

CDC Key Learning Area Committee on English Language Education 2001-2002  
Minutes of the Third Meeting

- Date: 27 February 2002
- Time: 2.30 p.m.
- Venue: Rm 1419A, 14/F Wu Chung House, 213 Queen's Road East, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
- Present: Mr. Stephen CHAN (Chairperson)  
Ms CHAN Wai-ming (Vice-Chairperson)  
Ms CHENG Woon-kai  
Mrs FUNG Sin Lai-wan  
Mrs Christina LEE  
Professor William LITTLEWOOD  
Mrs LIU LU Lee-Ching  
Mr Lindsay MILLER  
Mr Simon THAM  
Mr Derek Rodney TOO  
Ms WAN Koon-Har  
Mr Raymond NG (Secretary)
- Apologies: Mr CHEUNG Man-biu  
Mrs Shirley DUTHIE  
Mr KUAN Yuk-kin  
Dr Angela MOK  
Ms MOK Fung-ye, Emily  
Mrs Catherine LI  
Ms Truely SIU  
Dr Gordon SLETHAUG
- In attendance: Mr Kevin CHAN  
Ms Hazel CHIU  
Ms Eunice CHENG  
Ms Amy SHU

**Documents tabled:**

- (1) Handouts for Seminar on Secondary English Curriculum Development and Leadership (for principals)
- (2) "Building on Strengths"
- (3) Feedback on draft Curriculum Guide from Mrs Catherine Li
- (4) CDC Learning to Learn: English Language Education Consultation Document 2000
- (5) Curriculum Development Council Handbook
- (6) The Learning and Teaching of Poetry (Secondary 1-3): A Resource Package

## 1. Welcome to New Member

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Liu Lu Lee-ching, head of SKH Lee Shiu Keung Primary School (PM), who replaces Mr Chan Sai Ho. The Chairman also expressed his thanks for the contributions of Mr Chan as member of the committee over the past years.

## 2. Confirmation of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2002 were confirmed.

## 3. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

3.1 The Secretary drew members' attention to paragraph 2.1 of the minutes. He reported that a circular memorandum was issued to schools on 7 February 2002 to inform them of the change of the subject name from "English Literature" to "Literature in English".

3.2 The Secretary referred to paragraph 2.2 of the minutes, informing members that the tabled document regarding the Seminars on Secondary English Curriculum Development and Leadership (for principals) had already been forwarded by post to members together with the minutes of the previous meeting.

## 4. First Draft of CDC English Language Education KLA Curriculum Guide on Basic Education 2002

Members discussed the draft and made the following comments/suggested changes:

Page	Section	Comments/Suggested Amendments
1	Introduction/ Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Given that teachers are the main target reader, and in particular, to help new practising teachers use the Guide, it is necessary to provide an introduction that <u>clearly</u> shows how the Guide and the various other CDC English Language and EC documents inter-relate, and how it is to be used in conjunction with them.</li></ul>
2	Position of KLA in the School Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The "Position" section on p.2, the "Aims" and "Learning Targets and Objectives" on p.7, and the first box in the English Language Education framework diagram on p.9, all seem to express the aim(s) of the curriculum. However, each of them emphasizes slightly different things. In particular, the "Aims" on p.7 refer to the socio-economic demands in relation to language learning, which is not included in the other parts.</li></ul>
7	Aims, Learning Targets and Objectives	
9	Diagrammatic Representation of the English Language Education KLA Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It was agreed that the points presented on these pages be re-examined, and wherever possible, be made more consistent.</li></ul>
2	Rationale for/ Direction for Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Most members felt that the sentence, "...mechanical drilling of these elements in isolated contexts is unmotivating and can hardly bring about effective language learning", needed revising, as teachers might</li></ul>

		<p>take it as a criticism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One member, however, observed that the Guide should make clear that mechanical drilling of learning elements in isolated context should not be encouraged.</li> <li>• Some members questioned the validity of the point regarding Hong Kong lacking a language-rich environment (i.e. the second last sentence in the second paragraph).</li> <li>• It was agreed that the entire second paragraph be reviewed and revised.</li> </ul>
To be put on p.6 before “Major Challenges”	Building on Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the sake of clarity, members suggested adding the phrase “at primary level” to the first bullet point under “Existing Strengths”, and underlining the word “both” in the first bullet point under “New Emphases”.</li> <li>• The terms, “curriculum developer” and “curriculum leader” might appear daunting, particularly to novice teachers, and should therefore be glossed.</li> <li>• Though the two lists in “Building on Strengths” are not meant for comparison and contrast, it was suggested that they be put side by side to see whether this arrangement facilitated easier reading.</li> </ul>
6	Major Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members thought that the first bullet was a broad general comment whereas the second one was too specific. It was agreed that the second bullet be improved by saying “Helping teachers to implement the English Language Education curriculum by enhancing various aspects of learning/teaching, notably phonics, grammar and task-based language learning....”</li> <li>• Most members felt that italicizing the second bullet was unnecessary.</li> </ul>
7-11	Curriculum Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was agreed that the inclusion of modules, units and tasks as components of the English Language Education framework would help teachers effectively use the KLA Guide to develop suitable learning materials and activities.</li> </ul>
12-17	Learning and Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The connection between the five essential learning experiences presented under “Guiding Principles” on p.12 and “Four Key Tasks” (pp.12-13) is not too clear. Revision for better coherence is necessary.</li> <li>• The four key tasks should also be incorporated into the “New Emphases” list in the section, “Building on Strengths”.</li> <li>• Reference to the exemplar showing how teachers can</li> </ul>

		<p>promote critical thinking and creativity through language arts at secondary level should be made under “Integrative and Creative Language Use” (pp.15-16).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Catering for Learner Diversities” is to be expanded, incorporating the sub-headings “Curriculum Planning”, “Teaching and Learning” and “Assessment”.</li> </ul>
18-26	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The entire section needs to be edited down, with the guidelines for carrying out various forms of formative assessment relegated to the appendices.</li> </ul>
27-33	Considerations for Curriculum Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The underlined word in the heading on p.30, “<u>Suggestion</u> Lesson Time Allocation for Different Stages of Schooling” should be “Suggested”.</li> <li>• Notes or footnotes should be provided to explain the superscripts for the suggested percentage of lesson allocation for Science Education, Technology Education and Personal, Social and Humanities Education (pp.30-31).</li> <li>• The tone of the guidelines under “Smooth Transition between Kindergarten and Primary School, Primary School and Secondary school” needs improving.</li> </ul>
34-38	Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details regarding the three English Language Education “Seed” projects should be included in “Research &amp; Development (“Seed”) Projects” (pp.37-38).</li> <li>• The content of “Community Resources” (p.38) is to be strengthened.</li> </ul>
General Comments:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A paragraph explaining the interface between the 9-year Basic Education and the senior secondary curriculum should be provided.</li> <li>• The entire draft needs trimming, and the repetitive parts should be removed.</li> </ul>

## 5 Any Other Business

5.1 Ms Hazel Chiu reported that the Hong Kong Institute of Education had been commissioned to run an “In-service Teacher Development Course on Task-based Language Learning, Teaching and Assessment for Secondary School Teachers”. The course consists of 8 identical 15-hour events, and will be launched between May and July 2002.

5.2 Mr Kevin Chan noted that two identical half-day “Workshops on Using the Resource Package on the Learning and Teaching of Poetry (Secondary 1-3) in the English Language Classroom” would be organized in June to encourage teachers’ use of language arts and their use of the recently disseminated poetry package to promote language learning.

5.3 Ms Amy Shu reported that the Part 2, round 2 of the “Workshops on Task-based

Language Teaching, Learning and Assessment” came to an end on 25 February 2002. The workshops had been very well-received.

5.4 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5.00pm.

Confirmed on: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr Stephen CHAN  
(Chairperson)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr Raymond NG  
(Secretary)