific concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- Foundation to Year 4 (Level 1)
  - “backyards with swimming pools” are not a characteristic of the majority of Australian homes. This example should be removed.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - remove the examples of standalone houses and brands of cars being linked to affluence.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - the use of present perfect tense is implied. This is an unrealistic expectation for students in this band.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students’ understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

#### For Foundation to Year 10 sequence

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.
- Refine the achievement standards to:
  - remove any examples that are not sensitive to culture or are not age appropriate
  - ensure the expectations are pitched appropriately for each band.

## 7. Indonesian

### 7.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Indonesian language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to make it more succinct.
- Use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message.

### 7.2 Band descriptions

#### *General feedback*

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” Considering this, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.
- Many of the band descriptions provide a clear overview of the types of learners and provide appropriate expectations of learners, but there are instances where the expectations are too ambitious or inappropriate for targeted learners.
- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.
- The band descriptions need to outline the specifics of how courses are implemented and the extent to which learning enhances identity.

#### *Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback*

Consultation participants identified the following specific concerns for the Foundation entry band descriptions.

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - better examples need to be provided to support the following extract: “They will be exposed to key concepts, such as language, culture, ideas that are significant for learning Indonesian”
  - Currently, the examples provided are vocabulary items which could be interpreted in multiple ways. The examples could be rewritten as: *for example, Bahasa (Indonesian) as a national language, cultural diversity of the Indonesian archipelago and national unity (Bhinneka Tunggal Ika)*
  - the complexity of the concept budi pekerti:
    - is too difficult for students at this early stage of engagement with the target language
    - is not a commonly understood term for non-native speakers of Indonesian.

- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - *ising-ising* is not an “idea that is significant in learning Indonesian”. It means “just doing something to pass the time”
  - *ising-ising* is misspelt. It should be spelt *iseng-iseng*.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - at this level, the language ability of learners is not sophisticated enough for them to construct texts such as emails, narratives and advertisements in the target language.

#### Way forward

##### For both entry points

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - include examples that are not ambiguous
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions are age appropriate and aligned to the content descriptions
  - ensure spelling of Indonesian words is correct.

## 7.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### General feedback

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”.

With this in mind, the following concerns were raised.

- The volume of content is excessive for the time on task.
- In general, the Years 7–10 (Year 7 entry) sequence content descriptions are pitched higher than the Foundation to Year 10 sequence content descriptions.
- Many of the draft content descriptions, across all bands, depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- The content descriptions should include an expectation for higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- The draft content descriptions lack linguistic content. There are no references to grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn. Any linguistic content appears only in the non-mandatory content elaborations and is not presented in a comprehensive linear format.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.

- The requirements of many of the elaborations are considered to be new content for teachers.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised, or sequenced, nor is it made clear how they are to be used.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

The majority of consultation participants indicated that, in general, the pitch of the content descriptions and the content elaborations is realistic.

Some concerns were raised about the pitch and expectations of the content elaborations. Illustrative examples include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.7**
    - “describe what is entertaining or appealing in Indonesian imaginative texts” is pitched too high and is too ambitious for students in the band.
  - **Content description 1.11**
    - it is unrealistic to expect students in this band to understand the meaning of multiple instances of *saya* as in “*Saya suka boneka saya*”. More appropriate examples would include *saya suka boneka* and *ini boneka saya*.
  - **Content description 1.12**
    - *saya pandai berlari* is too complex for students in this band. *Saya pandai* and *Saya berlari* are examples that are more appropriate.
  - **Content description 1.16**
    - *buku merah, anjing besar, kucing kecil*, are too complex and not age-appropriate examples.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 2.3**
    - at this level students are just starting to develop number skills using hundreds. It is unrealistic for them to play games or role-play shopping in the target language using currency in the tens of thousands of rupiah.
  - **Content description 2.4** *budi pekerti* is too complex for students at this early stage of their engagement with the target language
    - *budi pekerti* is not a commonly understood term for non-native speakers of Indonesian.

- **Content description 2.7**
  - *Deklamasi* (Indonesian poetry) is unfamiliar to experienced teachers of Indonesian.
- **Content description 2.15**
  - it is incorrect to state that “g... never appears at the end of a word”. Examples to support this include:
    - *gudeg* (meaning cooking using jackfruit as main ingredient)
    - *grudug* (the onomatopoeic sound for a thunderclap).
- **Content description 2.15**
  - the assertion that “k... is nearly silent if at the end of a word” is incorrect. Many of the common words ending in “k” that students should learn in this band end in a clearly pronounced “k” sound. For example: *adik* (meaning younger sibling); *kakak* (meaning older sibling); *kakek* (meaning grandfather); *nenek* (meaning grandmother).
- **Content description 2.15**
  - no mention is made of the silent “h” which is prominent feature of the Indonesian language. Examples could include: *sudah* (meaning already); *puluh* (meaning tens); *sekolah* (meaning school); *rumah* (meaning house).
- **Content description 2.19**
  - most teachers would not readily identify *topi* and *kursi* as “loan words from other languages in Indonesian”. More effective examples include: *informasi*, *kompetisi*, *telepon*.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 3.1**
    - *bola* is not in sync with how students speak English at this age.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content description 4.17**
    - Some of the examples provided in the elaborations are colloquial expressions, i.e. *Mau nggak* and *nonton*
  - **Content description 4.19**
    - an additional elaboration should be included, i.e. explore how Indonesian accepts two forms of spelling for some borrowed words: *propinsi* and *provinsi*; *sistim* and *system*, *bis* and *bus*, *moderen* and *modern*.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.15**
    - there is a sudden inclusion of colloquial examples. It needs to be very clear to teachers which words/phrases are colloquial and which are not, e.g. it should be noted that the following are colloquialisms: *kasihan deh*, *bagi dong*, *aku dikasih nggak*.

## Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback

Limited feedback was received during consultation for the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) Indonesian draft curriculum. In general, it was felt that the content descriptions and content elaborations were pitched at a higher level than the content descriptions and content elaborations in the Foundation to Year 10 draft curriculum.

Illustrative examples of concerns raised about the pitch and expectations of the content elaborations include:

- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 2.1**
    - as the word “*curhat*” is made up of two abbreviations its meaning cannot be confirmed via any dictionary. The example *curhat dong!* is not commonly understood by teachers.
  - **Content description 2.7**
    - “Analysing popular-culture texts” assumes a depth of understanding of cultural nuances. This expectation is too ambitious for students in this band, at this stage of their engagement with the target language.
  - **Content description 2.8**
    - “depicting alternative realities/fantasies” is too ambitious for students in this band, at this stage of their engagement with the target language.
    - *Deklamasi* (Indonesian poetry) is unfamiliar to experienced teachers of Indonesian.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Revise the content descriptions to ensure higher order thinking expectations are evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Revise the content elaborations to ensure:
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - the accuracy of subject matter
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations
  - the examples provided are commonly used and can be understood by teachers and examples that may not be commonly understood are explained
  - the pitch of examples is appropriate for the entry level into the target language.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Add a grammar continuum to the Communicating and Understanding scope and sequence tables.
- Undertake a scan of the Indonesian curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur

concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.

- Be explicit in terms of which terms/phrases are colloquial and clarify their place in the curriculum. Clarify at what stage the use of colloquial terms/phrases are introduced in addition to formal Indonesian.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised, or sequenced, and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.

## 7.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- The achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students' understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that "or example" has a different meaning than "such as" or "including the use of".

#### For Foundation to Year 10 sequence

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.

## 8. Japanese

### 8.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Japanese language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

Consultation participants identified the following about the context statement:

- In *The place of Japanese culture and language in Australia and in the world* section:
  - it was appreciated that the importance of Japanese, both within Australia and on the global stage, was noted
  - statements in the context statement should be referenced. For example, statements that should clearly state the source of information include: “Japanese is the first language of the 127 million inhabitants of Japan...”. Inclusion of figures such as these, date the curriculum.
- *The nature of Japanese language learning* section should encompass:
  - the nature of language learning assumed in the document, not just features of Japanese
  - what it means to be a language learner in terms of language in use and participating in communities of practice. There are hints of this in the mentioning of katakana and kanji being taught in context, but there is no declared view of language and language learning in this document.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message
  - include references for statements.
- Revise *The nature of Japanese language* section to:
  - reflect the nature of language learning assumed in the document
  - outline what it means to be a language learner in terms of language use.

### 8.2 Band descriptions

#### General feedback

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.”

Considering this, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the band descriptions provide a clear overview, descriptions of the types of learners and provide appropriate expectations of learners.
- The band descriptions are lengthy and repetitive.
- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.



- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.
- Some contexts and examples are pitched too high for students in the band for which they are suggested.

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

Consultation identified the following specific concerns for the Foundation entry band descriptions:

- In general, more specificity is required about the interactions and language use in situations where ICTs are used.
- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - “graphophonic cues” is an unfamiliar concept for teachers.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - the balance between language knowledge and use, along with the use of hiragana was supported, although 46 hiragana is ambitious
  - it is not clear what is meant by the statement “developing a sense of what it means to be bilingual”. It is unlikely that students at this level will appreciate this concept.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - the statement “*katakana* is not taught explicitly until Years 7 and 8, but students may recognise high frequency words” is limiting for students who have been learning the target language for five years. The statement could be rewritten as: *katakana is not taught explicitly as a system until Years 7 and 8, but students may recognise and write high frequency words.*

### **Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

Consultation identified the following specific concerns:

- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - students do not have the language skills in the target language at this level to “initiate and sustain interactions with speakers of Japanese ... explore a range of contexts”
  - statements are needed about:
    - how many kanji characters are to be introduced
    - the written modes and realia to be used.

#### **Way forward**

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - remove repetition
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions:
    - are aligned to the content descriptions
    - take into account the language ability of learners in each level.

## 8.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### General feedback

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. Content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”.

Considering this, the following concerns were raised.

- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- In general, the precise element which is being progressed across the levels is hard to identify. For example in 1.3 to 5.3, students go from songs and games to guided tasks (listen and do); to identifying and using key language for events to competitions and problem solving; to discussions on social issues. This is a very loose set.
- The content descriptions of both sequences should include evidence of the expectation of higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- Shopping is used as a context regularly throughout the curriculum. The introduction to the use of money should align with the Mathematics learning area and numeracy general capability.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- The expectations of the curriculum are ambitious and assume that all schools have highly-qualified Japanese teachers.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised, or sequenced, nor is it made clear how they are to be used.
- The prominence of communication with people of the same age in Japanese-speaking communities is recognised as being valuable and also problematic to establish and maintain. Students at the same age tend to be more advanced in their understanding of English than the Australian students will be in the understanding of Japanese which also makes it difficult to sustain a connection with the other students.
- There was concern about the suggestion for young students (Years 5 and 6) to be involved in social networks. To monitor the nature of interactions, schools would need to have a closed networking system available, with careful supervision from teachers.
- Stereotypes are included in many of the elaborations. It is not always possible to characterise “how Japanese people think”. These generalisations need to be treated with caution, and can prove problematic when they link to the teacher’s own misconceptions.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X

- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
- Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

Illustrative examples of content descriptions and content elaborations that are pitched too low or high or lack clarity include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.3**
    - “following cues ... mimicking language and performing actions”, students in this band will be able to mimic but won’t understand the grammar.
  - **Content description 1.4**
    - “buying items from a shop...” borrowing is more age-appropriate than shopping for students in this band.
  - **Content descriptions 1.5, 1.10, 1.16, 1.21**
    - the introduction of kanji is ambitious at this level.
  - **Content description 1.8**
    - “create imaginary characters ... giving them names and characteristics such as likes and dislikes”. Students do not have the language skills in the target language to complete this example.
  - **Content description 1.16**
    - it is more realistic to have students at this level copying high-frequency kanji rather than “writing high-frequency kanji” if kanji has to be introduced in this band.
  - **Content description 1.21**
    - remove おおきに as it is no longer used.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - **Content descriptions 2.4, 2.10, 2.18**
    - in these content descriptions student’s need to use classifiers which they could imitate but would not understand. These content descriptions would be better placed at higher levels.
  - **Content description 2.7**
    - these phrases could be introduced in the Foundation to Year 2 band. In this band students should not be using romaji alone but hiragana should also be used.
  - **Content descriptions 2.9**
    - “Identify words and expressions that do not translate easily between Japanese and English and are often used in their original form in either language” would be better placed at a higher level
    - the examples provided do translate easily into English.
  - **Content description 2.18**
    - “noticing that unlike English, sentences in Japanese have subject-object-verb structure”, students need to be able to recognise the sentence structure in English before they can compare it to Japanese.

- **Content description 2.21**
  - remove the reference to using language to include and exclude people so as to not promote bullying.
- **Content description 2.22**
  - a better translation of the example , 山ガール is *girl who likes climbing mountains*.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 3.6**
    - it is unclear if this content description is to be completed in English, Japanese or a combination of both.
  - **Content description 3.12**
    - “Share and compare experiences of learning and using Japanese, considering whether identity changes when using a different language” at this age students are unlikely to have the personal awareness to notice a difference when they are using Japanese compared to English.
  - **Content descriptions 3.19**
    - this content description would be better placed in Years 9 and 10 (Level 4).
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content descriptions 4.2, 4.17**
    - the verb forms ㄗ would be better placed in Years 9 and 10 (Level 4).
  - **Content description 4.7**
    - “using romaji as a tool when typing using QWERTY keyboards” could be moved to Years 5 and 6 (Level 2).
  - **Content descriptions 4.17, 4.21**
    - honorifics would be better placed in Years 9 and 10 (Level 4).
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.6**
    - “creating a personal profile or resume for a real or imagined part-time job” is not an authentic example. A more authentic example would involve exploring the differences between Australian and Japanese resumes.

### **Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

- Years 7 and 8 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.2**
    - students do not have the language skills at this level to be responding in Japanese.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 2.1**
    - students do not have the language skills in the target language at this level to “initiate and sustain interactions with peers and others...”
    - debating; plain form, to *omou* and *kamo shirenai*, *koto ga dekiru* is too difficult for students in this band at this level.

– **Content description 2.15**

- it may be too difficult to have taught sufficient *keigo* for students to be able to do more than have the teacher identify the use of certain expressions and the students to recognise when similar expressions to those modelled by the teacher are used.

**Way forward**

**For both entry points**

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Revise the content descriptions to ensure higher order thinking expectations are evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Revise the content descriptions and content elaborations to ensure:
  - the focus of content descriptions is clear
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - the pitch of examples is appropriate for the entry level into the target language
  - examples are age and culture appropriate
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations
  - remove stereotypes.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Undertake a scan of the Japanese curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.

## 8.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- The achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards contain both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.

- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands; the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

The following level-specific concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

### ***Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback***

- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - writing hiragana in the correct stroke order is not important at this stage of engagement with the target language.

### ***Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback***

- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - it is unrealistic for students at this stage of engagement with the target language to “create a variety of informative and imaginative Japanese texts about ... future aspirations”
  - “initiate and sustain conversations” is pitched too high and should be changed to “respond to conversations”
  - grammatical structures that require plain form should not be included in the achievement standard
  - how teachers would gather evidence of “students using Japanese for everyday social interactions” is unrealistic.

#### **Way forward**

##### **For both entry points**

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students’ understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

##### **For Foundation to Year 10 sequence**

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.
- Refine the achievement standards to ensure the expectations are pitched appropriately for each band.

## 9. Korean

### 9.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Korean language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

Consultation participants identified the following about the context statement.

*The diversity of learners of Korean* section acknowledges different groups of learners, however, it should include specific advice regarding Korean first language learners and background learners.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to make it more succinct.
- Use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message.
- Provide guidelines that are more specific for teachers to cater for first language learners and background learners.

### 9.2 Band descriptions

#### General feedback

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” Considering this, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the bands the band descriptions provide a clear overview and provide appropriate expectations of learners.
- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.
- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.

#### Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback

Consultation identified the following specific concerns for the Foundation entry band descriptions:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - the statement “...recognise that learning Korean involves learning both the language and culture and requires cultural lenses to view their own and others’ linguistic and cultural practices” should include reference to expressions and body language (honorific gestures).
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - it is unclear what is meant by the statement “...make and test hypotheses for unknown areas in the Korean language...” the “unknown areas” need to be defined.

### Way forward

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions
  - align to the content descriptions
  - ensure clarity of message
  - take into account the language ability of learners in each level.

## 9.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### General feedback

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”.

In general, consultation participants felt the draft modelled a spiralling curriculum and this was considered a strength.

Concerns raised include the following.

- The volume of content is excessive for the time on task.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- The draft content descriptions lack linguistic content; there are not enough references to grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn. Teachers are dependent on the non-mandatory content elaborations to get clarity about what to teach.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The content descriptions should include higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse etc. (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- In general, throughout the content elaborations there are references to ePal and digital resources, but there is no indication about when Korean word processing should be introduced.
- Throughout the curriculum transliteration from English sounds into Korean, where the English sound does not exist, has been omitted, for example, /v/, /r/, /f/, /th/, Wool, /z/.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced nor is it made clear how they are to be used.
- To improve the user-friendliness the content descriptions numbering should align with the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:



- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
- Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

The majority of consultation participants indicated that in general, the pitch of the content descriptions and the content elaborations is realistic; however some specific concerns were raised about the content descriptions and the content elaborations. Illustrative examples include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.4**
    - it is unclear why the examples have question marks, i.e. 주세요? and 고맙습니다?
  - **Content description 1.5**
    - this content description would be strengthened if it included *locating specific Korean characters in texts*. The corresponding content elaboration would be: *matching pictures and their corresponding initial sounds/characters*.
  - **Content description 1.14**
    - this content description would be enhanced if it made reference to students being exposed to consonants and vowels.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 2.13**
    - the content elaboration “learning sets of Korean vowels and consonants” is out of sequence as students have already engaged with Korean sight words without any knowledge of Korean letters.
  - **Content description 2.14**
    - it is unclear if written texts in Hangeul are used extensively or just for sight words and whether Romanisation is used or avoided
  - **Content description 2.19**
    - it is unclear what the elaboration “Language awareness” means, an explanation and/or examples are required.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 3.13**
    - it is unclear what is meant by “printing conventions” in the content description. Examples are required.
  - **Content description 3.15**
    - It is unclear if the following is taught in a sentence block or if the concept of verb stems is to be introduced: “in a coordinative structure using a conjunctive suffix -고, for example, 밥을 먹고 운동해요’.

- without examples it is not clear to what depth the following is taught: “understanding and using basic metalinguistic terminology, for example, topic, subject, object, markers, past”.
- **Content description 3.16**
  - teachers queried the content elaboration: “recognising the meaningful parts of a verb, for example, **ㅁ** + 어요” in the context of irregular verbs — it was unclear how the meaningful part of a verb is recognised — verb stem or infinitive form. For example: **빠르다** — what is “meaningful”? **빠르/빨라/빨리** or all of these?
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content description 4.12**
    - in order to experience authentic or virtual interaction using Korean language and culture, students need to acquire Korean word-processing skills. It is not clear in the curriculum when these skills are developed.
  - **Content description 4.17**
    - this content description lacks clarity, consequently the depth of teaching and learning exemplified in the content elaborations is unclear, i.e. :
      - the extent to which students learn to manipulate/conjugate in Level 3 is unknown — are they required to do this themselves or is the intent of the content description that they encounter words that are already conjugated into **요** form?
      - do students learn to apply their knowledge of **요** form to create infinitive form for the conjunction: **-아/어서** or is this taught as set phrases?
      - does “exploring and identifying” refer to only comprehension and not production?
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.4**
    - the grammar in the content elaborations is pitched too high for students in this band.

### **Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

Limited feedback was received during consultation for the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) Korean draft curriculum. Many of the concerns raised for the Foundation to Year 10 sequence may also be relevant to the Year 7 entry sequence.

The following concerns were highlighted by consultation participants:

- Years 7 and 8 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.14**
    - it is implied that consonants and vowels are learned, but it is not explicit. When do students achieve the equivalent of content description 2.14 in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence?
  - **Content description 1.18**
    - the content elaboration “converting text from informal to formal or vice versa as appropriate for context, and explaining why such conversion is appropriate” is pitched too high for the band and entry — at this stage students would be able to convert only simple greetings and formulaic sayings.

## Way forward

### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to:
  - make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - ensure higher order thinking is evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations)
  - clarify when Korean word processing should be introduced
  - include transliteration from English sounds into Korean where the English sound does not exist.
- Revise the content elaborations to ensure:
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - clarity of subject matter
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations.
- Provide more linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn without dependence on the content elaborations.
- Undertake a scan of the Korean curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include numbering in the scope and sequence documents.

## 9.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- Some achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- The achievement standards lack reference to higher order thinking cognitions.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

## **Way forward**

### **For both entry points**

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students' understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

### **For Foundation to Year 10 sequence**

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.

# 10. Modern Greek

## 10.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Modern Greek language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message.

## 10.2 Band descriptions

### *General feedback*

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.”

With this in mind, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the band descriptors provide a clear overview, descriptions of the types of learners and provide appropriate expectations of learners.
- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.

## 10.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### *General feedback*

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”.

Considering this, the following concerns were raised.

- The volume of content is excessive for the time on task.
- In general, there is a discrepancy between the expectations of the Understanding and Communication strands. The communicating expectations are pitched higher than the Understanding. The understanding is realistic, but the communicating is unrealistic given the levels and time on task
- The requirements at Foundation to Year 2 band were considered to be ambitious for students of this age particularly the expectations of speaking and writing imaginative texts.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.

- The content descriptions should include evidence of the expectation of higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- The content descriptions lack a clear progression in the development of complexity of grammatical elements. It is necessary that this progression is clearly articulated from Level 1 upwards. The development of the following should be articulated in the document:
  - sentence structure: statement, interrogative, negative
  - verbs: conjugations, tenses, groups and voice
  - adjectives: agreement, possessive, demonstrative, comparative, adjectives used as nouns
  - adverbs: modifiers as required
  - nouns: gender, number and case
  - prepositions: place, movement
  - articles: definitive, indefinite
  - pronouns: subject, reflexive, demonstrative, interrogative, possessive.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced nor is it made clear how they are to be used.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### ***Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback***

The majority of consultation participants indicated that the pitch of the content descriptions and the content elaborations is often realistic. There were concerns about the discrepancy in the expectations of the Understanding and Communicating strands.

Illustrative examples of content descriptions and content elaborations that are pitched too high or lack clarity include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - In general, the Level 1 content descriptions and content elaborations are pitched too high. It is realistic to have students speaking in the target language but not realistic to have them writing in it.

- **Content description 1.6**
  - this content description assumes students have a functional knowledge of the language. Students at this level in this band do not have the language skills to produce written work in the target language.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.16**
    - “analysing differences in syntax ... exclamations or expressions and lexis...” It would be best not to use the word “lexis” in the content elaboration as “lexis” means “word” in Greek
    - analysing the differences in syntax is beyond the language skills of students at this level.

### **Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

The following concerns about the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) were highlighted by consultation participants:

- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 2.7**
    - the songs listed (*Αχ Ελλάδα, Μεσ του Βοσπόρου τα στενά, Τα Συμυρνέικα τραγούδια*) are not examples of “contemporary songs related to the Modern Greek experience”. These songs could be used to assist students to understand historical and migrant experiences but not the Modern Greek experience.
  - **Content descriptions 2.7, 2.8**
    - “Karagiozi puppet theatre/show” is an outdated and age-inappropriate example for teaching these content descriptions.
  - **Content description 2.17**
    - the example *το κάνω* does not belong in this content elaboration as it does not fall under the “non-Greek words” category, nor does it have any special meaning resulting from immigration experiences or technological developments.

### **Modern Greek spelling errors Foundation to Year 10 sequence**

Content description	Error	Correction
3.19	η καλαθόσφαιρα	η καλαθοσφαίριση
4.3	Σάβατο	Σάββατο
4.3	πόδιαπόδια	τα πόδια
5.3	Γιάννη δεν έχεις δίκαιο	Γιάννη δεν έχεις δίκιο
5.19	ζαπινγκζαπινγκπαρκινγκ, ζαπινγκ	το ζαπινγκ

## Modern Greek spelling errors Year 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence

Content description	Error	Correction
1.5	απίστευτω	απίστευτο
2.17	γάρι	το γάρι

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Revise the content descriptions to ensure higher order thinking expectations are evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Revise the content descriptions and content elaborations to ensure:
  - the disparity of expectation of the two strands is corrected
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band and level
  - examples are correct and age-appropriate
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations
  - spelling errors are corrected.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Provide a clear progression in the development of complexity of grammatical elements.
- Undertake a scan of the Modern Greek curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.



## 10.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- Some of the achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students' understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that "or example" has a different meaning than "such as" or "including the use of".

#### For Foundation to Year 10 sequence

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.

# 11. Spanish

## 11.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Spanish language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

Consultation participants identified the following concerns about the context statement.

- Statements in the context statement should be referenced. For example, statements that should clearly state the source of information include: “Spanish is a global language spoken by 500 million people across the world”. Inclusion of figures such as these date the curriculum
- The term “culture” is used throughout the curriculum, including the context statement, however, it is not defined
- The place of the Spanish language in Australia section:
  - does not speak to the target audience of school-based teachers because examples refer only to tertiary education
  - has a condescending tone which is supported by statements such as “The universities were the first Australian educational institutions to seriously undertake the teaching of Spanish”
  - should emphasise the benefits of teaching Spanish in terms of Australia’s place in the global market.
- The nature of Spanish language section should state that Spanish is a phonetic language.

### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message
  - define culture
  - include references for statements.
- Revise *The place of Spanish language in Australia* section to:
  - be less condescending by including school-based examples
  - emphasise the benefits of teaching Spanish in terms of Australia’s place in the global market.
- Revise *The nature of the Spanish language section* to state that Spanish is a phonetic language.

## 11.2 Band descriptions

### General feedback

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” With this

in mind, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- In general, the band descriptors provide a clear overview, descriptions of the types of learners and provide appropriate expectations of learners.
- A strength of the band descriptions is that the language functions increase in complexity from one band to the next.
- The importance of reflection in the process of learning the Spanish language was acknowledged.
- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.

### ***Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback***

Consultation participants identified the following specific concerns for the Foundation entry band descriptions:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - the pitch of the band description should be adjusted to take into account that students are still learning to read and write in English before they can learn to read and write in Spanish.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - the exploration of classroom rules could be moved to the Foundation to Year 2 band description to coincide with classroom routines.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - in general, the expectations of this band description are pitched too high for the language ability of learners in this band.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - in general, the examples given need to take into account the maturity of the students and what they are likely to be capable of producing in English
  - “use vocabulary and grammar with increasing accuracy, drafting and editing to improve structure and clarify meaning” is pitched too high for the language ability of learners in this band. Students’ foundation in simple grammar would not be sophisticated enough at this stage to allow for increased rigour.

#### **Way forward**

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - make them more reader-friendly, e.g. use headings and dot points
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions:
    - are aligned to the content descriptions
    - take into account the language ability of learners in each level.

## **11.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations**

### ***General feedback***

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”.

The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”. Considering this the following concerns were raised.

- The volume of content is excessive for the time on task.
- In general, the Foundation to Year 10 sequence content descriptions are pitched higher than the Year 7 to Year 10 (Year 7 entry) sequence content descriptions.
- The requirements at Foundation to Year 2 band were considered to be ambitious for students of this age.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- The content descriptions should include evidence of the expectation of higher order thinking, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- The content descriptions lack a clear progression in the development of complexity of grammatical elements. It is necessary that this progression is clearly articulated from Level 1 upwards. The development of the following should be articulated in the document:
  - sentence structure: statement, interrogative, negative
  - verbs: conjugations and tenses
  - adjectives: agreement, possessive, demonstrative, comparative, adjectives used as nouns
  - adverbs: modifiers as required
  - nouns: gender, number
  - prepositions: place, movement
  - sentence connections: pero, porque, claro, por supuesto, o, y, despues, mientras
  - articles: definitive, indefinite
  - pronouns: subject, reflexive, demonstrative, interrogative, possessive.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- The expectations of the curriculum are ambitious and assume that all schools have highly-qualified Spanish teachers.
- The Foundation to Year 10 sequence has a greater emphasis on culture than linguistics.
- It should be stated that there are 21 Spanish speaking countries and that the examples provided within the document come from across these countries. Based on the examples used in the draft curriculum, it appears that some sections of the document were written by writers from Spain and other sections were written by writers from Latin America. This distinction should not be able to be made.
- It is not made clear in the documentation how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised, or sequenced, nor is it made clear how they are to be used.

- The items that were included as concepts were inconsistent, sometimes being actions, sometimes being contexts.
- The prominence of communication with people of the same age in Spanish-speaking communities is recognised as being valuable and also problematic to establish and maintain. Many Spanish-speaking communities exist in different time zones which also pose a complication for real time discussions. Students at the same age tend to be more advanced in their understanding of English than the Australian students will be in the understanding of Spanish which also makes it difficult to sustain a connection with the other students.
- There was concern about the suggestion for young students (Years 5 and 6) to be involved in social networks. To monitor the nature of interactions, schools would need to have a closed networking system available, with careful supervision from teachers.
- Stereotypes are included in many of the elaborations. It is not always possible to characterise accurately “how Spanish people think”. Generalisations need to be treated with caution, and can prove problematic when they link to the teacher’s own misconceptions.
- Slang is included in the elaborations. If slang must be included, then it needs to be identified as being slang.
- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### **Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback**

The majority of consultation participants indicated that the pitch of the content descriptions and the content elaborations is often unrealistic. There were concerns about the depth of content to be developed in some levels.

Illustrative examples of content descriptions and content elaborations that are pitched too high or lack clarity include:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.1**
    - the examples in the elaborations are pitched too high and are too ambitious for the level, e.g. *un hermanito*
    - the expectation of use of diminutive should be removed as this concept is too complex for this level.
  - **Content description 1.2**
    - at this level students do not have the language ability in the target language to understand the grammar when they act out the various scenarios and mimic the use of language
    - “responding to classroom instructions ... becoming familiar with classroom activities in some Spanish-speaking countries and comparing them to Australian classroom routines”. It is not clear what Australian classroom routines are.

- **Content description 1.3**
  - the Latin American examples provided are slang and consequently need to be adjusted.
- **Content description 1.7**
  - to recite *El Renacuajo Paseador* is too ambitious for students at this level.
- **Content description 1.13**
  - “Recognise what is different and new in songs, rhymes and pictures to identify differences and similarities between the languages and cultures of Spanish-speaking communities and those of Australia”. This content description lacks clarity, it could be interpreted to be about greetings, body language and/or expression
  - the listing of songs, rhymes and pictures should be moved to an elaboration and the understanding that is to be developed from looking at these examples should be the focus of the content description.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 2.2**
    - “using social media to connect with penpals”. At this level students will not have the language skills to correspond with penpals.
    - online environments must be carefully monitored and chosen by the teacher.
  - **Content description 2.2**
    - “participating in a shared lunch after preparing it together” will require health and safety risk assessments to be conducted
    - “making toys and crafts, and making and playing games, for example, indigenous paper cutting” it is unclear what “indigenous paper cutting” means in this context. More appropriate examples could include: Carnival masks; making indigenous craft, e.g. Mayan clothing, friendship bracelets.
  - **Content description 2.4**
    - “Gather information from peers relating to home, routines, responsibilities and interests”, it is not clear if this task is to be completed in Spanish or in English.
  - **Content description 2.7**
    - “Respond to imaginative texts by creating, modifying and completing own versions of stories, paintings, plays, rhymes and songs”, at this level students do not have the language ability in the target language to create imaginative texts.
  - **Content description 2.10**
    - “Explain to friends and family members”. In order to facilitate assessment this content description should focus on explaining to peers rather than friends and family.
  - **Content description 2.12**
    - “Participate in a class performance showing how a learner changes as they continue to study a new language and culture, for example, rejecting stereotypes and understanding that Spanish is spoken in a large number of countries”. It is not necessary to include the phrase “rejecting stereotypes” in the content description
    - the topic for the performance play is unsuitable, Additionally, the notion of a performance would be time consuming given the time on task
    - it is not clear if the performance is to be in English or in Spanish.

- **Content description 2.19**
  - “recognising variations in language use and noticing that these may correspond to particular regions or countries of origin”. The specificity of regions is too great, comparing countries of origin is adequate.
- **Content description 2.21**
  - “noticing how many different words for dance exist in the Spanish language (for example, *el tango, la salsa, la cumbia, el flamenco, la cueca, la jota, el bambuco, el cha cha cha, camdombe*)”. The examples listed are not different words for “dance” they are examples of different dances.
- **Content description 2.22**
  - content elaborations should include examples about body language differences and gestures, e.g. “ojo”.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - it is not clear if the subjunctive is to be taught at the level. Students may not understand this concept in English at this stage.
  - **Content description 3.1**
    - for many students the only Spanish speakers they will encounter are at school. Hence for the majority of schools and local communities, it will not be possible for students to “share with ... Spanish-speaking contacts...”.
  - **Content description 3.16**
    - this content description is pitched too high for this level and is not aligned with the expectations of the achievement standard.
  - **Content description 3.14**
    - the content elaborations do not exemplify the requirements of this content description.
  - **Content description 3.19**
    - “discussing the presence of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages as part of the languages community in Australia and their presence in the school community” is tokenistic and has no relevance to the Spanish curriculum, unless the discussions are conducted in Spanish, though it is doubtful that students would have the language skills in the target language
    - this could be an opportunity to increase awareness of indigenous languages such as Quechua, Nahuatl and also the regional languages on Spain, e.g. Catalan.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - in general, the examples used in Years 7 and 8 (Level 3) content descriptions need to take into account the maturity of the students and what they are likely to be capable of producing in English.
  - **Content description 4.1**
    - “initiate and sustain interactions with peers and Spanish-speaking adults” . Students in this band are likely to find it difficult to initiate and sustain conversations with adults in English. It will be more difficult to do it in Spanish
    - for many schools and local communities students will not be able to access Spanish speakers.

- **Content description 4.2**
  - *tengo ganas de ir al cine* is too grammatically complex as an example of the content elaboration “describing plans and arrangements, offering suggestions, explaining own preferences, and negotiating outcomes”.
- **Content description 4.8**
  - students at this level will only be able to “translate texts on familiar topics” if the texts have been modified.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - **Content description 5.1**
    - “*exchanging* emails and participating in online chats”. Online environments must be carefully monitored and chosen by the teacher.
  - **Content description 5.2**
    - “create texts expressing a point of view on social issues”. Students are unlikely to have adequate general knowledge to create informed texts about social issues.

### **Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) sequence-specific feedback**

In general, consultation participants indicated that the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) Spanish draft curriculum is more realistic in its pitch compared to the Foundation to Year 10 draft Spanish curriculum. The examples are pedagogically appropriate for the age group and provide opportunities for teachers to hook into the interests of students.

The following concerns about the Years 7 to 10 (Year 7 Entry) were highlighted by consultation participants:

- Years 7 and 8 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.7**
    - “*mote*” is a complex word. “*por qué tiene ese mote*” is pitched too high for this entry level into the target language.
  - **Content description 1.8**
    - the political cartoon *Mafalda* is often sexist in its content. Because of this, it is not an appropriate example.
  - **Content description 1.18**
    - the following examples should be removed as they are Spanglish: *tú, vos, usted, vosotros, doctor López, doña Clementina*.
  - **Content description 1.20**
    - this content description is better placed in Level 2 because students in Level 1 are just beginning their engagement with Spanish and will have more success with this content at the next level.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 2)
  - **Content description 2.2**
    - reword the content description to indicate that learning activities/tasks can be negotiated, not the curriculum.
  - **Content description 2.16**
    - “using the subjunctive mood” is pitched too high for this band and entry point into the target language.



– **Content description 2.16**

- *el mitin* is a political term and should be removed.

**Way forward**

**For both entry points**

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Revise the content descriptions to ensure higher order thinking expectations are evident, e.g. interpret, compare, contrast, analyse, evaluate (as opposed to these verbs only being present in the non-mandatory content elaborations).
- Revise the content descriptions and content elaborations to ensure:
  - the focus of content descriptions is clear
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - the pitch of examples is appropriate for the entry level into the target language
  - examples are age and culture appropriate
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations
  - remove stereotypes
  - remove slang
  - examples are provided from both Spain and South American countries and the source country is identified through a consistent application of format, e.g. example from Spain/example from Latin American country.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Provide a clear progression in the development of complexity of grammatical elements.
- Undertake a scan of the Spanish curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.
- Review the content description numbering to ensure it aligns to the band level and include this numbering in the scope and sequence documents.

## 11.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- The achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.

- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

The following level-specific concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- Foundation to Year 4 (Level 1)
  - *profe, tío* as an example is an incorrect example of the use of titles.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - the alignment of paragraph one in the achievement standard to the content descriptions needs to be strengthened
  - “...using the present tense of verbs...” is not in the content descriptions
  - the inclusion of *Mortadelo y Filemón, Condorito* as examples of comics that can be read independently are not age appropriate or culturally appropriate, because they:
    - focus on social issues that are pitched at the teenage age-group and are tied too closely to the social realities of Spain to be appreciated by Australian students
    - are political cartoons that discuss culturally sensitive topics.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - the use of present perfect tense is implied. This is an unrealistic expectation for students this band.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - the requirement to explain, recognise and differentiate within the cultural section of the achievement standard is pitched too high for students in this band.

### Way forward

#### For both entry points

- Revise the achievement standards to:
  - show progression in the development of students’ understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

#### For Foundation to Year 10 sequence

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.
- Refine the achievement standards to:
  - remove any culturally sensitive and age inappropriate examples
  - correct any errors in Spanish language examples
  - ensure the expectations are pitched appropriately for each band.

## 12. Vietnamese

In general, consultation participants indicated that the draft Vietnamese curriculum is not as complete as the other language documents. More work is required by ACARA to:

- make the documents accessible to the target audience of teachers
- make the content less traditional and more contemporary and reflective of contemporary society and culture
- clarify the “version” of Vietnamese that is the context for the curriculum. The context statement states that Modern Standard Version of Vietnamese is taught, however, examples throughout the curriculum mix formal and traditional language use
- embed the general capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities.

The curriculum should balance the use of contemporary texts and traditional texts as examples. Feedback suggested that teachers who identify with Vietnamese communities in Australia are less likely to access contemporary texts from Vietnam.

This creates a challenge for ACARA to resolve the tension between developing a contemporary curriculum that meets the needs of the range of learners in this language and ensuring an appropriate balance of examples that represent both traditional and contemporary texts.

### 12.1 Context statement

In general, the context statement clearly describes the place of Vietnamese language in Australian education and more broadly in contemporary Australia. However, the text is overly descriptive, and clarity is lost in the lengthy sentences and explanations.

The context statement needs to clarify the “version” of Vietnamese that is to be taught. It states that Modern Standard Version of Vietnamese is taught, however, this is in conflict with examples throughout the curriculum, which are formal and traditional.

#### Way forward

- Revise the context statement to:
  - make it more succinct
  - use dot points as a formatting style to support clarity of message
  - clarify the “version” of Vietnamese to be taught.

### 12.2 Band descriptions

#### *General feedback*

One of the purposes of the band descriptions is to “provide a general description of language learning that is typical of particular phases along the F–10 continuum.” With this in mind, consultation participants provided the following general feedback about the draft band descriptions.

- It is crucial that the expectations framed in the band descriptions align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum. Realistic band descriptions will better inform age and student capabilities at each band level. If content and achievement are to be appropriately described, the bands must be age, pathway, content and concept appropriate.

- The expectations framed in the band descriptions should align to the content descriptions. This is not always the case in the draft curriculum.

### ***Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback***

The additional text outlined below for the Foundation to Year 2 band description models an approach that should be applied to the revision of the other band descriptions:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - add text to identify the following information:
    - Vietnamese is explored through the concepts relating to self, family and home
    - there is a transition from spoken to written language through scaffolding using selected texts
    - learners talk about differences and similarities they notice between Vietnamese and English and other languages/s and culture/s
    - the initial focus for learning is on listening to the sounds, shapes and patterns of Vietnamese through activities, such as rhymes, songs, clapping and action games, using repetition and recycling to identify frequently used words and simple phrases
    - the expectation to use specific Vietnamese non-verbal communication strategies
    - the expectation to use simple formulaic expressions; adapted, modelled language; and to explore audience, context and purpose.
    - that writing skills progress from labelling, copying words and co-constructing simple texts to adapting models to produce their own short texts using familiar vocabulary, language features and structures.

Consultation identified the following specific concerns:

- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - it is unrealistic to assume that all classrooms in this band will be implementing bilingual practices.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - at this band it is not realistic to:
    - expect students to explore Vietnamese language and culture by reading folk tales
    - recognise embedded cultural beliefs, values and practices.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - at this band it is not realistic for students to appreciate the impact of culture on language use
  - a systematic approach to intercultural literacy is not evident
  - emphasise that intercultural understanding discussions are held in English.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - in order to engage students in this band it is important to use learning experiences that relate to their experiences. The resources accessed by students need to be of relevance to secondary students.

### Way forward

- Revise the band descriptions to:
  - include key information needed for developing a rigorous language program
  - ensure the descriptions about language learning in the band descriptions are age appropriate and aligned to the content descriptions
  - ensure a systematic approach to intercultural literacy
  - emphasise that intercultural understanding discussions are held in English.

## 12.3 Content descriptions and content elaborations

### General feedback

The purpose of the content descriptions is to “describe the knowledge, understanding, skills and processes that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn”. The content elaborations are not mandatory and “are intended as support material only”.

In general, consultation participants identified the spiralling curriculum as a strength of the Vietnamese draft curriculum.

Concerns raised include the following.

- The content descriptions lack the specificity of expected teaching and learning, many are very broad and do not describe knowledge, understanding, skills and processes. For example, “recognise and understand their Vietnamese cultural identity” and “recognise the relationships between Vietnamese and English”.
- The content descriptions need to be written so metalanguage is included.
- Many of the draft content descriptions across all bands depend on the content elaborations for meaning.
- Many of the draft content descriptions lack of verbs that explicitly describe what students are doing and producing in the target language, e.g. reading or viewing, compiling, demonstrating, locating, sequencing etc.
- The draft content descriptions lack linguistic content. There are not enough references to grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn. Teachers are dependent on the non-mandatory content elaborations to get clarity about what to teach.
- Successful teaching of grammar and cohesive language features in the target language is dependent upon the learner understanding and successfully using these in English. The Languages learning area and relevant aspects of the English learning area should be complementary. The learning of language features in the Languages curriculum needs to occur concurrently with, or after, the same learning in English.
- The inclusion of examples linked to the content elaborations is supported. All content elaborations should be supported with examples.
- The addition of key concepts, key processes and key text types clarifies the content descriptions in the draft curriculum for other languages. Consultation participants believe these should be included in the Vietnamese curriculum.

- To improve the user-friendliness of the documents, the content description numbering should align to the relevant Level. The numbering system should be repeated in the scope and sequence documents. For example, in the Foundation to Year 10 sequence:
  - Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1A.X
  - Years 3 and 4 (Level 1) band, content descriptions should be numbered 1B.X
  - Years 5 and 6 (Level 2) band, should be numbered 2.X
  - Years 6 and 7 (Level 3) band, should be numbered 3.X
  - Years 9 and 10 (Level 4) band, should be numbered 4.X.

### ***Foundation to Year 10 sequence-specific feedback***

Specific concerns raised about the content descriptions and content elaborations are illustrated through the following examples:

- Foundation to Year 2 (Level 1)
  - **Content description 1.3**
    - “engaging with short texts such as poems or songs” is pitched too high for students in this band.
  - **Content description 1.4**
    - “stating sensory responses” is too difficult for students in this band.
  - **Content description 1.7**
    - in general, the Vietnamese language being taught in this band is reflective of the formal language of the 1930s and 1940s it is not representative of language spoken in contemporary society. For example, the terms of address taught need to be modernised.
- Years 3 and 4 (Level 1)
  - In general, the Vietnamese language being taught in this band is too formal and traditional it is not representative of language spoken in contemporary society.
  - **Content description 2.6**
    - “creating texts such as short poems, songs, picture books, films” in the target language is too challenging for students in this band
    - “listening to or reading ... a fairy tale” is not an age-appropriate example.
- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - In general, the Vietnamese language being taught in this band is pitched to high-performing students. Students will only have success if they are very well rehearsed.
  - **Content description 3.3**
    - it is unclear if the requirements of this content description are done in English or Vietnamese. It is a reasonable expectation of students in the band to research and summarise in English
    - “identifying and comparing Vietnamese cultural references in” newspapers and advertisements is pitched too high for students in this band.

- **Content description 3.5**
  - the expectations of this content description are pitched too high for students in this band, namely:
    - summarising stories, describing plots and characters
    - distinguishing between the main ideas and supporting ideas.
- Years 7 and 8 (Level 3)
  - **Content descriptions 4.3, 4.5**
    - these content descriptions are pitched too high for students in this band. Students will not have sufficient language skills to enable them to understand enough of any imaginative text to allow them to analyse themes, characters and messages.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - in general, the Vietnamese language being taught in this band is too formal and traditional. Students will be disadvantaged if they do not have interactions with native speakers.
  - **Content description 5.5**
    - the content elaborations are pitched too high for students in this band. They will not have the necessary language skills to be able to access the information in the texts that is needed to discuss the values and attitudes changing over time. These discussions, even in English, would be difficult for students of this age.
  - **Content description 5.16**
    - the expectation that students in this band could “explore the evolution of the Vietnamese language under the impact of media, technology and globalisation” is unrealistic.

## Way forward

### For both entry points

- Revise the content descriptions to make clear what teachers are expected to teach and what students are expected to learn without the need to rely on the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- Review the language to ensure that contemporary language is used.
- Revise the content elaborations to ensure:
  - the pitch is appropriate for the band
  - examples are age and culture appropriate
  - examples are provided for all content elaborations.
- Provide linguistic references to the grammar, cohesive language features or linguistic elements (such as phonology, morphology and syntax) that teachers are expected to teach, and students are expected to learn.
- Undertake a scan of the Vietnamese curriculum against the Australian Curriculum: English to ensure the teaching of grammar and cohesive devices in the target language occur concurrently with, or after, they have been taught in English.
- Support teachers in using the content descriptions by identifying the:
  - key concepts
  - key processes
  - key text types.
- Ensure examples represent both traditional and contemporary texts.
- Articulate how the key concepts and processes accompanying each content description are organised or sequenced and how they are to be used.

## 12.4 Achievement standards

The following general concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- The achievement standards are a summary of content rather than showing a progression of learning and quality of performance.
- Some achievement standards are too detailed, contain too much information and are not achievable in the time indicated.
- The achievement standards are very lengthy and difficult to read in the current format.
- The achievement standards include both the content descriptions and the non-mandatory content elaborations.
- The inclusion of examples within the achievement standards leads to confusion about what is mandatory and what is for illustrative purposes only.
- There is a single achievement standard representing the standard of learning for two bands: the Foundation to Year 2 band and the Years 3 and 4 band.

The following specific concerns about the achievement standards were identified.

- Foundation to Year 4 (Level 1)
  - remove reading short extracts from stories as it is pitched too high for this band. Students will not have the language skills at this level to read an extract of a story.



- Years 5 and 6 (Level 2)
  - “initiate conversation” is too high an expectation for this band. It should be changed to “participate in well-rehearsed and familiar spoken and written interactions”.
- Years 9 and 10 (Level 4)
  - the inclusion of “inferences” in the achievement standard is not aligned to the content descriptions.

### **Way forward**

#### **For both entry points**

- Revise the achievement standards:
  - to ensure the expectations are band appropriate
  - show progression in the development of students’ understandings and capacity with language skills
  - ensure they align only to the content descriptions and do not include the non-mandatory content elaborations
  - remove examples, or provide a clear articulation that “or example” has a different meaning than “such as” or “including the use of”.

#### **For Foundation to Year 10 sequence**

- Develop separate achievement standards for the Foundation to Year 2 and the Years 3 and 4 bands.
- Refine the achievement standards to ensure the expectations are pitched appropriately for each band.

---

## **Queensland Studies Authority**

154 Melbourne Street, South Brisbane

PO Box 307 Spring Hill

QLD 4004 Australia

**T** +61 7 3864 0299

**F** +61 7 3221 2553

**[www.qsa.qld.edu.au](http://www.qsa.qld.edu.au)**

---