Task specifications – English Communications – unresolved issues

Issues:
The key issues requiring attention in a course to replace English Communications, as yet unresolved, are, in summary:

1. The ‘learning statement’ requires writing as clearly identifiable outcomes (not abilities) with evident links from these to the course content and the assessment criteria and standards
2. The assessment criteria and standards require updating and clarifying:
   a. the clarity of the link between the course outcomes and the ‘key competency’ criteria (4, 6, 8 & 10) and the nature of their standards, particularly use of a common framework for standards elements, which consists of selecting, identifying changes, evaluation effectiveness and helping others
   b. the value of criterion 6 to teachers’ effective management of internal assessments
   c. the respective roles of criteria 7 & 10 and the overlap between the two
   d. the relationship in the assessment context of the display of communication skills and of academic integrity, where the work is the student’s own except where explicitly acknowledged
   e. the role and scope of assessment of criterion 9
3. the value of the ‘work file’ requirement
4. the structure and purpose of the externally assessed folio in the context of the general policy that a folio may be required as part of the external assessment process for a course only when the criteria to be assessed externally cannot be effectively and efficiently assessed in a supervised standardised assessment such as a conventional exam. The use of a folio in the external assessment must add value to the validity of an award proportionate to its significant cost.
5. updates to the themes for the ‘ideas and Issues’ strand
6. degree and scope of prescription of texts, taking into account the requirement for validity of assessment through the external examination
7. updates to genres for the ‘texts and contexts’ strand
8. the role and value of the study of text adaptations.
Attachment A lists the unresolved comments from stakeholders on the exposure draft. Attachment B gives specific comments from the accreditation report requiring attention. These are provided as background to the issues listed above.

Deliverables:
1. A proposed replacement learning statement, written as outcomes, showing the relationship of its elements with the content and assessment criteria, links with the national standards defined by the ACARA content statements approved by Ministers as the agreed and common base for course development.
2. Clearly stated assessment criteria and standards meeting the requirements set out in attachment C with referenced grounds (including comparisons with mainland courses) for
   a. retaining (suitable modified) ‘key competency’ criteria (4, 6, 8 & 10) in terms of their link with the central purposes of the course and the extent to which they support valid and reliable assessment or for substituting one or more alternative criteria and standards
   b. the respective roles of criteria 7 & 10 and the overlap between the two
   c. implementing academic authenticity and integrity as a key component of communication
3. an analysis of the value, if any, of the 'work file' requirement
4. the structure and purpose of the externally assessed folio in the context of the general policy that a folio may be required as part of the external assessment process for a course only when the criteria to be assessed externally cannot be effectively and efficiently assessed in a supervised standardised assessment such as a conventional exam. The use of a folio in the external assessment must add value to the validity of an award proportionate to its significant cost.
5. suggested updates to the themes for the 'ideas and Issues' strand
6. descriptions of the degree and scope of prescription of texts, taking into account the requirement for validity of assessment through the external examination
7. suggested updates to genres for the 'texts and contexts' strand
8. description of the role and value of the study of text adaptations in achieving the learning outcomes of the course
Attachment A: comments on the exposure draft identifying issues that have not yet been resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent statement:</th>
<th>Office annotation:</th>
<th>Actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four new standards have been included under criterion 10, which are intended to address authenticity and academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The blurring of the two criteria is problematic as external assessment would be compromised as there could be inconsistencies as individual teachers/markers weight those things that they view as important within the two criteria. These standards are incongruous under this criterion, which is intended to assess students' ability to 'Communicate Ideas and Information'. Referencing and plagiarism are not an issue of communication, but are instead a question of research and acknowledging sources. A student may write fluently and accurately but fail to accurately reference sources. The latter should be assessed separately from the former.</td>
<td>Whilst relating to 'identifying changed conditions' the context of each criterion is different. These were a part of the 2009-13 course.</td>
<td>To be specifically considered in 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 4</strong>: descriptor 2 is repeated in Criterion 6, Criterion 8 and Criterion 10.</td>
<td>Current element regarding 'improvement' needs to be replaced. These elements are drawn from other accredited courses.</td>
<td>To be specifically considered in 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 6</strong>: There are two new standard descriptors in the draft course document, assessing the use of planning tools and a student's reflection and analysis/evaluation of his/her progress, goal setting and planning. These could prove difficult to assess.</td>
<td>These criteria are a part of the 2009-13 course.</td>
<td>Consider in the 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only). Consider role and assessment of this criterion in the 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only). Consider role and assessment of this criterion in the 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic criteria 4 and 8 have been retained. These two criteria be removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 9 has been difficult to assess in an analytical exam response. There has been no state wide agreement at external marking. Assess criterion 9 in the folio. Criterion 10 could be assessed in the external exam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 10 contains too much for assessment. (It now includes four dot points about referencing etc). Remove dot points 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5 and include them in criterion 8 (if C8 remains in the course).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Respondent statement:**

Criterion 7 should address range of form only. The assessment of ‘grammatical conventions, punctuation and spelling’ would be a welcome addition to Criterion 10.

The blurring of the two criteria is problematic as external assessment would be compromised as there could be inconsistencies as individual teachers/markers weight those things that they view as important within the two criteria.

There is a new emphasis on the use of ICT and teachers need to be given opportunities to upskill to help students ‘demonstrate discernment in their use of ICT’ and to ‘demonstrate understanding of the personal and social implications of ICT texts’ not to mention actually using the ICT.

There is still too much in this course. The Applications could be removed, with more time allocated to Ideas and Issues and Texts and Contexts. The suggested topics given (2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9) on this new investigation of communications media are daunting and require teacher preparation and PD.

A personal reflective journal is too difficult for many students to maintain and a nightmare to mark; students do not know how to write these despite countless explanations. They are busy work at best.

Demanding that two of the three responses in the major modules need to be up to publication standard seems unreasonable given that students rarely achieve this without concentrated effort, class time and teacher input.

Many students struggle to read the prescribed texts; they will not 'read widely for personal enjoyment' or reflect on their reading by maintaining a reading log and journal – this is unrealistic.

The Work File is an unwelcome carry over from Communications as it stands. The TQA do not request to sight the student’s Work File. Surely no other subject actually stipulates how the students should organise their notes.

Criterion 8 is an unwelcome generic criterion from the present course and should go. Referencing could be included in C8 (instead of C10) and give that criterion specific purpose.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office annotation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009-13 Course document p.9.</td>
<td>The Exposure Draft notes, “Issues not fully resolved in expected exposure draft of course for 2014:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applications in the exposure document was ‘at least one’: expiring 2009-13 course is ‘two’. Topics have been inserted from the expiring 2009-13 Course Guide into the exposure course document. There are no changes to the requirements or expectations of this course when compared with the 2009-13 course.</td>
<td>- updating the assessment criteria and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009/13 Course document pp.4, 5, 7, 8, &amp; 9.</td>
<td>- the structure and purpose of the externally assessed folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009/13 Course Guide document (p.10 ‘Overview of Work Expectations’) and has just been inserted into the exposure course document.</td>
<td>- updates to the themes for the ‘ideas and Issues’ strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009-13 Course document p.8.</td>
<td>- updates to genres for the ‘texts and contexts’ strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider whether academic integrity and authenticity, including referencing should be a separate criterion in the 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only).</td>
<td>- study of text adaptations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the role of the ‘work file’ in the 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only).</td>
<td>- to be worked through with stakeholders during June 2013 to April 2014 for versions of the course in 2015 and beyond.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent statement:</td>
<td>Office annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evidences for Criterion 4 (group work) are still unhelpful when it comes to meaningful assessment.</td>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009/13 Course document p.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much in this course. As an example the purpose of asking students to make ethical decisions about issues, events and actions seems unnecessary.</td>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009/13 Course document p.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the difference between a performance and a visual text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how language is used 'to act'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipulating that one of three responses in Texts and Contexts must be oral prevents students from easily including this in their folio.</td>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009/13 Course document p.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would be very disappointed if the English document revised and published in October 2012 were simply discarded and Tasmanian teachers and students were left with the course that has been proposed for 2014. We hope that this most recent proposed course is just a “stop gap” measure in order to allow time for further development of the October 31, 2012 English document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are explanatory footnotes for criteria 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 (which have been transposed from the old Course Guide. Why are there no explanations for criteria 1 and 2. There were none in the old guide either. The explanation of Criterion 5 does not make sense. (It didn’t in the old guide either!) Some of the dot points in the standards are meaningless or impossible to interpret. They need MAJOR reworking before this course is implemented.</td>
<td>This is a feature of the expiring 2009/13 Course document p.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are interested to see that ‘the structure and purpose of the externally assessed folio’ is under review. While we value the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Exposure Draft notes, “to be worked through with stakeholders during June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent statement:</td>
<td>Office annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student folio as an external assessment we do not think that the Communications folio in its current format (the ‘polishing’ of three pieces written for class assessment) has academic merit.</td>
<td>2013 to April 2014 for versions of the course in 2015 and beyond.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should focus change from reflective writing to persuasive writing as in other jurisdictions/ACARA courses??</td>
<td>consider as a part of the 2013/14 development of a course to replace that accredited for use in 2014 (only).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The match between the Learning Statements and Course Criteria is tenuous, due in part to the absence of relevant action verbs and overuse of knowledge-based descriptors in the Course Criteria. Four of the six domain-specific Course Criteria require students to ‘demonstrate an understanding of’ language, ideas, issues and text structures, while one of the six Learning Statements requires students to ‘demonstrate knowledge of’ the cultural, social and technical dimensions of language and texts. This is very difficult to quantify in assessment and reflects poor curriculum design.

The standards are vaguely comparable with Units 3 and 4 from ACARA’s senior secondary Australian Curriculum for English.

The imprecise wording of the course standards does not compare to the precise wording of the ACARA standards. For example, the following ratings are from English Communications – Criterion 1

_Demonstrate an understanding of the power of language to create cultural representations:

Rating C: Critically analyses texts in terms of the cultural values suggested by omissions from representations
Rating B: Critically analyses texts in terms of the cultural values suggested by omissions from representations
Rating A: Critically analyses texts in terms of the cultural values suggested by omissions from representations

As noted previously, there is no differentiation between the three ratings, which challenges the need for ratings in this course. The comparable ACARA standard (Unit 4) is worded as follows:

Students reflect on their own and others’ texts by:
• analysing and evaluating how different attitudes and perspectives underpin texts
• questioning the assumptions and values in texts
• identifying omissions, inclusions, emphases and marginalisations
• discussing and evaluating different readings of texts.

There is a significant difference in the clarity of wording between the two standards.

The following domain-specific course criteria require students to _demonstrate an understanding of..._, which is difficult to measure in assessment and reflects poor curriculum design:

• Demonstrate an understanding of the power of language to create cultural representations
• Demonstrate understanding of ideas and issues
• Demonstrate understanding of the ways language is used to position audiences
• Demonstrate understanding and appreciation of text structures and features.

In many instances there is little differentiation in the descriptions of evidence required by the standards. For example, the following ratings apply to _Criterion 4 Work constructively with others:_

Rating C: Considers, selects and uses personal approaches to sensitively and responsibly engages with others to achieve agreed purposes
Rating B: Considers, selects and appropriately uses personal approaches to sensitively and responsibly engages with others to achieve agreed purposes
Rating A: Considers, selects and competently uses personal approaches to sensitively and responsibly engages with others to achieve agreed purposes
In most environments, appropriate use and competent use are one and the same.

In some cases, the wording across different ratings is identical. In Criterion 5 Demonstrate understanding and appreciation of text structures and features, the following descriptors are used:
Rating C: Identifies the specific characteristics of the structures and features of a range of genres
Rating B: Identifies the specific characteristics of the structures and features of a range of genres
Rating A: Identifies the specific characteristics of the structures and features of a wide range of genres
There is no differentiation between Rating C and B, and the only difference to Rating A is the inclusion of a wide range of features.

This would be difficult to measure in assessment.

It is recommended the TQA reconsider the wording of the criteria and standards in English Communications.
Attachment C: Developing assessment criteria and performance standards

In course documents there is a hierarchy of:

- learning outcomes
- assessment criteria
- standards of performance.

There is a hierarchy of these three in the sense that the assessment criteria must align with the learning outcomes and not the other way round; and standards of performance must in turn elaborate differences in how well students do in terms of the assessment criteria. Whereas the learning outcomes of a course describe the broad range of objectives for students, the criteria describe the aspects of performance that will be assessed. These must align\(^1\) with, and provide adequate coverage of, the learning outcomes. The standards then describe the characteristics of performance in terms of each of these criteria at each of the rating levels. It is generally known that words alone do not adequately and completely define achievement standards. The words in the course document are a first (and important) element in the development and application of the standards to be applied to students’ performance.

Sadler (1987)\(^2\) defines these terms as:

- **Criterion**: a property or characteristic by which the quality of something may be judged. Specifying criteria nominates qualities of interest and utility but does not have anything to offer, or make any assumptions about, actual quality.
- **Standard**: a definite level of achievement aspired to or attained. Standards are about definite levels of quality (or achievement, or performance).

The assessment criteria capture the essence of what is important, critical and central about doing well at the particular discipline or area of study/activity covered by the course. The criteria should not include aspects of performance that are not essential and intrinsic to the nature of the activity/discipline. A course will usually have between 3 and 10 assessment criteria and these should be roughly of equal importance. The criteria must be meaningful to the particular course; they should not be so generic that they could apply to any course. This does not mean that generic skills such as communication do not appear; it means that the criterion will be about communication in the context of that particular course in the particular way in which communication occurs in that discipline, subject or area of study or activity.

When developing assessment criteria it is helpful to review them in terms of:

- assessment criteria are clear and specific when it is obvious to a reasonable person from the statements of criteria alone (no course name) which discipline/study area they belong to.

Criteria are written in the form of:

*The assessment for (name of course) will be based on the degree to which the student:*

1. [brief description of the required performance, starting with a verb]

Examples of some clearly written assessment criteria from existing courses:

\(^1\) ‘Align with’ does not mean that there is one assessment criterion for each learning outcome. It does mean that it should be clear that the set of assessment criteria provides a reasonable coverage of the set of outcomes. Such coverage is reasonable when it is clear that a student who does well at all of the assessment criteria is very likely to have achieved the learning outcomes of the course.

• **observes and critically appraises drama works** (starts with a verb, succinct, clear, related to the nature of the learning – drama)
• **develops a personal movement vocabulary as a means of expression** (again we have a clear picture of what the required performance looks like)
• **creates a design brief that incorporates design process and principles** (here we know what the product will be and what its critical qualities must be)
• **uses probability and data analysis techniques to analyse distributions** (we know what the task is and what it has to do)

Note that these criteria describe the actual performance required. Avoid criteria which imply but do not describe the performance, eg *demonstrate an understanding of*.... Go straight to the point of what the demonstration would look like – is the student expected to describe, perform, analyse, draw, create etc?

**Performance Standards**

Performance standards describe a level of achievement aspired to or to be attained. Standards are about definite levels of quality (or achievement, or performance).

Standards have two dimensions:

1. What are they describing?
2. How many levels of performance do they attempt to describe?

**What are they describing?**

They can describe student performance either in total or in terms of each of the criteria individually.

(a) In total

Here the standards attempt to describe the overall performance required. While the description will cover all the criteria, it will build a total picture of the student performance. Such a picture might read something like:

*At this level:*

*The student reads and understands basic scientific literature and selects the key ideas from literature such as scientific journals. The student gathers relevant scientific information and organise it in a meaningful way to present a case.*

*The student explains fundamental principles of physics and chemistry. The student designs a simple experiment to test a given hypothesis and participates in conducting simple experiments, closely adhering to given practices including safety requirements.*

(b) Against each criterion individually (this is the approach required in externally assessed courses). We have numerous examples of these in current courses.

**How many levels of performance do they attempt to describe?**

Standards are the description of student performance at various levels. The levels can be:

(a) the award levels of the course – SA, CA etc. This model may be more appropriate where there are only a small number of awards, such as Satisfactory Achievement and High Achievement.

(b) a designated set of ratings that are then used to calculate an award. Traditionally TQA courses have used 3 ratings: (C, B and A)³. A ‘C’ rating is the minimum acceptable standard, an ‘A’ rating is the highest standard of performance and a ‘B’ rating is between these two. Even when the three ratings are used, it is not essential to try to describe performance at all three levels. A description of the performance at the outer levels – C and A – may be all that is needed, with B being obviously in between these two.

---

³ The standards represent ‘anchor points’ along the continuum described by the criterion. It is more useful to have meaningfully described anchor points than it is to insist on a particular number of such points for all criteria. However, consistency is helpful unless it detracts from meaning and clarity.
What makes the difference between different ratings

An analysis of standards statements used to date in course documents suggests that there are some key characteristics of performance that are used to discriminate one rating from another:

- does the student know and can do only just enough or a lot? (breadth)
- does the student carry out the required tasks only just adequately or very well? (quality)
- does the student have only the basic knowledge and understanding or does the student fully comprehend the required information and concepts? (comprehension)

In some courses, frequency of performance has also been used as discrimination between the ratings. This is often expressed as ‘often’, ‘sometimes’, ‘always’, ‘occasionally’ etc. This does not really tell us what the performance looks like and what you think is ‘often’ I might regard as ‘occasionally’. Frequency is usually a factor of the difficulty of the task. Describe the nature of the performance, not how often the student can do it.

Standards should be set to be reasonable – neither so high that most students will not achieve them nor so low that all will meet them. Even though TQA courses do not include a ‘fail’ or ‘unacceptable performance’ standard, it is often helpful to have one in mind so that the minimal acceptable performance (a ‘C’ rating) is put into sharper focus.

It is easier to achieve reliable and valid assessment in terms of ratings where the standards describe contextualised knowledge and skills rather than generic performances. Performance standards are clear and specific when it is obvious to a reasonable person looking at the standards alone (no assessment criterion statement) which assessment criteria they belong to and what order they are in (no statement of A, B, C).

Consider the following to see if it would meet the above test. What is the probable criterion and which would be the ‘A’ rating, which the ‘B’ rating and which the ‘C’?

- sets out the content of the report clearly and logically
- produce a report that contains an introduction, a body and conclusions
- structures the report following established conventions and justifies the conclusions by the information in the body of the report

Some guidelines:

1. Write standards as simply as possible avoiding unnecessary words that detract from clarity

   Rather than say: demonstrate the ability to identify relevant sources
   just say: identify relevant sources.

2. Write them as simply as possible avoiding unnecessarily complex structures and ones that include several aspects of performance. Can the standard below be expressed more clearly?

   Consider, select and use strategies to anticipate and solve minor problems; clearly identify more complex issues and consider, select and use strategies seeking to resolve them.

3. Avoid phrases that don’t describe any particular performance, eg
   - Demonstrate a sound knowledge of...
   - Demonstrate extensive knowledge and comprehensive understanding of a wide range of...
   - Demonstrate some willingness to attempt
   - ‘Attempt to...
   - Endeavour to ...

4. Avoid very subjective terms such as ‘satisfactory’, ‘good’, ‘acceptable’, ‘adequate’, ‘very well’. These mean different things to different people. Describe the actual performance you expect to see from the student.
5. Avoid comparative terms such as ‘less’, ‘more’, ‘better’. Again these can be interpreted very differently by different people.

6. Always try to describe the actual performance you expect to see. Some good practice examples from our current courses might be:
   - use relevant sources of information in the report
   - produce designs incorporating all key features
   - list the basic steps in the process
   - initiate conversations with toddlers
   - adapt technology/communication methods and styles to suit audience
   - given an unfamiliar computing task, apply top down design in order to identify the required subtasks.

7. Do not use the context of the performance as part of the standard, eg do not use such terms as “with teacher guidance” etc. If the independence of action is part of the standard, describe it using words such as: “when provided with a range of options, select…” The only stem to standards statements is “A student…"

8. Limit the number of elements of a standard to that which is sufficient but not superfluous (as a guide consider 2 to 4 elements per criterion). Writing standards is difficult so write a few very good ones rather than a lot of not very good ones.
   - There does not have to be an element in each of the ratings, eg a particular behaviour might not be expected for a ‘C’ rating but is expected for a ‘B’ and ‘A’ rating. It might not be meaningful to try and describe the ‘B’ rating; it is in-between the ‘A’ and the ‘C’ rating.

9. Try to make sure the elements go to the heart of the criterion and are not focussing on peripherals. An example might be that the criterion is to do with reflecting on own creative performance but one of the elements of the standard is being able to write an essay. Is this central to the criterion?

10. Try to make the distinction between the ratings as clear as possible. You do not need to use the same form of words. For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘C’ rating</th>
<th>‘B’ rating</th>
<th>‘A’ rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A student: lists the basic components</td>
<td>A student: describes the function of the major systems</td>
<td>A student: trouble-shoots common system malfunctions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The distinction between the ratings can sometimes be best described by using different verbs. Possible examples might be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘C’ rating</th>
<th>‘B’ rating</th>
<th>‘A’ rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>use</td>
<td>modify</td>
<td>design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list</td>
<td>describe</td>
<td>analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify/select</td>
<td>describe</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate</td>
<td>initiate</td>
<td>modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>formulate</td>
<td>predict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copy</td>
<td>draft</td>
<td>design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respond</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>facilitate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The distinction might be best described in terms of the complexity or sophistication of the task, eg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘C’ rating</th>
<th>‘B’ rating</th>
<th>‘A’ rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one-on-one</td>
<td>small groups</td>
<td>large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brief notes</td>
<td>memos and letters</td>
<td>reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiar operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>new situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using whole numbers</td>
<td>using whole numbers and fractions</td>
<td>using decimals, fractions and percentages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The distinction might be in terms of the quantum of response provided by the student:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘C’ rating</th>
<th>‘B’ rating</th>
<th>‘A’ rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>basic, few, limited, most obvious</td>
<td>a range of, the most important</td>
<td>comprehensive, extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The distinction might be in terms of the quality of response provided by the student, particularly if describing a performance or a product:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘C’ rating</th>
<th>‘B’ rating</th>
<th>‘A’ rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>usable</td>
<td>finished</td>
<td>polished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable</td>
<td>interesting</td>
<td>well expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional</td>
<td>structurally sound</td>
<td>creative, innovative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. It is probably a good idea to start with the ‘C’ rating – what is the minimum acceptable performance? then go to the ‘A’ rating – what would a very good performance look like? Only then come back and think what an in-between performance might be.