

Industrial Technology

Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package

Consultation Report

1. Background

The preparation of the **Industrial Technology** Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package took into account the instructions described in the writing brief approved by the Board in **December 1998**.

The **Industrial Technology** Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package has been distributed widely for comment over the period **8th February 1999 – 5th March 1999**. Additionally, consultations on the **Industrial Technology** Stage 6 Draft Syllabus Package have involved meetings with the following:

- ⇒ school sector representatives
 - Department of Education and Training
 - Catholic Education Commission
 - Association of Independent Schools

- ⇒ tertiary representatives
 - Gordon McLean – TAFE Manufacturing & Engineering Educational Services
 - Alan Jeary - University of Western Sydney Hawkesbury
 - Marianne Bowman – University of Sydney

- ⇒ **Professional associations**
 - Institute of Technology Education
 - Technology Educators Association

- ⇒ the Board Curriculum Committee for **Manufacturing**.

Modifications to this draft, following widespread consultations, will enable the syllabus package to be finalised for submission to the Board Curriculum Committee, and the Board.

50 written responses to the consultation progress report in **Industrial Technology** were received. The sample profile is as follows:

45 Individual responses

Teachers	<input type="text" value="44"/>			
Rural	<input type="text" value="10"/>			
Government	<input type="text" value="6"/>	Catholic	<input type="text" value="2"/>	Independent <input type="text" value="2"/>
Metropolitan	<input type="text" value="33"/>			
Government	<input type="text" value="23"/>	Catholic	<input type="text" value="8"/>	Independent <input type="text" value="2"/>
Academics	<input type="text" value="1"/>			
Others	<input type="text"/>			

4 Institution/group responses

Organisation details:

Schools:

Moderate (<500)	<input type="text"/>	Medium (500 – 800)	<input type="text"/>	Large (>800)	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Government	<input type="text"/>	Catholic	<input type="text" value="1"/>	Independent	<input type="text"/>

Tertiary/post-school:

Universities	<input type="text"/>	TAFE	<input type="text"/>	Industry/training	<input type="text"/>
--------------	----------------------	------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------

Special Interest:

Parent Groups	<input type="text"/>	School Sectors	<input type="text" value="2"/>	Other (BCC)	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Teacher/professional associations			<input type="text"/>		

Key Issues

<p align="center">Summary of Key Issues for Stage 6 Industrial Technology arising from the consultation process:</p>	<p align="center">Summary of action taken as a result of these Key Issues:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient differentiation of outcomes between the Preliminary and HSC courses • Insufficient detail of depth of study in the content. • The formatting of the document is repetitive with the “core” being repeated 16 times (for the preliminary and HSC courses in each focus area). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives, outcomes and content have been reviewed by a reference group of school sector representatives. • Additional column “Students will learn to:” will outline depth of study. • The document has been restructured with the core and its content placed at the front. The content for each focus area then follows.

3. Analysis

3.1 Quantitative Analysis

3.1.1 Industrial Technology in the Stage 6 Curriculum

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	13	27	1	0	0
13.0%	28.3%	58.7%	2.2%	0	0

3.1.2 Pathways for Industrial Technology Stage 6 Students

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4	17	22	3	1	0
8.7%	37.0%	2.2%	6.5%	2.2%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who commented that the diagram on page 11 of the draft syllabus should also show the Vocational education and Training courses that are available within schools and which relate to Industrial Technology focus areas. The diagram has been adjusted and appears on page 8 of the final syllabus.

3.1.3 Aim

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	19	20	2	1	0
10.9%	41.3%	43.5%	4.3%	2.2%	0

3.1.4 Objectives

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	17	23	0	2	0
10.9%	37.0%	50.0%	0	4.3%	0

3.1.5 Course Structure

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4	16	21	6	0	0
8.7%	34.8%	45.7%	13.0%	0	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” category can be attributed to respondents who indicated that there was insufficient differentiation between the Preliminary and HSC outcomes and in the depth of study specified for the content for each course. Some respondents also suggested that the emphasis on production be increased throughout the courses. These issues have been addressed throughout the syllabus as indicated in this analysis report.

3.1.6 Outcomes

3.1.6a Preliminary course outcomes

Nil	Strongly	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly
-----	----------	-------	--------	----------	----------

Response	Agree				Disagree
3	12	24	3	5	0
6.5%	26.1%	52.2%	6.5%	10.9%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who indicated that there was insufficient differentiation between the Preliminary and HSC outcomes. This has been addressed throughout the syllabus as indicated in this analysis report.

3.1.6b HSC course outcomes

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	14	23	3	2	0
10.9%	30.4%	50.0%	6.5%	4.3%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who indicated that there was insufficient differentiation between the Preliminary and HSC outcomes. This has been addressed throughout the syllabus as indicated in this analysis report.

3.1.7 Content

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	9	21	2	10	0
10.9%	19.6%	45.7%	4.3%	21.7%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who indicated that there was insufficient specification of the depth of study in the content section. This has been addressed throughout the syllabus as indicated in this analysis report.

3.1.8 Assessment Components, Weightings and Tasks

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4	10	24	5	4	0
8.7%	21.7%	52.2%	10.9%	8.7%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and the “disagree” categories can be attributed to an error in the table which summarises internal and external assessment weightings on page 72 of the draft syllabus. This has been rectified and the correct table now appears on page 56 of the syllabus.

3.1.9 Industrial Technology Stage 6 HSC Examination Specifications

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	15	17	1	7	1
13.0%	32.6%	37.0%	2.2%	15.2%	2.2%

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and the “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who suggested that there

should be an increase in the emphasis on the “production” component of the examination criteria. This has been addressed and the weighting increased from 35% to 40% of the major Project marking criteria.

3.1.10 Post-School Opportunities

3.1.10a Links between courses and training packages

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	11	17	10	4	0
10.9%	24%	37.0%	21.7%	8.7%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and the “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who commented on the need for greater accreditation into TAFE and the need for recognition into the appropriate training packages. Some respondents also commented on the confusing nature of this section of the document.

Meetings with TAFE representatives have indicated that credit transfer and achieving competencies in the AQF will be difficult due to the 7 optional focus areas. Also within a single industry focus area, students can undertake a range of projects which can relate to very different TAFE modules and industries. As now, TAFE credit transfer will be communicated in a separate document, not in the syllabus.

3.1.10b Links between courses and VET opportunities

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	9	19	10	3	0
10.9%	19.6%	41.3%	21.7%	6.5%	0

Comment as above for 3.1.10a

3.1.11 Industrial Technology Stage 6 Sample HSC Assessment Items

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4	7	29	5	1	1
8.7%	15.2%	63.0%	10.9%	2.2%	2.2%

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and “disagree” categories can be attributed to the limited number of sample questions provided for each of the focus areas. This has been addressed in the development of the complete specimen examination paper.

3.1.12 Industrial Technology Stage 6 Draft Performance Bands

Nil Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	7	28	5	2	0
10.9%	15.2%	60.9%	10.9%	4.3%	0

The relatively high response rate in the “unsure” and “disagree” categories can be attributed to respondents who suggested that the performance bands need to be modified in line with any changes occurring during consultation and to better reflect the objectives and outcomes in the draft. The objectives, outcome and content have been revised as a result of a reference group workshop proposed by the BCC. The performance bands have been checked by the writing team against these.

3.1.13 Overall Evaluation

Nil Response	Excellent as is	Good, with fine-tuning	Acceptable with re-working	Unsure	Unsatisfactory in issues treatment
4	4	27	10	1	1
8.7%	8.7%	58.7%	21.7%	2.2%	2.2%

3.2 Issues Raised and Writing Team Action

Syllabus Item	Issues	Source/s	Action
<p>Industrial Technology in the Stage 6 Curriculum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mention should be made of the choices of the “Industrial Technologies” (ie the focus areas) and why they are important. • This section should state that the syllabus has been designed to be inclusive of the needs, interests and aspirations of boys and girls and it provides opportunities for students to learn explicitly about gender issues relating to manufacturing. • should also refer to environmental sustainability • page 10 indicates that the only pathways from Industrial Technology are to Uni or TAFE. What about those to the world of work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher • DET • DET • DET • Teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. This has been addressed in the syllabus (page 7) • Agreed. This will be included in the syllabus (page 7) • Agreed. Environment has been specifically mentioned (page 7) • Agreed. The diagram has been adjusted. (page 8)

<p>Pathways for Industrial Technology Stage 6 Students</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flow from Stage 6 to the VET block seems to indicate another layer of training outside of Industry TAFE and Tertiary. • Page 11 diagram needs the specific mention of Universities under “other pathways”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catholic Schools Office • Teacher - • Catholic Schools Office – Diocese of Broken Bay • Academic – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. The diagram has been adjusted. (page 8) • Agreed. The statement will be changed to include mention of Universities in “other pathways” (page 8).
<p>Aim</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should say “knowledge and understanding of the selected industry” not “the structure of industry”. Structure is a subset of the overall industry. • Should imply a greater emphasis on planning and construction with a less emphasis on design and communication. • Should mention “skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Teachers • Teacher • Teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed the implication is for study of all industry. The aim has been adjusted. (page 9) • The aim has been reviewed by a reference group meeting and the writers. The aim mentions management and production. Changes throughout the syllabus reflect a greater emphasis on planning and construction. • This is implicit in the succinct

	appropriate to the selected industry”.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school 	aim statement. No change.
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should include specific reference to Information Technology/Computer Based Technologies • There are weaknesses in the objectives and outcomes. The workshop to review these which was suggested by the BCC is strongly supported. The objectives need to include a clear statement about the role of technologies in the specific industry and the use of related technologies by students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Teachers • DET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is implicit in objective 5, and rather than addressing the issue via a specific objective statement, it has been integrated with outcomes and content sections relating to Design and Management, and Workplace Communication. • Agreed. These have been strengthened in line with suggestions from the workshop. (page 12-13)
Course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The differences between the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. A reference group

<p>Structure</p>	<p>outcomes of Preliminary/HSC are not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do students focus on the same focus area for Preliminary and HSC courses. This is not clear. • What exactly is involved in “C – Workplace Communication”? There seems to be a large overlap with “B – Design, Planning Management”. • Graphics and Multimedia – concerned about the combining of these as they are two very different areas. Two separate focus areas need to be established. • The focus areas should be listed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference group • BCC for Manufacturing • Teacher • Teacher • Catholic Schools Office – Diocese of Broken Bay. • DET 	<p>meeting suggested alterations which have been included. (page 12-13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes students focus on the same area for both courses. This has been clarified. • Agreed. Workplace Communication has been removed from the design, Planning Management section and thus reduced the perception of overlap. (pages 16, 17 and 19, 20). • The focus areas have been separated and content clarified • Agreed. The focus areas have
------------------	---	---	---

	<p>in alphabetical order and not by order of popularity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that “Other and emerging technologies” be deleted from the course structure as a focus area. No content has been included for this focus area. • The information on page 14 is additional information about the course structure. It should be integrated with the information on page 13. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DET • DET 	<p>been re arranged into alphabetical order. (page 10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. This has been deleted. (page 10). • The BCC for Manufacturing identified the table, now on page 11, as a valuable summary. It has been edited and maintained.
<p>Outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes clear, descriptive, and well written • 90% of the outcomes in the HSC course relate to, and mention specifically, the Major Project. Surely some of these outcomes are observable through the written component of the HSC as well! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 Schools • Teacher • DET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Agreed. This has been addressed in revised outcomes statements which were developed with the assistance of an objectives/outcome workshop. • Agreed. This has been

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are weaknesses in the objectives and outcomes. The workshop to review these which was suggested by the BCC is strongly supported. • Clearer definition of the outcomes in the Preliminary and the HSC courses is needed. As stated they present the view that the HSC course involves doing “just a bit more” than the Preliminary course. • Insufficient outcomes for objective 4 which lies at the core of this syllabus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DET • Teacher 	<p>addressed in revised outcomes statements. (pages 12, 13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. This has been addressed in revised outcomes statements. (pages 12, 13) • Agreed. This has been addressed in revised outcomes statements. (pages 12, 13)
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content does not sufficiently specify the depth of study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most respondents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. This has been addressed in revised content

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to plastics there needs to be content relating to “dry” plastics as well • In relation to the Graphics focus area students should study all of the options (and not have a choice) • In relation to graphics, 1st angle projection is no longer studied as a standard. Only 3rd angle projection in orthogonal is part of AS1100. • More details needed in relation to what is expected in the Industry Study in each course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Teachers • A school • Teacher • 3 schools 	<p>with a change in format to a “students learn about:” and “students learn to:” format.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been addressed in an introductory way only. Whilst dry plastics forming is a significant section of the industry, students cannot access the large, specialised industrial equipment to develop project work. (pages 36, 37) • Agreed. The syllabus has been adjusted so that all students who do this focus area gain a broader understanding of the graphics industry. (page 30) • Students are required to have an introductory understanding of 1st angle projection which is an out of date but common practice in some industries and some countries (eg the USA)
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the Furniture and Timber Products focus area I question the name. What if a student wants to do furniture other than timber furniture – all the content is aligned with wood rather than furniture in general. • The options available in Automotive, Graphics and Multi media should be removed. The approach to content should be holistic as in other focus areas. • Consideration of a major layout change to reduce duplication. It would be clearer to state that sections A, B, C are core for each focus area and D, the Industry Specific section for each focus area could follow. • In section A, Industry Study students should learn to: Identify and evaluate career 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher • Academic • DET • DET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. This has been addressed in the syllabus through the addition of a “Students will learn to:” column. • The focus area relates to timber furniture and timber products. This has been clarified in the content. In any focus area students can use a range of appropriate allied materials. (Identified as “Allied materials” pages 38, 39) • Agreed. This has been addressed in the syllabus. (pages 21, 22 and 30, 31) • Agreed. This has been addressed in the syllabus.(Throughout the document)
--	--	---	---

	<p>opportunities and working conditions within the focus industry; and Compare and contrast the involvement of men and women in different aspects of that industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the electronics focus area a better statement re safety of projects might be: “any project using or developing voltages in excess of 32v should be inspected and accredited as safe by a suitably accredited person in line with appropriate Australian Standards”. These types of statements may also be necessary in other focus areas such as Automotive with cars, and Metals and Engineering with welding of structural components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. This has been added to the content in the “Personnel Issues “ topic area (roles of industry personnel and equity/EEO). (page 16). Agreed. Appropriate safety statements have been incorporated as an introductory note to the Industry Specific Content for the relevant focus areas. (pages 21, 22, 26, 28, 32, 33)
<p>Assessment components,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The table on page 72 is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many individual respondents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. The table has been clarified. (page 51)

<p>weightings and tasks</p>	<p>confusing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest increase in weighting for the Industry Specific Content • The Major Project criteria has a separate weighting of 5% for evaluation. This in fact should be part of the “on going” evaluation component. Alter the Production weighting from 35% to 40%. • Computer software – this is a confusing statement • External assessment of 60/40 compared with 80/20 of internal assessment is of concern due to parity of performance indicators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school • Teacher • Teacher • Teacher • Catholic Schools Office – Diocese of Broken Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The weighting of the Production section of the Major Project has been increased from 35% to 40%. (pages 50, 51)) • Agreed. The intention that the evaluation is ongoing has been reinforced. • Agreed. This has been addressed in the section on Design, Planning and Management (page 17) • Agreed. This has been adjusted so that both courses reflect the same weighting. (page 51)
<p>Industrial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Major Project criteria on page 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change. Disagree. The

<p>Technology Stage 6 HSC Examination Specifications</p>	<p>77 has retained significant similarity to Design & Technology. It is important that there is clear differentiation</p>		<p>criteria are different in emphasis and weighting. The Industrial Technology project criteria reflects the course outcomes and places emphasis on the use of a range of industrial processes and materials from the specific industry. The project emphasises the production and quality of the actual product, safe work practices and OH&S.</p> <p>Design and Technology places emphasis on the application of the design process to solving an identified problem. The “product, system or environment” could be a proposal, a simple model, or a fully developed product. Creativity, evaluation and ideas generation are emphasised in the project criteria. Students need not undertake in depth study in relation to a specific industry, its materials, technologies or processes.</p>
<p>Post-School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is confusing. Too 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. This has been

<p>Opportunities</p>	<p>many words. Use of acronyms is a problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you detail credit transfer for TAFE modules in this document? • Helpful, but can't we map outcomes to NTF/ARF/AQF so teachers know? (and similar responses) 	<p>respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 schools • 3 Individual Teachers • DET • Academic, University of Sydney 	<p>addressed in the syllabus. (pages 41, 42, 43)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with TAFE representatives have indicated that credit transfer and achieving competencies in the AQF will be difficult due to the 7 optional focus areas. Also within a single industry focus area, students can undertake a range of projects which can relate to very different TAFE modules and industries. As now, TAFE credit transfer will be communicated in a separate document, not in the syllabus.
<p>Industrial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good but need more examples in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final syllabus package will

<p>Technology Stage 6 Sample HSC Assessment Items</p>	<p>the on-going development (and similar comments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes should be actually listed (Not by number only) for easy mapping and checking of questions • Some better questions would better reflect the rigour required 	<p>respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher • Teacher 	<p>incorporate a complete specimen examination paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not practical on the exam paper. Each year the exam paper becomes the specimen paper for the following year. Exam committees undertake the mapping process. • This has been addressed and will be reflected in the specimen examination paper.
<p>Industrial Technology Stage 6 Draft Performance Bands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive comments such as “applies well to all candidates” • Need to be modified in line with any changes to the draft syllabus. • The performance descriptor bands do not reflect the course objectives, content and outcome in an accurate or balanced way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many respondents • DET • Teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Agreed. This has been addressed in the syllabus. • The objectives, outcome and content have been revised as a result of a reference group workshop proposed by the BCC. The performance bands have been checked by the writing team against these.

<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very comprehensive document and a demanding subject in terms of wide coverage of industry. I would like to see the following topics added to each of the seven focus areas: Alternative energy sources (solar, wind, geothermal); Industrial waste management; Standards and measurement. • In general terms the draft syllabus is a useful document which outlines an important and valued Stage 6 subject. I congratulate the Board of Studies officers and the writing team. 	<p>2 Academics Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The industry study is already heavily weighted. These additional suggestions are commendable but the courses are already demanding as indicated by the respondent. Inclusion of these areas is not recommended. • Noted
---------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

4. Responses

Written responses were received from the following individuals and groups:

Individuals

Name	School/Group
John Rochford	Corpus Christi College
J C Wills	Kinross Wolaroi School
Rolf Ballin	Blacktown Boys High School
Raj Gopal	Blacktown Boys High School
Jim Newton	St. Paul's College
K. Liddelt	Francis Greenaway High School
Jim Snow	James Busby High School
Greg Glanville	Forster High School
Michael Beaton	De La Salle College
Peter Gallagher	Catholic Schools Office
Jim Wilkinson	Lismore High School
B. Santarelli	Warners Bay High School
Darrel McGovern	Belmont Languages High School
Phillip Martin	Belmont High School
Greg Pullinger	Greystanes High School
Martyn Harris	Northern Beaches Christian School
Trevor McAllister	St. Ives High School
Grant Dooner	St. Mary's Cathedral College
Robert Curtis	SCEGGS Darlinghurst
	Narwee High School
Bob Foster	Matraville High School
Stuart Pearsall	Narandera High School
	St. Mary's Cathedral College
Martin Riley	Sydney Technical High School
Stephen Reynolds	St. Phillips Christian College
Tim Sutherland	Shore
M Dabbs	Parramatta High School
Peter Orsi	De La Salle College, Caringbah

Robert Kirk	Cabramatta High School
Peter Thompson	Bossley Park High School
Lee MacMaster	Trinity Catholic College
Peter Low	Kelso High School
	Sydney Technical High School
Warren Monaghan	All Saints Senior Catholic College
Stuart Moses	Menai High School
	Wyong High School
Peter Pinazza	Edmund Rice College
John Gibson	University of Sydney
Neil Brown	St. Edward's College
	Balranald Central
	Liverpool Girls High School
Peter Freeland	Evans High School
Greg Young	Campbelltown Performing Arts High School
Geoff Hogan	Macquarie Boys Technology High School

Groups

Group
Department of Education and Training
CSO Diocese of Broken Bay
St. Francis Xavier College
Manufacturing Technologies BCC
Catholic Education Commission