

## Comparison of Current & Draft Outcomes NSW 7-10 Syllabus

### English Stage 4: Outcome 1

(Key: CS = Current Syllabus; DS= Draft Syllabus)

Current Syllabus	Draft Syllabus
A student: responds to and composes texts for understanding, interpretation, critical analysis and pleasure	A student: engages imaginatively and creatively, critically and interpretively with experience, information, ideas and arguments to respond to and compose texts

Outcome 1 Comment and questions:

- The CS goes straight to the heart of student activity in English emphasising responding and composing. These terms are defined (p.16 of the 2002 English 7-10 syllabus) as activities which encompass “the personal and intellectual connections a student makes with texts.”
  - The DS puts engagement up front. It seems to be a blending of
    - Current Outcome 6: draws on experience, information and ideas to imaginatively and interpretively respond to and compose texts and
    - Current Outcome 7: thinks critically and interpretively about information, ideas and arguments to respond to and compose texts
- What is gained or lost in this?
- Is the overlap of DS Outcome 1 with DS Outcome 2 too great?

### Content for Outcome 1

Current Syllabus Students learn to:	Current Syllabus Students learn about:	Draft Syllabus Students learn to:	Draft Syllabus Students learn about:
1.1 respond to imaginative, factual and critical texts, including the required range of texts, through wide and close listening, reading, and viewing	1.11 the ideas, information, perspectives and points of view presented in imaginative, factual and critical texts	1.1 recognise, explain and reflect on the connections between their own experiences and the world of texts by responding to the ideas and arguments of others [CCT]	1.10 the ways in which meaning is shaped by context, purpose, form, structure, style, content, language choices and their own personal perspective [L, CCT]

#### 1.1 Comment

- *Respond to* in CS is replaced with *recognise, explain and reflect*. This seems to make DS a less active and more internal process. *Responding* is still there in the DS.
- Personal perspective is articulated in draft 1.10 but is absent in the current outcome 1.1 and 1.11.
- Reference in CS is made to ‘required range of texts’ but there is no actual reference to the study of texts in the draft just the reference to the *world of texts*.
- DS1.10 is similar to CS1.13 and 1.15

Current Syllabus Students learn to:	Current Syllabus Students learn about:	Draft Syllabus Students learn to:	Draft Syllabus Students learn about:
1.2 respond to and compose texts intending to inform,	1.12 links between the ideas, information,	1.2 engage in wide reading of self-selected texts for	1.11 the ways individual interpretations of

persuade and entertain, including humorous texts	perspectives and points of view presented in texts and their own background and experience	enjoyment and share responses individually, in pairs and/or in small groups in a variety of relevant contexts, including digital and face to face contexts	texts are influenced by students' own knowledge, values and cultural assumptions 1.12 qualities of language in their own and others' texts that contribute to the enjoyment that can be experienced in responding and composing [L]
--	--	--	--

1.2 Comment and Questions:

- The single CS outcome is replaced with 3 *learn to and about* in the DS.
- The focus on engagement, identification and reflection is quite different in the DS and perhaps detracts from the CS emphasis on responding *and* composing. Is there a need to provide more active elements here?
- The reference in the DS to wide and personal reading gives students the opportunity to pursue their own interests in texts. This assumes self-directed learning. Should this be more clearly scaffolded to ensure its development at this early stage as groundwork for greater independence in later years?
- There is no distinctive equivalent in the CS for DS 1.3-1.9 although CS 6.5 'use *imaginative texts as models to replicate or subvert new texts*' is similar to 1.4
- DS 1.12 correlates somewhat with CS6.10 and 4.8

<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn about:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
1.3 compose imaginative, factual and critical texts for different purposes, audiences and contexts	1.13 the ways their own background and experience affect their responses to texts	1.3 reflect on ideas and opinions about characters, settings and events in literary texts, identifying areas of agreement and difference with others and justifying a point of view	1.13 the ways experience, knowledge, values, and perspectives can be represented through characters, situations and concerns in texts and how these affect responses to texts [CCT]

1.3 Comment and question:

- Students learn to 'reflect' and 'identify'. Not 'compose'. Is there too much of an emphasis on thinking and not enough on doing in the DS?
- DS *learn about* is the same as the CS but far more wordy and has similarity to CS 1.13, 1.17 and 2.12

<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn about:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
1.4 manipulate, combine and challenge different text types in order to compose new texts that address specific	1.14 their emerging sense of personal style and taste in composition and response	1.4 identify and explore ideas and viewpoints about events, issues and characters represented in texts	

purposes, audiences and contexts		drawn from different historical, social and cultural contexts	
----------------------------------	--	---	--

#### 1.4 Comment and questions

- The requirements in 1.3 and 1.4 are abstract. Should these be more concrete at this stage?
- The content of the CS here is taken up in DS 2.8 and 2.9 without reference to ‘emerging sense of personal style and taste’

<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn about:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
1.5 interpret, question and challenge information and ideas in texts through close study	1.15 the forms and features of language, the structures of texts and the nature of content that enables categorisation by content, composer and genre	1.5 interpret, question and challenge information and ideas in texts, drawing on knowledge of the text’s historical context [L, CCT]	

#### 1.5 Comments and Questions:

- *Learn to* is similar in both syllabuses but while the DS emphasises historical context, the CS has a broader emphasis on interpretation without reference to context.
- There is no corresponding descriptor for *learn about*. Language is addressed in the DS outcome 1.12.
- Where does the students’ knowledge of the text’s historical context come from? What pedagogy could be appropriate here?

<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn about:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
1.6 categorise texts by content, genre, composer and purpose	1.16 conventions associated with generic definitions of literary, film, television and other multimedia, information, everyday and workplace texts	1.6 analyse and explain how language has evolved over time and how technology and the media have influenced language use and forms of communication	1.14 the ways mobile and digital technologies influence language use and shape meaning [ICT] 1.15 conventions of storytelling in a range of modes and media such as digital storytelling [L, CCT]

#### 1.6 Comments and Questions:

- In the DS students learn to analyse and explain language evolution over time and how digital technologies influence language. Should this be 2 separate content descriptors?
- Knowing how language has changed over time implies that students at Stage 4 are studying historical texts. How viable is this with your students?
- In the CS there is a far greater correlation between ‘learn to’ and ‘learn about’. Is this an issue for the DS?

<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn about	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
---	---	---	--

1.7 respond to and compose texts beyond the literal level 1.8 graphically represent aspects of texts such as the storyline of a novel or film, the structure of a poem, the set of a play, and links in a webpage	1.17 features of texts that can be represented in graphical form to enable deeper understanding of meaning 1.18 inference, figurative language and alternative readings as strategies for responding to and composing texts beyond the literal level	1.7 create imaginative, informative and persuasive texts that raise issues, report events and advance opinions, using deliberate language and textual choices, and including digital elements as appropriate	1.16 alternative, creative and imaginative ways of expressing ideas, recognising, valuing and celebrating originality and inventiveness [L, CCT] 1.17 how inference and figurative language can be used in complex, subtle and creative ways [L]
--	---	--	---

#### 1.7 – 1.8 Comments and questions

- The DS here is more prescriptive than the CS and makes explicit the critical aspect of responding which in the CS is understood as included in the definition of the term.
- In the CS the specific reference to ‘graphic’ texts has been replaced in the DS by ‘literary texts’. Does this mean a devaluing of Representing as against Writing in literary and other texts? Or do you read this as an instance where the use of ‘literary text’ in the Australian curriculum is creating problems for NSW’s accommodation of quality texts of a more contemporary kind?

<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Current Syllabus</b> Students learn about:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
1.9 demonstrate understanding of the complexity of meaning in texts 1.10 describe and explain qualities of language in their own and others’ texts that contribute to the enjoyment that can be experienced in responding and composing.	1.19 types of humour and how humour is expressed in texts 1.20 the complexity of meaning in texts	1.8 share, reflect on, clarify and evaluate opinions and arguments about aspects of literary texts 1.9 express considered points of view accurately and coherently in speech or writing with confidence and fluency in rehearsed, unrehearsed and impromptu situations [L]	

#### 1.8 and 1.9 Comments and Questions

As we move through the content of this outcome, there are fewer parallels between the CS and DS and between *learn to* and *learn about* in the DS.

- There is no reference to enjoyment or humour in the DS where the focus seems to be on accuracy, opinion, coherence and argument. It must be noted that 1.10 of the CS is picked up as 2.1 in the DS.
- There is also no explicit reference to complexity of meaning.
- There is less on imagination and creativity throughout the DS content even though they are referred to in the overall Outcome.
- Whereas Outcome 1 does require students to *compose texts*, the word *compose* does not appear in either the *Learn to* or *Learn about*. There are references to *creating texts* in DS 1.7

## English Stage 4: Outcome 2

<p><b>Current Outcome 1:</b> A student responds to and composes texts for understanding, interpretation, critical analysis and pleasure</p>	<p><b>Draft Outcome 2:</b> A student: responds to and composes texts for understanding, interpretation, critical analysis, imaginative expression and pleasure</p>
<p><b>Current Outcome 2:</b> A student uses a range of processes for responding to and composing texts.</p>	<p><b>Draft Outcome 3:</b> A student: uses a range of processes for responding to and composing texts in different mediums and technologies</p>

### Comment

- CS Outcome 2 is the same as DS outcome 3 and Outcome 1 of the CS is the same as Outcome 2. For this reason, content descriptors for 2.1-2.7 will be held over for comparison with Outcome 3.
- This seems to be a result of the overlap between Outcomes 1 and 2 in the DS and makes it difficult to make direct comparisons of content. This is particularly the case for DS Outcome 2 where so much of the Australian Curriculum has been housed.

<p><b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:</p>	<p><b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:</p>
<p>2.1 <b>describe and explain</b> qualities of language in their own and others' texts that contribute to the enjoyment that can be experienced in responding and composing [CCT]</p>	<p>2.16 evaluating texts – understand how language is used to evaluate texts and how evaluations about a text can be substantiated by reference to the text and other sources</p>

### Comment:

- DS 2.1 is the same as CS 1.10 and addresses the issues raised under that content descriptor for Outcome 1.
- 2.16 seems to be a sophisticated expectation given that it is a key distinction between the Standard and Advanced courses at Stage 6.
- There is no indication of the 'other sources' (DS 2.16) to be used for comparison or reference.

<p><b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:</p>	<p><b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:</p>
<p>2.2 <b>respond</b> to their own and others' texts by considering ideas, images, information, linguistic and visual forms and features, tone, style, and type and structure, with reference to their appropriateness for the text's purpose, audience and context [L, CCT]</p>	<p>2.17 informative and persuasive texts – understand and explain how the text structures and language features of texts become more complex in informative and persuasive texts and identify underlying structures such as taxonomies, cause and effect, and extended metaphors</p>

### Comment:

- There is an emphasis in the Australian Curriculum on language forms and features and on persuasive texts.

- The focus on explanation, identification and evaluation raises questions about the place of the creative and composing features of early secondary education in English, despite its equal status in the outcome itself.
- Many students find creative writing more satisfying in at this stage and still require support in developing those skills. Is there enough scope for this in the DS?

<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
2.3 <b>analyse</b> how the text structures and language features of persuasive texts, including media texts, vary according to the medium and mode of communication	2.18 the structures and features of imaginative texts, including characterisation, setting, tension and climax, chronology and time, narrative voice, effective beginnings and endings [L]
2.4 <b>recognise</b> when information is presented objectively and subjectively by examining the language of opinion, including modality, bias, personal pronouns and other semantic cues [L, CCT]	2.19 rhetorical devices – understand how rhetorical devices are used to persuade and how different layers of meaning are developed through the use of metaphor, irony and parody

**Comment:**

- There is little concentration in the DS on the writing process: *analyse/recognise* rather than *compose/organize/record*.

<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
2.5 analyse and explain the ways text structures and language features shape meaning and vary according to audience and purpose	2.20 using language for effect – understand, interpret and discuss how language is compressed to produce a dramatic effect in film or drama, and to create layers of meaning in poetry, for example haiku, tankas, couplets, free verse and verse novels
2.6 explore and explain the ways authors combine different modes and media in creating texts, and the impact of these choices on the viewer/listener	2.21 modality – understand how modality is achieved through discriminating choices in modal verbs adverbs, adjectives and nouns

**Comment:**

- DS 2.5 is similar to CS1.4 but in the DS the emphasis is on analysing and explaining whereas in the CS it is on composing new texts.
- In the CS references to specific grammatical elements is limited to *paragraphing, cohesion, grammar, spelling and punctuation*. In the DS this becomes specifically about parts of speech and this is taken directly from the AC.

<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn to:	<b>Draft Syllabus</b> Students learn about:
2.7 identify and discuss main ideas, concepts and points of view in spoken texts to evaluate qualities, for example the strength of an argument or the lyrical power of a	explicit criteria for judging the effectiveness of a text in light of its purpose, audience and context [L, CCT]

poetic rendition

2.8 creatively adapt texts for different purposes, audiences and contexts and articulate the effects on meaning [L]

2.9 manipulate creatively, imaginatively combine and challenge different types of texts in order to compose new texts, including media texts, that address specific purposes, audience perspectives and contexts [L, CCT]

2.10 identify and evaluate devices that create tone, for example humour, wordplay, innuendo and parody in poetry, humorous prose, drama or visual texts

2.11 apply increasing knowledge of vocabulary, text structures and language features to understand the content of texts

2.12 compare the ways that language and images are used to create a character, and to influence emotions and opinions in different types of texts

2.13 recognise and analyse the ways that characterisation, events and settings are combined in narratives, and discuss the purposes and appeal of different approaches

2.14 interpret the stated and implied meanings in spoken texts, and use evidence to support or challenge different perspectives

2.15 discuss aspects of texts, for example their aesthetic and social value, using relevant and appropriate metalanguage

Comment:

These content descriptors from the DS are largely absent from the CS and provide an analytical focus on texts.

DS 2.7 links to CS 1.1 apart from its reference to *spoken texts*.

DS 2.8 links to CS1.3 but *compose* becomes *adapt* in the DS.

DS 2.9 links to CS2.2 and 1.4 quite effectively. It is also duplicated somewhat in DS 3.2. It is a 'do' outcome which is fairly unusual.

DS 2.10 links to CS 2.4 and 2.6 and also DS 3.5

DS 2.11 links to CS 2.5 which are both about how to use parts of speech.

DS 2.13 links to CS 2.7, 2.4, 3. 3 & 3.4 but is more specifically about plot, character and setting in texts.

DS 2.14 links to CS 1.5 but specifies *different perspectives* rather than *challenging information*.

DS 2.15 links to CS 1.10 & 2.1