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Utah and the majority of states have adopted mandatory standards for visual arts, yet no accountability measures have been established. Consequently, it is impossible to determine if standards are being addressed in the art classroom and aggregate grades are subjective. Queensland, Australia instituted a system of moderated school-based assessment ( moderation) in 1971, whereby assessment is accomplished locally, then verified by peer experts. Queensland ensures that standards are addressed in curricula and assessment and that exit grades are reliable and comparable. Research has shown that Utah and Queensland share comparable visual arts standards and similar demographics. Queensland moderation has been extensively studied for solutions to Utah and U.S. accountability problems.

Queensland teachers submit curricula, assessment tasks, and assessed student work to the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA), which is responsible for moderation.
QSA suggests modifications where appropriate, thus ensuring accuracy. Schools are then compared according to group performance on a standardized core skills test and aggregate grades are scaled, resulting in student rankings.

Research has revealed that Queensland visual arts teachers widely approve of moderation. Accountability validates good teaching and promotes diligence. Teachers also appreciate QSA curriculum and assessment guidelines. Because these are regulated, QSA has been able to promote progressive directives effectively, including integrated authentic assessment and student-directed conceptual approaches to art. Queensland has constantly striven for improvement through research and teacher feedback. Consequently, Queensland is considered a global leader in school-based assessment.

Art education literature implies that accountability for visual arts education is inevitable. Arts educators strongly oppose traditional external testing. Moderation is the proven alternative to traditional testing. While other models of moderation exist, the QSA model is similar in theory to the predominant Utah and U.S. philosophy of standards-based assessment. At the same time, the QSA model offers flexible options that allow emerging theories to be embraced.

The research, then, suggests that Utah and other states should consider implementing versions of moderated school-based assessment based on the success of QSA. The thesis concludes with recommendations for the U.S., and a practical curriculum guide that embraces curriculum and assessment merits of Queensland visual arts education.
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Utah has recently embarked upon a campaign to improve fine arts education. Introduced in 2001, the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum (Utah Core) marks a concerted effort to define state standards that are aligned with national standards, easy to understand, and measurable. The effectiveness of the Utah Core, however, must be brought into question: Do school curricula and student performance reflect the identified standards? Presently, the Utah does not have accountability measures in place for district or individual school programs, which would ensure statewide consistency in addressing state standards. According to Carol Goodson of the Utah State Office of Education (USOE), this problem has been acknowledged at the state level, but the USOE has decided against imposing accountability measures in the foreseeable future (personal communication, December 4, 2003). Because schools are not held accountable for the implementation of standards in visual arts, uncertainty exists with respect to standards in terms of curriculum, assessment, and learning outcomes.

Additionally, the United States Department of Education (USDE) has instated the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which demands attention and accountability to standards in core content areas. Fine arts, including visual arts, has been identified as a core subject area, and is, therefore, subject to the stipulations of NCLB. The USDE (2004) states,

> All states must implement statewide accountability systems. These systems will: [sic] set academic standards in each content area for what students should know and be able to do; gather specific, objective data through tests aligned with those
standards; use test data to identify strengths and weaknesses in the system; …and direct changes in schools that need help.

If standards are to be effective, it is imperative that visual arts educators in the United States seek solutions as to how they might be improved, implemented, and assessed.

Queensland, Australia addressed a similar crisis with its general education system in the early 1970s. The Queensland Studies Authority (QSA) developed, over time, a cooperative system in which grades eleven and twelve curricula, called work programs, are assessed by groups of peer experts, called review panels. Thirteen district review panels evaluate the effectiveness of local work programs and intervene whenever a work program is considered incomplete in addressing standards with reliability and consistency. Through moderation, district review panels support teachers “by providing feedback on how they might improve their curriculum design, assessment and application of standards to student work” (B. Lea, personal communication, April 21, 2004).

Additionally, a state review panel (in each discipline) oversees the thirteen district panels, and analyzes samples of student work and work programs to ensure educational consistency throughout Queensland. State panels also work with teachers who are unable to appease district panels, although this is rarely necessary. The result is exceptional quality and consistency of curricula and assessment, with respect to state standards. Through experimentation and diligence, Queensland has emerged as a global leader in school-based assessment, which has implications for visual arts assessment in Utah and many other states.

This thesis compares Utah and Queensland policies on secondary visual arts education, with respect to state standards, curriculum and assessment guidelines, and
reporting procedures. Research has been conducted in order to discern the merits and implications of Queensland’s system of art education, as compared to Utah art education. The research goal of this thesis has included three sequential components: (1) to establish credible grounds for comparing Utah and Queensland based on similarity of demographics and art education goals, (2) to evaluate and compare the contents and quality of visual arts programs in Utah and Queensland, and (3) to construct recommendations for Utah and other states on how to increase quality and consistency of visual arts education by revising state education policies on accountability measures.

Indeed, research has yielded positive conclusions. First, preliminary research has provided evidence that Utah and Queensland are similar in terms of demographic makeup and in terms of secondary visual arts education goals and standards. These results are detailed in chapter 2. Second, research has been conducted at both sites to determine the quality and consistency of art education. The most compelling conclusion pertains to consistency: USOE does not hold schools accountable to its mandated standards, whereas QSA does measure students’ and schools’ application and achievement of standards. Queensland is able to quantify its success in meeting standards, whereas Utah cannot. Analysis of the two states’ primary visual arts education documents—the Utah Core, and Queensland’s Visual Art Senior Syllabus (Senior Syllabus)—reveals this fact; the results of this comparison follow the demographic research section in chapter 2. Finally, chapter 3 discusses the intricacies of Queensland secondary visual arts education, the result of methodological research in Queensland. The results of this research are listed in chapter 4. From this, the thesis concludes in chapter 5 with three sets of recommendations: (a) an
ideal plan for Utah, (b) suggestions for other states, and (c) a practical curriculum guide for use in the United States.

Introduction

The potential problem in education that any state of significant magnitude and diversity faces is inconsistency. Examination of visual arts education practices in Utah reveals that assessment and curriculum are in fact inconsistent. Utah schools are required by the USOE only to allow specific Utah Core courses for fine arts graduation credit. These courses, in theory, should be alike in terms of curriculum and assessment, in that they must utilize the standards outlined in the Utah Core. While academics disagree on the merit of standards and educational uniformity, they are mandated by most states, including Utah. The contents of nominally identical courses, however, vary tremendously across Utah because of (a) differences in district policies and directives set by school boards and administration, (b) varying knowledge and motives of empowered teachers, and (c) inequalities in school resources. These dynamics vary among schools in any diverse state and Utah is no exception. Without any formal regulation, consistency of curricula and assessment is highly unlikely and cannot be guaranteed.

Utah schools do not, in fact, offer state-wide consistency among like-named Utah Core course offerings. Schools are locally governed by elected district school boards, comprised mostly of community members. Thus, the educational philosophies and goals of district school boards reflect local values, which can differ drastically. Since school boards make decisions according to these ideals, such as hiring administrators to realize their agendas and allocating financial support to particular programs and educational initiatives, they ultimately influence what is taught in classrooms, and how. School
boards in Utah must operate within the parameters established by the state, but when districts deviate from USOE directives, USOE is reluctant to impose sanctions unless the matter is deemed very serious.

One example of this dilemma is that some schools brand non-approved courses with Utah Core course names, in order to offer them as graduation credit. According to state officials, who do not wish to go on record, this has been a known problem for some time and continues to persist. USOE usually encouraged these schools to comply, but little can be done to force regulation. Some schools are allegedly culpable because they critically lack resources, whereas others purportedly violate state code through intentional deceit. This familiar breach of law devalues the integrity of Utah education.

Less pronounced infractions of USOE directives may go unnoticed or be ignored. Specifically, some schools offer courses that superficially qualify as Utah Core courses; within those courses, however, teachers do not teach or assess according to Utah Core standards. This is a problem that seems to be widespread, partly because the Utah Core is not used by some schools and some cases because teachers do not want to use the Utah Core. Park City School District (PCSD) faced this problem and had to resolve the issue internally. A particular art teacher was required to document teaching and submit examples of student artwork and assessment to district administrators and the district recorded conduct and assessment outcomes. Eventually, the teacher voluntarily resigned. Since there is no official documentation or reporting of curriculum or assessment, it took PCSD several years to initiate action because of logistical issues and legal concerns.

These examples illustrate the spectrum of problems that can result when states do not scrutinize district practices to insure compatibility with its laws. On one hand, it is
easy for districts to offer divergent curriculum and to retain accreditation falsely, because they are not held accountable. On the other hand, when districts that want to comply with state guidelines identify problems, the ambiguity and lack of support at the state level can translate to legal chaos, making resolution difficult. Ideally, states should demand and enforce consistency among districts, with respect to the laws and standards they establish.

Economy also affects educational practices within school districts. Financial resources are not comparable among schools in Utah, because a significant portion of school revenue is generated through local taxes, specifically property tax. Unequal funding among districts affects salary scales, professional development, and program spending. Ultimately, school boards and administrators determine how funds are allocated, but the amount of money a district has to work with cannot be dismissed as irrelevant.

Inadequate funding can be a deterrent to well-trained, well-intentioned prospective teachers. Candidates in all educational disciplines frequently overlook rural positions due to salary and lifestyle issues. Schools may be forced to hire teachers whose qualifications do not acutely meet program demands and weak curriculum could result. For instance, it would be inappropriate to hire someone with no computer training to teach commercial art, but a poor district may feel pressured to do such a thing. NCLB attempts to solve this issue, demanding that only highly qualified teachers be allowed to teach in public schools. The criteria used to determine highly qualified status (i.e., fine arts certification), however, is general, not precise. NCLB would not prevent the above scenario from occurring and states are not legally bound to federal directives.
If a district cannot or will not fund professional development, then art teachers may not keep up with current trends in art and art education. Some teachers may not take it upon themselves to remain current and others may be ignorant of how to remain current. When the USOE unveiled its new Fine Arts Core [including the Utah Core] at the Fall Arts Networking Conference in 2001, PCSD funded conference costs, substitute teacher costs, and transportation costs, enabling every Park City visual arts teacher to learn about and receive a copy of the new Utah Core. Unfortunately, very few Utah art teachers attended this event, possibly because in some cases funding was unavailable. The result was that some teachers may not have known about the Utah Core or its importance. This problem is perpetuated by the fact that USOE does not take measure to find out if schools use the Utah Core, and that the Utah Core is not actively promoted to individual teachers or schools. Instead, the USOE has made the Utah Core accessible via the Internet exclusively, which fails to help teachers who are currently unaware of the Core’s existence or availability.

Low program funding also influences curricular decisions. Economically-challenged schools may lack the financial means to keep art departments equipped with current technology and perishable art supplies. Such schools often modify curricula and consideration of Utah Core standards may be overlooked. Compensating for poor resources is no easy task. The Utah Core does not address or acknowledge this issue.

The problem of resources extends beyond its explicit relation to economy. Size is another diversifying demographic characteristic that propagates inconsistency among schools. Larger districts are generally able to offer broader course selections than smaller schools, partially because of funding, and partially because of quantitative differences in
faculty and student enrollment. Large and small schools are also managed in different ways—larger districts employ a greater number of specific administrators, whereas smaller districts are typically directed by fewer, more general administrators. A few large districts in Utah employ arts coordinators, because such a position is logistically necessary. The largest Utah school districts serve over 75,000 students, while the smallest districts have less than 500 students. Obviously, program discrepancies result from this fluctuation. In chapter 2, specific data are presented to support these claims.

The potential exists for smaller schools to follow narrow agendas defined by small administrative staffs, who may have few constituents to answer to or whose agendas may be condoned by the communities that they serve. On the other hand, accountability measures in large districts might be relatively superficial because administrators oversee many teachers. In such cases, teachers may be able to implement discreet curricula that deviate from state standards.

Thus, it would be credulous to assume that the many unique combinations of community agendas, administration assignments, and teacher knowledge and motives would render comparable curricula, particularly when no broad system of accountability exists. The Utah Core is vague, in terms of defining curricular objectives, and some teachers are even unaware of the Utah Core. School districts have diverse needs, environments, resources, and agendas. Curricula are not reported to or evaluated by USOE. Because of these factors, it would be a daunting task for USOE to prove that any school is in violation of its directives.

Assessment also presents unique problems. Utah does not evaluate its schools to ensure accuracy or consistency of assessment. Neither does USOE produce assessments
or assessment guidelines for art teachers, with one exception: the Utah Core contains portfolio assessment tools, named Student Achievement Portfolios (USOE, 2001). These assessment tools are designed to be used in numerically assessing Utah Core objectives according to level of achievement, but nowhere in the Utah Core are any criteria listed as to how achievement should be determined or quantified. Instead, a Likert-type rating scale is used, where number values are given anchors: 10 = Distinguished, 9 = Independent, 8 = Fluent, 7 = Developing, and 0–6 = Novice.

There are several problems with these tools as the lone statewide instruments of visual arts assessment. According to A. J. Nitko (as cited in Beattie, 1997), “Well-designed assessments provide students with information about the time of the assessment; special conditions and procedures; content to be covered; type of performance expected; how the performance will be judged, scored, and weighted…” (p. 9). The Utah Core does not list or even acknowledge these provisions. Rather, the tools are presented without context or explanation of their intended use. Another problem is lack of clarity in terms of what performance criteria should match the defined anchors. Beattie (1997) writes, “Assessment experts agree that no assessment specification is more critical than [describing criteria and achievement levels (standards) of the assessment task or strategy]” (p. 118). Furthermore, USOE recommends reporting portfolio results to the state, which suggests that the model be used not merely as a norm-referencing benchmark, but in a criteria-referencing context. Without clarification the anchors could be interpreted quite differently among teachers, resulting in aberration.

The most significant factor [that might cause an unreliable assessment score] is related to scoring: inconsistent marks resulting from the idiosyncrasies of the
person(s) marking the student’s performance. When two people rate a performance, then the concept of inter-rater reliability, that is, the consistency of scores assigned by different raters, becomes a consideration. (Beattie, 1997, p. 128)

Finally, since the provided anchors lack definition, and since no additional instruction on the assessment tools are given, the tools are clearly unreliable and, therefore, invalid.

“Reliability can be defined as the consistency of assessment scores. How many times the same assessment, when repeated under the same conditions, would be given the same score lies at the heart of reliability. …an assessment can never be valid without being reliable” (Beattie, 1997, p. 127). Thus, it cannot be assumed that grades are consistent between Utah schools, even if teachers use the prescribed Utah Core assessment tools. Plus, it has been made clear that in some cases the Utah Core is not used by teachers whatsoever. For these reasons, there is currently no way to interpret the meaning of students’ grades for Utah Core visual arts courses. It is, therefore, unmistakable that like grades do not necessarily represent like achievement.

Queensland has identified and addressed the problem of assessment and curriculum inconsistency and has consequently reformed its educational protocol. QSA has attempted to eliminate poor and inconsistent teaching through a unique system of moderated school-based assessment. In this system, each school’s programs and student outcomes (in all subject areas) are evaluated locally by district review panels, which are comprised of peer teachers. This is known as the moderation process or moderation. Teachers submit curriculum maps, assessment models, and student outcomes. Student work is submitted in portfolios, called verification folios. District review panels blindly
analyze these documents to determine quality and consistency of teaching, according to pre-determined standards-based guidelines. When submissions do not meet established criteria, review panels help teachers to revise their curricula or assessment practices. To ensure that the thirteen district review panels are consistent with each other and accurate, a state review panel compares samples of work programs and verification folios that have been previously reviewed by district panels. In extreme cases, the state review panel may directly meet with teachers to help them improve the quality of their programs.

This thesis analyzes Queensland’s system of school-based assessment, and considers beneficial implications for Utah visual arts education. Chapter 2 explores USOE and QSA state-mandated secondary visual arts regulations and other policies, as conveyed in each of the states’ secondary visual arts education documents, the Utah Core and Senior Syllabus. These documents are compared and contrasted in order to determine similarities and dissimilarities, and strengths and weaknesses. Particular attention is given to the vagueness of the Utah Core and its major weakness—that its use is not mandated. In chapter 3, QSA policies and procedures are expressed in detail. Between chapters 2 and 3, every major aspect of Utah and Queensland secondary visual arts education has been scrutinized and compared in order to harvest improvements for the Utah Core from the QSA system of school-based assessment.

The study concludes with three proposals: (a) a recommended plan to ensure through moderated school-based assessment that all Utah art teachers employ standards-based curricula and assessments; (b) a recommendation for other states to adopt moderated school-based assessment; and (c) a practical curriculum guide that adopts key features of the Senior Syllabus for use in planning a semester study and subsequent units.
While short of the ideal, this could improve curriculum and assessment quality in United States visual arts programs.

Justification

The apparent success of Queensland’s ability to ensure that state visual arts standards are reached has warranted further research, from which promising implications for Utah visual arts education could be gleaned. The fact that the USOE has recently updated its visual arts standards indicates that it is serious about striving for educational excellence and indicates that teachers are legally and ethically bound to these standards. Utah has redefined visual arts standards to be compatible with national visual arts standards, and they also agree with Queensland standards. What Utah lacks is a strategy or means to guarantee that state standards are implemented and assessed. Queensland has faced this quandary and has developed and instituted a secure solution that can offer encouraging possibilities to Utah and to other states experiencing accountability problems similar to those in Utah.

In order to discover how Queensland practices might be adapted for Utah, significant research in Utah and in Queensland was conducted. It was necessary to scrutinize and evaluate the protocol of Queensland’s system of school-based assessment and its level of success in instigating accountability measures. This thesis thoroughly addresses these issues through examination of official documents, namely the Utah Visual Arts State Core and Queensland’s Visual Art Senior Syllabus; through investigation of school sites and interviews with QSA officials and Queensland art educators, for the sake of determining how school-based assessment in Queensland is implemented, and how professionals feel about the system; and through comparison of
student art outcomes and assessment practices according to state standards, to determine the program’s success. Chapters 2 and 4 report the findings of this research. The end goal of this thesis has been to offer suggestions for Utah and other states on how to improve art education. Proven accountability measures from QSA have been introduced to offer solutions to USOE for consistency and competency problems. Realization of the proposed solutions would assure students, parents, teachers, administrators, and legislators that all secondary visual arts programs in the state of Utah follow the Utah Core and that assessment and curricula are consistent across the state. From collected and analyzed data, conclusions have thus been drawn as to how Utah and other states might benefit from Queensland’s system of school-based assessment.
CHAPTER 2

This chapter reports the outcome of preliminary research in three sections: (1) Review of the Literature, (2) Utah and Queensland Demographic Comparison, and (3) USOE and QSA Visual Arts Core Comparison, which addresses the (a) Utah Core and (b) Senior Syllabus. The goal of Review of the Literature is to investigate visual arts assessment theory concerning standards and standards accountability. The literature review section considers available research relating to this thesis. Where evidence is lacking, namely in accountability, further research has been conducted. The literature review confirms the contentions of chapter 1: (a) visual arts standards must be the focus of curriculum and assessment, (b) it is a problem that Utah and most states cannot verify that standards have been met, and (c) moderation of local assessment is a desirable alternative to external testing. The remaining two sections investigate Utah and Queensland demographics and art education standards to support the claim that the two states are comparable. The research shows that Utah and Queensland are demographically similar and that the states share like art education standards. Through moderation, Queensland is able to verify that standards are met, while Utah cannot. In short, chapter 2 identifies problems with Utah art education, identifies that Queensland art education does not share these problems, and justifies the implication that the Utah could adopt solutions based on the Queensland system by disclosing their similarities.

Review of the Literature

Chapter 1 proclaimed that art education in Utah and Queensland is standards-based, that it is problematic that Utah and other states cannot verify that standards are being met, and that the Queensland system of moderated school-based assessment could
offer a solution to the problem. The first step in validating this claim was to investigate literature on visual arts standards and assessment. A thorough review of the available literature has resulted in confirmation of these assumptions. Below is an account of the literature according to two points: (1) the importance of standards in visual arts education and (2) moderation of local assessment as an alternative to traditional testing.

**Definition of Visual Arts Education Standards**

To gain an understanding of the role of standards, it is necessary to consider literature that defines, supports, and challenges art education standards. At least as important are policy issues: Aside from standards theory, what legal and ethical obligations do adopted standards demand? When considering the arguments for and against standards, it is necessary to understand the difference between what standards are philosophically and which standards have been recognized and adopted.

First, “standards” can be defined in multiple ways. The literature that discusses standards assumes various definitions. For the purpose of this thesis, it is important to know the underlying theory behind the term, as well as its implied meaning when used to address visual arts assessment in the United States and other parts of the developed world. One aspect of standards is that they serve as criteria. Standards-based assessment is a type of criteria-referencing as opposed to norm-referencing. Beattie (1997) remarks, “Criterion-referenced assessments do not compare students’ performances to that of other students but to the standard of the criterion” (p. 4). A norm-referenced system scores performance as relative to the performance of the group. Criteria-referencing has been widely preferred to norm-referencing over the past few decades in all educational circles, including visual arts education.
Another philosophical underpinning of standards-based education is that fair assessment is only possible when a consensus is reached on what is to be assessed. This point is fairly difficult to refute. Standards, then, are the defined criteria that students strive to meet and by which student outcomes are evaluated. Standards are the fulfillment of the belief that student work must be measured according to objective criteria, that all student work must meet the same criteria.

In visual arts discourse, “standards” commonly refers to one or more officially adopted sets of standards. In 1994, the National Art Education Association (NAEA) published the *National Visual Arts Standards* (NAEA, 1994) as the result of a consortium founded in 1991. These standards “identify what our children must *know* and be able to *do*” (NAEA, 1994, p. 2). These student content-based standards are meant to provide a voluntary reference for states, school districts, and teachers, upon which curricula and assessment can be based. All educated art students ought to demonstrate competency according to these basic fundamental objectives. There are six content standards, and each of these is divided into 1–4 achievement standards. A different set of achievement standards exists for each of three grade groupings, K–4, 5–8, and 9–12. Achievement standards are divided into two groups for the 9–12 level, proficient and advanced.

Many state education departments have followed the lead of NAEA, and have officially adopted standards for visual arts. “The majority of the United States has...adopted a version of the national art standards that have formed the basis for state school curriculums and assessment practices” (Boughton, 2004, p. 587). The below section on assessment accountability discusses the implications and specifics of this. In state contexts, “standards” is commonly used to refer to state adopted standards.
In Queensland, the term “standards” is used for several things. In the section of this chapter that addresses the Senior Syllabus, the use of this and other similar terms is clarified. Queensland art education is standards-based, according to the above definitions.

The Role of Visual Arts Standards in the United States

Now that “standards” has been defined, a discussion of the role of standards can ensue. A study of the QSA Senior Syllabus, which is reported later in this chapter, reveals that all schools in Queensland are accountable to standards. Standards accountability is the product of three beliefs: (a) assessment should primarily address standards, (b) standards provide an objective basis for valid and reliable assessment, and (c) standards assessment results should be justifiable and should be reported.

In determining the role of standards in the United States, it was necessary to discover what standards policies have been adopted. The Arts Education Partnership Web site (2003) declares that standards are considered mandatory in many states. This suggests that schools may be held accountable to standards. Standards accountability policies, however, are not clarified on the Arts Education Partnership Web site. The Web site also fails to specify whether standards are mandatory or voluntary for certain states. No sources were found to report that information. Therefore, it was decided that a survey would be issued to each state to discover: (1) which states have officially adopted standards, (2) which states consider adopted standards to be mandatory, and (3) which states have adopted standards accountability measures.

Each state office of education was contacted and asked the following three questions: (1) “Has your state officially adopted state visual arts standards?” (2) “If so, then are these standards considered voluntary or mandatory?” (3) “If mandatory, then are
schools held accountable for implementing these standards, and how?" The results were compiled and compared to the State Arts Education Policy database (Arts Education Partnership, 2003); the information was also confirmed by state Web sites wherever possible. The results of the inquiry and database searches are detailed in Table 1 of this thesis, which appears on the following page (p. 19).

Only two states, Nebraska and Rhode Island, have not officially adopted visual arts standards. Rhode Island has adopted suggested standards. Of the remaining 48 states, 18 have adopted voluntary standards, and 30, including Utah, have adopted mandatory standards. Only three states claim to hold schools accountable: Kentucky, New Jersey, and Vermont.

Kentucky and Vermont use school-based assessments, and schools report assessment outcomes to the states. In Vermont, a new initiative has been implemented in which schools can be periodically audited by the state to ensure that curricula follow standards. Kentucky is also one of the few states that regularly assess art as part of their mandatory core testing. Art is assessed in this state at grade levels 5, 8, and 11. The extent of accountability has not yet been fully determined.

New Jersey claims to monitor curricula, but not specifically visual arts curricula. All schools in New Jersey are monitored according to their general curricula, which includes visual arts. It is difficult at this point to speculate the merit of New Jersey’s claim with respect to accountability of visual arts standards.

California has identified a need for standards accountability in visual arts, and has formed a task force that is addressing the issue. The task force is in the early stages of development and has not developed a plan as to how or in what manner it will hold
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
schools accountable to art standards. According to California art specialist Don Doyle (personal communication, 2004), the state plans to implement a resolved plan around 2007, which will include, among many things, standards accountability. Currently, California’s visual arts standards are voluntary.

In short, the current data suggest that almost every state has adopted standards for visual arts, but that very little is happening in the United States to ensure the implementation of those standards. If other states had resolved this issue, then perhaps research for this thesis could have been directed inland. Instead, this survey confirmed that many states face the same dilemma as Utah, some of which admit the dilemma. For this reason, it remained necessary to search for a model outside of the United States that holds schools accountable to standards.

Assessment Theory Regarding Visual Arts Standards

The implication of this survey is that most states have identified standards as appropriate criteria for assessing students, and 60% of states have demanded that standards be met. It is important to understand that, regardless of theory, art teachers in the United States are expected to address standards. Nevertheless, the consensus of the academic community on visual arts assessment should be considered. Two aspects of assessment theory needed to be considered for this thesis: (a) the appropriateness of standards-based assessment and (b) assessment methods.

A number of visual arts assessment theorists support the use of standards. Foremost, the fact that the United States national standards have been determined and published by the NAEA should be considered. According to NAEA (1994), these national standards are the result of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. This Act
defines the arts as a core subject, equal to other core subjects in importance. The Act also calls for educational standards to be devised for all core subjects. The U.S. Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities provided a grant for NAEA to develop these standards (pp. 6–7). NAEA (1994) describes the context of standards as: (a) providing a framework for arts education, (b) keys to the art disciplines, (c) keys to correlation and integration within the arts, (d) incorporating cultural diversity, (e) focusing on technology, and (f) implore in-depth study and policy revision.

Few recent publications on assessment in art education exist. In the past few years, *Studies in Art Education* has only published one article on assessment. Dorn (2002) reports on the Models for Assessing Art Performance project, a collaborative effort including Florida State University, Northern Illinois University, Purdue University, and four U.S. school districts. The goal was to research assessment strategies in response to recent pressure by the U.S. Department of Education to assess work in core subjects, and the lack of available models for assessing art performance. This project, like the creation of national standards, resulted from the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. The project involved, among other tasks, holistic portfolio evaluation based on a variety of criteria that were compatible and emergent from state and national standards. The creation and scoring of assessment models involved training teachers. Dorn (2002) reports that while this was not conducted as a technical scientific study or experiment, the analysis of the data derived from the adjudication of the nearly 2,000 portfolio and 16,000 student artworks confirms that an authentic assessment process where art teachers are trained how to conduct themselves will produce
quantifiable and reliable estimates of student performance in the making of expressive objects. Additionally, these results suggest that qualitative instructional outcomes can be assessed quantitatively, yielding score values that can be manipulated statistically and that produce measures that are both valid and reliable estimates of student art performance. (p. 367)

The study suggests that standards can be assessed reliably. As importantly, the study affirms the need for visual arts teachers to legally and ethically follow adopted standards in actual K–12 teaching situations.

Zimmerman writes about conducting authentic assessment (1997),

Steps taken to conduct authentic assessment projects often include determining the purpose of the assessment, deciding on audiences for the assessment, and identifying resources (e.g. national standards [italics added], state frameworks, school restructuring efforts, and professional organizations such as the National Art Education Association)... (p. 154)

Beattie contends that assessment should be standards-based (1997). “Art educators should provide students with written examples of achievement levels regarding content standards…” (p. 8). Additionally, “assessment supports, rather than interferes with, instruction and course objectives” (p. 6).

The assessment community outside of art education also supports standards-based assessment. Cummings and Maxwell argue that contemporary assessment theory concerns standards (Cummings & Maxwell, 1999):

The changing focus of assessment has led to two major theoretical considerations. The first relates to the conceptions of validity, (Messick, 1989, 1984) …[which]
are more compatible with the ‘new paradigm of assessment’ (Gipps, 1994),
emphasizing interpretations of quality and judgements [Australian spelling
maintained] of standards (Maxwell, 1997), than with measurement-oriented or
psychometric approaches based on true score theory. The second theoretical
consideration relates to the need for learning and assessment of learning to be
contextualised and meaningful for students. (p. 177)

Clearly the authors are not supporting stagnant curricula. Authentic assessment concerns
the student and must contribute toward learning. Authentic assessment promotes
individuality and creativity, but is rooted in standards. The end, accomplishing standards,
justifies the means.

Others support assessment beyond standards. For example, Eisner (2002) writes,
[A] major subject matter of assessment is what students have learned. A focus on
what students have learned is wider than determining if they learned what the
teacher intended them to learn or determining if they learned what course
objectives or standards described. I have posed the assessment and evaluation task
as one that seeks to appraise the outcomes of teaching and curriculum. Many of
those outcomes are likely to be related to objectives and standards, but not all will
be, and perhaps not the most important ones. (p. 186)

Eisner continues by recommending open-ended assessment strategies over high-stakes
tests. The reason for this is that tests typically reveal what students can do, not what they
will do (or have done). In this case, standards are not necessarily a problem, but rather the
method of assessment (which is high-stakes testing). Eisner’s comment and many like it
suggest that standards are often assumed to relate to traditional assessment strategies. A
The common critique of standards is that they inhibit curriculum flexibility and variation of outcome.

Boughton (2004) argues against standards for this reason. “The effect of testing the [national art] standards through the use of multiple-choice tests is to atomize artistic knowledge to the point where assessment information gathered is virtually meaningless” (p. 587). This is not an attack on standards, but on poor assessment. Again, he reiterates this point:

…despite the development of national and state-based standards for the teaching of art, current state testing formats are largely inappropriate to assess arts learning; and further, the field is undergoing a transition that points to a need for a more reflexive, holistic approach to both the construction of curriculum and the conduct of assessment. An implication from the aforementioned is that the relationship between curriculum and assessment needs to be reconsidered in the United States. (p. 591)

In the above comments of Eisner and Boughton, it seems that standards can stifle art outcomes. Perhaps in application this is true. NAEA (1994) clarifies, however, the intent of national standards:

…arts standards provide a vision of both competence and educational effectiveness, but without creating a mold into which all arts programs must fit. Let us be clear. These Standards [sic] are concerned with which results, in the form of student learning, are characteristic of a basic education in the arts, but not with how those results ought to be delivered. (pp. 7–8)
NAEA clearly conveys throughout the document that standards are meant to provide a basis for states, districts, and schools to use to develop a program, and that in implementing standards, local needs should be considered. The standards are not intended to stifle curriculum or student outcomes, and no restrictive assessment provision is given. Rather, the content standards are the basic performances that all students educated in art should be able to perform, and the achievement standards denote general achievement indicators.

In terms of assessment theory, it has already been suggested that the community of art educators favors a progressive approach to curriculum and assessment that considers student needs and differences. Quality of learning is favored, and student artworks are considered in context, not as isolated aesthetic objects. Zimmerman (1997) writes,

*Authentic assessments* are usually alternative assessments that are performance-based and require solutions to real world problems that include decisions similar to those made by professionals….Authentic assessment tasks are integrated, complex, and challenging; and students are encouraged to apply their previous knowledge and relevant skills to solve “realistic problems” when completing these tasks (Kirst [sic] 1991; Maranzo et al., 1993; Rudner & Boston, 1994). (p. 150)

As previously mentioned, Zimmerman supports the use of standards as one way of establishing assessment criteria. Cummings and Maxwell (1999) support standards-based authentic assessment in all educational disciplines. Authentic assessment suggests that
traditional testing methods are no longer appropriate in light of today’s high educational demands.

Boughton (2004) challenges the use of analytic scoring altogether, especially in the application of traditional testing to visual arts, and calls for acceptance of authentic assessment techniques:

Performance measures, such as portfolio or other “authentic” assessment techniques…are rare in statewide assessments of art, most likely due to the high cost of their implementation and the likely perception of policymakers that the arts are not worth the investment because their subjectivity compared to mathematics or science would make assessment unreliable. The result is that art is not tested in 43 states, which diminishes perception of its importance in the curriculum, and in the 7 states in which it is tested paper-and-pencil multiple choice assessment formats are predominant. These kinds of assessments are not widely supported in the arts education assessment literature. (p. 588)


Sabol (1997) agrees with this position:

[The] use of standardized tests in a visual arts program…provides art teachers, administrators, parents, students, and other decision-makers with only a partial view of learning that occurs in art classrooms. Although criticisms of standardized testing abound, standardized tests, \textit{when incorporated with authentic assessments} [italics added], can provide a complete picture of overall student achievement in visual arts programs. (p.148)
While recognizing the value of traditional testing, Sabol (1997) clarifies that, “Most test items do not permit students to demonstrate their abilities to revise and build responses,” and, “Test items tend not to be representative of the wide span of various types of learning that occurs in visual arts classrooms (Haney, 1995; Hamblen, 1987; Sabol, 1990; Stiggins, 1985)” (p. 147).

In summary of the role of visual arts standards, three points are clear. First, standards have been widely accepted in the United States. Most state standards are based on the national standards. The standards have been established to justify art education and to provide a basis for developing and improving all K–12 art programs in the United States. Second, some opposition to standards exists. This opposition seems to be based on a belief that standards reduce learning options, either philosophically or in practice. Critics of standards seem to associate standards with outdated educational philosophy. The literature indicates that proponents and opponents of standards agree that assessment theory has moved away from traditional testing. Third, visual arts teachers in the United States are ethically and, in most cases, legally responsible to teach according to standards. Little is currently done, however, to hold teachers accountable to standards implementation. The next section considers current and projected means of assessment accountability.

Visual Arts Assessment Accountability in the United States

On the topic of accountability, Boughton (2004) writes,

Until recently, the issue of student assessment in art education received scant attention in the United States….current accountability pressures in the United States have caused arts educators to pay increased attention to the difficult
business of assessing learning in the arts. High-stakes assessment in particular has heightened schools’ awareness of the need to assess student learning in all subjects with unprecedented intensity. (p. 586)

The NCLB Act is partially responsible for raising attention to arts assessment. The arts have been declared part of the national core in the United States. NCLB demands accountability for almost all core subjects, although art is not currently assessed. Failing the demands of NCLB has serious consequences. Public scrutiny of education in the United States has also provoked a search for defensible assessment methods (Boughton, 2004, p. 586). The suspicion among the art education community is that pressure could be put on the U.S. Department of Education to assess art, for which funding is distributed based on its status as a core subject area.

In addition to assessment accountability, schools and teacher are being held to higher standards than ever. Zimmerman (1997) reports that assessment involves “…three kinds of accountability: program accountability, accountability of student learning, and teacher accountability (Davis, 1993; Rudner & Boston, 1994)” (p. 151). Boughton (2004) and Dorn (2003) agree that art teachers have traditionally escaped the scrutiny that teachers in other disciplines experience and have thus resisted voluntary change. Sabol (2004) warns that there is a great possibility that public dissatisfaction with schools and student achievement will grow and assessment will gain in power as an accountability measure. Assessment of teachers will become more comprehensive and more frequent. Teachers will be required not only to pass various assessments of their competence at all stages of their careers, but also to provide evidence of continued
improvement in their students’ achievements. In the future, employment of teachers may hinge on assessment results more than any other single factor. (p. 545)

Dorn (2003) reiterates the point that the recent trend in education is to hold teachers accountable (p. 352). If this is correct, then it is likely that traditional paper-and-pencil testing methods would be used to assess art, since other methods of testing art are not regularly used at the national and state levels. As mentioned, arts educators are generally against traditional external testing as a primary source of accountability.

There are few assessment accountability alternatives to external testing of students. The alternative that Queensland presents is local assessment that is moderated by the government. Boughton argues that, “…the portfolio-based moderated assessment systems used internationally are far more supportive of good classroom practices [than typical United States assessment practices]” (2004, p. 592). Additionally, Boughton contends that moderation can be reliable:

The IB program’s reliance on external examiners and the use of moderation have succeeded in attracting widespread confidence in the reliability of judgments, and there is much to be said in support of the value of moderated assessments which are used throughout Europe, the United Kingdom, and Australasia (Boughton, 1996b; Blaikie, 1994; Wilson, 1996). (2004, pp. 598–9)

Moderation confirms assessment outcomes, and, when necessary, scales outcomes according to particular criteria. Boughton favors the criteria used by the International Baccalaureate program and the use of holistic over analytic methods. The moderation system in Queensland has been developed to allow maximum curricular freedom and is
less invasive than the IB moderation system. The Queensland moderation system has also been developed according to the unique needs of the state, whereas IB is a universal model. Both systems provide criteria-referenced accountability while allowing assessment to remain local.

In conclusion, a review of the literature confirmed three things concerning visual arts standards. First, visual arts standards must be the focus of curriculum and assessment in the United States. The U.S. Department of Education has validated NAEA national standards as the essential learning outcomes in visual arts. Most states have officially adopted versions of these standards and 60% of states consider these mandatory, meaning teachers are legally bound to teach and assess according to standards. Second, a serious problem exists in that most states cannot verify that standards are being met. Only three states have established accountability measures to evaluate schools and teachers in terms of visual arts outcomes. No states actively verify assessment results. Experts agree that art teachers in the United States may soon be held accountable to assessment in the same manner as teachers of other core subjects. Third, moderation is a viable option to high-stakes external testing. Moderation allows teachers to use authentic assessment and promises aggregate grade comparability. Thus, moderation has been considered as a possibility in Utah. Because Utah and Queensland are similar, which is discussed below, and because assessment criteria are similar, the implications of literature on standards and assessment reinforced the justification that studying Queensland art education could provide solutions to Utah’s dilemma.
Utah and Queensland Demographic Comparison

It has been previously mentioned that both of the states of this comparison are demographically diverse. This is important because substantial diversity heightens the potential for divergent educational practices, which are undesirable if that divergence compromises equity. Both Queensland and Utah define educational parameters at the state level, while education is implemented at the local level. Each school or school district should ideally meet the same learning objectives (standards) as other districts and aggregate grades should be comparable. This is not to suggest that diverse assignments cannot be implemented. On the contrary, teachers should assign tasks according to local needs, expertise, and resources. National standards, which, in the United States, the NAEA has published, or state standards, which, in Utah, reflect NAEA national standards, must still be followed for the sake of legality and equity. Standards attempt to define essential learning outcomes and, in the case of both Queensland and Utah, are the necessary aims of visual arts education.

Without regulation, different communities are likely to teach courses differently if the curricular requirements are vague. Visual arts [considered a single composite discipline] is as likely as any subject to be affected by this, because no state or national assessments exist and because textbooks are not commonly used. Visual arts is itself a diverse field and teachers disagree on what exactly is to be taught. In Utah and Queensland, state governments have mandated standards. If teachers are unaware of standards or dislike them, and their use is not accounted for, then standards may be ignored.
To further justify a comparison of how these two states address this issue, it is necessary to analyze the demographics of each state in order to discover how the diversity of these two states compares. Beyond determining that these states simply share the common trait of diversity, it is essential to analyze the types of diversity issues of each state. The purpose of this is to ascertain whether or not Utah and Queensland share similar educational challenges because of demographics and, if so, whether or not these states share similar goals in addressing such challenges. Determining demographic similarity is the first step toward determining educational compatibility.

Research shows that Queensland and Utah are nearly identical in terms of demography. No information has been found that would portray the two states as having even one major demographical difference. Table 2 of this thesis, located on the following page (p. 33), reveals the similarities of Utah and Queensland with respect to general and school demographics, in the areas of physical geography, population, and ethnicity. Table 3, located on page 34, indicates the economic similarities between the two states.

Before analyzing specific details about demography, it is important to recognize a few points. First, the goal of this comparison is to verify that Utah and Queensland share similar demographic diversity. Similarity of demography supports the claim that the two states share similar challenges in implementing consistent and equitable statewide education and helps to justify comparing the two states’ education systems. Second, it is necessary to understand that the two states publish demographic statistics independent of and without regard for each other. The information made available to the public by the two governments is not entirely co-linear and, therefore, the data are not optimal for
1. Data from different official sources was occasionally slightly uncooperative, in the case of acreage and other statistics.

2. The majority in Utah is defined as white, non-Hispanic, and in Queensland is considered native-Australian, non-native. The minority in both states excludes native citizens. Native citizens are US American Indians, and Australian Aborigines.

### Table 2

*Demographic Comparison of Utah and Queensland*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Comparison</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area in Square Miles(^1)</td>
<td>82,144</td>
<td>669,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2,385,358</td>
<td>3,627,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Metropolitan Cluster</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-urban District Average</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest District Division</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Population(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority resident</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority resident</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native resident</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* 1. Data from different official sources was occasionally slightly uncooperative, in the case of acreage and other statistics. 2. The majority in Utah is defined as white, non-Hispanic, and in Queensland is considered native-Australian, non-native. The minority in both states excludes native citizens. Native citizens are US American Indians, and Australian Aborigines.
Table 3

Economic Comparison of Utah and Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross State Product</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Retail and Wholesale</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communications, Utilities</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* In certain cases, the category names used in this table are not nominally identical to those used in the collected data. These category names have been altered slightly to create consistency. Some categories within states have been necessarily combined to create congruency in this table. Utah reports the category of Trade, Retail and Wholesale as: Retail Trade = 9.9%; Wholesale Trade = 6.0%. Queensland reports the category of Finance, Insurance, Real Estate as: Ownership of Dwellings = 9.6%; Finance, Property and Business Services = 9.7%. Queensland reports Transportation, Communications, Utilities as: Transport, Storage and Communication = 9.5%; Electricity, Gas and Water = 3.3%.
constructing a linear comparison. Nevertheless, the data are reasonably comparable and satisfy the demands of this study. Finally, this comparison is not meant to dissemble. Wherever demographic differences between Utah and Queensland have been discovered, they are noted in this thesis.

Several sources have been drawn upon for this comparison. For Utah data, the following organizations have directly provided statistical information: OSOE, the U.S. Census Bureau, Utah Populations Estimates Committee (UPEC), and the Utah Governor’s Web site. For Queensland information, Education Queensland and (Queensland’s) Office of Economic and Statistical Research (OESR) have supplied data. The information that all of these agencies provided has been accessed through their official Web sites, all of which are operated by the states’ governments.

This section is organized in two parts, (1) general demographics and (2) school demographics. The first part addresses: (a) broad demographics, which include state and regional data on size, population distribution, and physical geography; (b) ethnicity, including ethnic classification and population distribution; and (c) economy, which includes industry, wealth distribution, and other socioeconomic issues. The second part discusses (a) the demographic diversity of schools in each state and (b) the relationship between schools and general demographics. This section bolsters comparison of Utah and Queensland secondary education by showing how diverse demography effects education in both states.
General Demographics

Population Data

Table 2 (see p. 33) reports that Queensland is much larger than Utah. In terms of landmass, Queensland is almost eight times larger, with over one third more people. This initially suggests that the two states may differ demographically, but a closer look reveals similarities with respect to population distribution. The data for Table 2 (see p. 33) and Table 3 (see p. 34) are derived from reports by OESR of Queensland (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/data_fs.htm?bulletins/c01/qld_pop/qld_pop.htm–main) and by the U.S. Census Bureau (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/49000/html).

Each state’s primary metropolitan area is home to nearly two-thirds of its inhabitants. These statistics are reported by OESR, regarding the Southeast Queensland (SEQ) region, which is comprised of the Brisbane, Gold Coast, and Moreton areas (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/views/regional/reg_pro/regpro_fs.htm), and by UPEC (http://www.governor.state.ut.us/dea/UPEC/stateandcountypopulationestimates.pdf), regarding the Wasatch Front region, which includes the Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Provo areas. These primary metropolitan areas share many traits. The Wasatch Front Multi-county District (MCD) covers an 80 mile span along the Wasatch Mountain Range’s eastern valley, between the cities of Ogden and Provo, with Salt Lake City as the concentration. The Brisbane–Moreton metropolitan area, SEQ, includes the following: the eastern South Pacific coastal strip between Brisbane City and the Gold Coast, which borders the southern state of New South Whales; the island of Moreton, located off-shore of Brisbane; and inland suburbs that are adjacent to the included costal neighborhoods.
The SEQ district is approximately the same size as the Wasatch Front MCD. Both cities function in similar ways as well, which is discussed later.

The non-urban regions of the two states also show demographic and geographic similarities. OESR defines 11 statistical divisions, two of which are Brisbane and Moreton, which together form the SEQ division. The remaining divisions are scantly populated, ranging from 0.4% to 7% of Queensland’s total population, averaging 3.9% (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/data/data_fs.htm?bulletins/c01/qld_pop/qld_pop.htm~main). Most of this population is situated along the eastern South Pacific coast, extending north from Brisbane. Immediately east of the coast is a natural barrier, the Great Dividing Range, which is a mountain range of forests and rainforests. The populated strip between the coast and just into the mountains is predominantly agricultural terrain. East of this is the Outback, a vast desert, which is climatologically harsh.

In Utah, The Wasatch Front MCD is densely populated, as mentioned, and the adjacent Mountainland MCD is moderately populated, accounting for 20% of Utah’s total population. Aside from these two districts, the others encompass between slightly less than 2%, and slightly less than 7%, averaging 3.9%—the same average population percentage of non-urban regions in Queensland (http://www.governor.state.ut.us/dea/UPEC/stateandcountypopulationestimates.pdf). Most of Utah’s population, like Queensland’s, is dispersed along a natural longitudinal border, in this case the valley immediately east of the Wasatch Mountains. As in Queensland, this low, flat terrain is suitable for agriculture, albeit for different produce. The majority of Utah’s terrain is either alpine forest or high desert, which is comparable to Queensland’s topography. Geography clearly affects population distribution.
Two major geographical differences between the states exist. One is temperature: Utah experiences cold, wet winters and mild, dry summers, whereas Queensland is tropical and subtropical, with temperate winters and hot summers that range from humid in the south to torrential monsoon rains in the tropical north. The other clear difference is Queensland’s coastal footing compared to Utah, which is landlocked.

_Ethnic Data_

Ethnicity is a complicated matter in many ways and differs between Utah and Queensland. It would even be difficult to characterize either state with a single ethnic profile, because both states vary tremendously from one region to another. Furthermore, it is futile to attempt to quantify ethnicity by charting numbers, because the essence of ethnicity is inseparable from social implications, history, and culture. The fundamental aspects of ethnic makeup of a landmass can be quantified, however, and ethnic research comparisons between Utah and Queensland reveal several particular similarities.

First, it is important to recognize the notes of Table 2 (see p. 33), which indicate that differences exist in terms of how Utah and Queensland define ethnic diversity. Queensland, for example, does not employ race as a necessary criterion for ethnic classification. It should be noted, however, that the majority of Queenslanders are white and of European descent. This is consistent with both common knowledge and historical reports on immigration to the state, which can be found on the OESR Web site (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/data/data_fs.htm?bulletins/c01/qld_pop/qld_pop.htm~main) and at an additional URL of the OESR Web site, that specifically reports historic birthplace (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/data/tables/multi/m1-09.htm). The United States, including Utah, defines ethnicity in slightly different terms, sometimes according to race,
sometimes according to geographic origin, and sometimes both. Like Queensland, most Utahns are white and of European descent. The comparison of Ethnic Population stated in Table 2 (see p. 33) refers to general ethnic classifications: a single majority group, a collective group of all non-native minorities, and a native population. While this three-prong classification does not present the most accurate, specific declaration of either state’s ethnic canvas, it serves the purpose of identifying basic ethnic demography, both statewide and in terms of schooling, and provides a basis for unpacking and comparing educational equity issues. Specific ethnic statistics for Utah can be found at two URLs from the U.S. Census Web site: a “quick facts” page lists statewide race information (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/49000.html) and a race population by county page (http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/crh/crhut98.txt).

As Table 2 (see p. 33) indicates, the population distribution among the defined ethnic groups is fairly similar, with slightly fewer minorities in Utah. As mentioned, the majority groups are white, and or European descent, and in both states include over 80% of residents. In both cases, this single group is responsible for most of the decision making, on a government level and on a cultural level.

Within the minority resident categorization in each state, much diversity exists, and it is unfair to describe either of these as a cohesive group. In both states, however, all minorities share the distinction of being excluded from the majority race and native people. Consequently, whatever challenges and disadvantages might exist for minority groups is generally consistent. This is why minorities are being considered together in this comparison. While Table 2 (see p. 33) effectively illustrates that the minority population is similar in terms of percentage between states, it does not show how the
groups differ in terms of character. Most foreigners in Queensland are white immigrants, usually from the same European countries as its majority race generally originated. A small percentage of Asians add to this otherwise white population. In Utah, the largest minority group is Hispanic, many of whom are Mexican nationals. It may be worth noting that an undisclosed number of undocumented Mexicans also permanently live in Utah, which somewhat alters the statistical reporting on ethnic distribution. Utah is also represented by a small percentage of other minority groups, such as Black Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Asians. In both states, a considerable number of minorities do not speak English as their first language.

Native citizens, while encompassing a relatively small percentage of citizens in both states, have been defined separately in this study, because these groups not only carry the stigma of being excluded from the majority race, but also face issues relating to the historic implications of white settlement. It is well documented that Native Americans and Indigenous Australians, including Aboriginal and Torres Straights Island people, have been treated poorly by the white settlers of their lands and the settlers’ successors. While it is not in the interest of this thesis to kindle a sociopolitical discussion about racial injustice, such underlying issues are unavoidable because they engender significant educational implications. For example, in both states, native peoples have been forcefully relegated to small, remote areas, which contain schools that severely lack resources.

Race population distribution is similar in both states. Some areas are more heavily populated by minorities than others in each. Specific data on this are difficult to attain, but in general, three types of ethnic distribution exist. This conclusion is well supported by research on school demography, which is discussed immediately below. Urban areas
tend to be ethnically diverse, with subsections that are populated exclusively by White residents, some subsections that are populated exclusively by a single minority constituent, and some subsections that are represented by an amalgamation of ethnic groups. Rural areas tend to be mostly White, with some dispersed minorities, except for those areas that have been segregated for native population inhabitation.

Economic Data

In addition to the similarities of general physical geography, the population distributions, which reflect physical geography, are also similar. Ethnic and economic distributions are also similar. Table 3 (see p. 34) expresses the gross state product (GSP) for Queensland and Utah, which is mostly similar. The data uncovered exemplify the need for the aforementioned disclaimer, that data are not reported in identical terms. Consistency and accuracy have been attempted, but it is uncertain whether or not the two states have grouped information differently. In some cases, Utah and Queensland have disagreed on how to numerically divide the categories. For example, Utah reports retail trade and wholesale trade as separate categories, whereas Queensland reports the two together. In all such cases, Table 3 (see p. 34) considers the categories as a single category, to maintain consistency. Aside from this difference, there is no major difference in the categorization of industry reported. Statistics for Utah GSP are compiled in the annual Economic Report to the Governor (http://governor.utah.gov/dea/ERG/ERG2004/09GSP.pdf); the source of data is the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Queensland GSP is reported by OESR (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/data/historical/table5-5.htm); several sources are cited.
The possible interpretations of this data are infinite, which is one reason why Table 3 (see p. 34) is necessary. The data, however, seem to suggest that only a few significant industrial differences exist between the two states. First and foremost, it is clear that Utah relies more heavily on services, which includes domestic and international tourism. Services encompasses a fifth of Utah’s GSP—nearly three times that of Queensland’s. Another difference is the consideration of two small similar categories, mining and agriculture, which are reported as separate categories by both states. Combined, mining and agriculture comprises 3.1% of Utah’s GSP compared to 9.2% of Queensland’s. It could be argued that this comparison is misleading, since these categories are not grouped by either state’s government. The significance of comparing these small categories lies in the relative importance of each, which, when counted singly, is less obvious. Third, Queensland relies more on the conglomerated category of transportation, communication, and utilities than Utah. Otherwise, all categories occupy approximately the same percentage of GSP for both states, within a 3% margin of difference. Thus, it can easily be argued that Utah and Queensland operate on similar economic platforms.

Regional economic and socioeconomic data are scarce, because of the nature and goals of state economic reporting, but general trends are observable, and can be considered common knowledge. In terms of industry, both Brisbane City and Salt Lake City function similarly. Each primarily functions as its state business and government capitols, and also as the primary tourism hub for nearby recreation—skiing for Salt Lake, surfing for Brisbane. These diverse characteristics are reflected in the climate of education in both metropolitan areas.
In terms of socioeconomic makeup, rural areas in both states tend to be poor, particularly those without agricultural suitability or any other natural resources, namely southeastern Utah and the Outback. Indigenous Australian regions and American Indian reservations are known to be areas of extreme poverty. Urban areas, on the other hand, tend to vary dramatically in terms of wealth distribution, often easily distinguishable by the varying quality of neighborhoods. This is true in both states.

In summary, analyses of the existing data reveal that Utah and Queensland are demographically similar in all aspects. Research shows that physical geography, population distribution and ethnicity, and industry are all basically comparable between the two states. Because of the similar demographic diversity, it is worth considering how demographics affect education.

School Demographics

In terms of the impact of demographics on education, there are three basic aspects of education that are worth considering. These are school administration, school resources, and school needs. These three aspects of education are inseparable with respect to the makeup of any school and are interrelated. Also, each of these educational aspects is affected by all types of information discussed in the above section on general demographics: broad demographics, ethnicity, and economy. Thus, since all of these things affect each other, it is difficult to dissect the effects of demographics on the educational atmosphere. The implications of demographics, however, are discussed below in a rough chronology akin to the above discussion. Simply put, the diversification of various demographic features yield educational variety in both states, the products of which are an assortment of parallel problems and concerns relating to educational equity.
Table 2 (see p. 33) expresses some key points about the diversity of educational settings, reporting ethnic distribution in Utah schools and the span of pupil population in both states. Neither the Australian nor the Queensland government currently publishes statistics about student ethnic population per school. USOE, however, publishes a wealth of statistical information about its schools, including electronic links to ethnic population by age and district, socioeconomic information, history and future projections concerning minorities, school population, and more (http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/data/files.htm). As for school population in Queensland, these data were gathered by searching the Education Queensland database on school statistics (http://education.qld.gov.au/schools/directory/).

General demographics directly and indirectly impact education in several ways, the first of which is physical geography. The fact that both states are large presents a common challenge. The larger any landmass is, the more difficult it is to govern, theoretically. Because education, including standards, in both states is defined and controlled by state government, this challenge exists in education, regarding administration. Both states strive for equity, which is difficult for any large, diverse state.

Another important aspect of physical geography to both states is climate. The Outback in Queensland and most of Utah, especially the southeastern portion, are climatologically harsh in terms of temperature and deprivation of water. These desert areas are unsuitable for farming, do not provide enough water to sustain much life, and they lack other valuable resources. The result is sparse population, which affects schooling. In the remote areas of both states, schools are small in size, and cater to relatively large regions. Farming regions also tend to be thinly populated, because of land
use. Also, farming regions require education to be somewhat practical, because many children from these areas will pursue agriculture as a career. The same is true for regions that rely heavily upon mining. Thus, school needs are affected by physical geography.

Geography indirectly affects education though its influence on peoples’ decisions regarding settlement and industry. Examples of this include: formation of urban areas based on export potential and other accessibility issues; the beach and ski industries that have recently emerged, and the cultures that have formed around these activities; mountain and forest areas, which are difficult to navigate or inhabit; and, as mentioned, desert land, which lacks appeal. Population density, ethnicity, and socioeconomics all relate to physical geography. Utah and Queensland share similar geographic traits, which have led to similar demography and, in turn, to similar schooling issues and structure.

Population distribution is reflected in school distribution. In urban areas, there are many schools in both states, and they possess relatively high student populations. Rural areas, on the other hand, are small in number, and spread out dramatically. The extreme student populations listed in Table 2 (see p. 33) do not present a skewed statistic. In both states there are at least a few high schools with approximately two thousand students, a few schools with around twenty-five students, and schools with populations everywhere in between these boundaries. Urban schools tend to be large, rural schools tend to be small, and suburban and small town schools tend to be manageably populated. In addition to different land areas having different educational needs, because of local culture and industry, resources are a key issue that schools with extreme population density issues face.
Small, rural schools often face the crisis of lacking funds, because schools receive monies based on enrollment. Thus, small schools cannot provide the facilities that larger schools are able to provide. This can be quite detrimental to visual arts programs, resulting in the inability to offer a variety of media opportunities to students. Rural areas are also usually poor and are less likely to supplement funding with corporate donations—an option occasionally available to urban schools. Also, in scantly populated areas, teacher availability can often present problems, because there are few certified teaching professionals available for hire in many remote areas. In Utah, Carol Goodson of USOE explains that sometimes schools in isolated areas struggle to find the resources necessary to teach the Utah Core, let alone compete with large, well-funded schools. Both states are faced with this problem, and as such, equity becomes a serious issue: can students in remote, poorly funded areas receive the same quality of education as other students in the two states?

Large schools face different types of resource issues, or, at least, the issues have different causes. Most large schools in both states exist in poor, urban locations. In Utah, schools in poor regions are themselves poor—a consequence in part of property tax-based educational funding. More research would be required to determine the cause of the same phenomenon in Queensland; it has been observed that the problem does exist. Large schools also typically suffer from overcrowding, which has multiple consequences. For visual arts education, overtaxed facilities produce the obstacle of storage issues, so large-scale works may not be possible. More importantly, student-to-teacher ratios can be affected by school size. Class sizes vary between schools in both states, a fact that can easily be proven by comparing numbers of teachers and students in a variety of schools.
Much research has been done on the affects of class size, and it is commonly accepted in
the field of education that quality of education significantly decreases with
extraordinarily large class sizes. In a related issue, it may be difficult for urban schools to
attract the most qualified and capable teachers, when such schools are known to lack
facilities and materials, or may be known to have other problems, like safety issues, at
least in the United States. Thus, like small schools, urban schools may lack outstanding
teachers. Finally, large schools face administration issues that smaller schools do not,
such as large department sizes and large student bodies. This presents potential pros and
cons. The possibility may exist to offer students a greater variety of learning
opportunities and teachers may be able to collaborate. Or, teachers within a school may
compete against each other, resorting to dubious tactics to increase enrollment. Several
Utah art teachers, all of whom have requested anonymity, have reported this when
interviewed, preceding this research.

Ethnic diversity complicates education in several ways. One important aspect of
ethnicity is culture, which has several educational implications. Because different
cultures communicate in different ways, learning styles differ from one culture to the
next. Different cultures have different values, beliefs, and customs, all of which must be
taken into consideration when teaching students of particular cultures. Each culture also
has a unique history and, from that history, a distinct emerging voice. H. Gene Blocker
(2004) argues that, in addition to the personal aspect of art, “…we also want to help
young people assimilate into their own culture, and this is the more ‘public’ side of art
education” (p. 188). Art is directly associated with culture, in that art is a product of one’s
self, which relates to one’s culture. When a society is multicultural, people of different
cultures live together and the case could be made that it is important to study art from all of those cultures. This is especially true and necessary, whenever a school and, therefore, its classes, are multicultural. Blocker argues that we need to engage in multicultural art education, “because our [North American] culture is multicultural, meaning that it cannot be narrowly specified religiously, or ethnically, or racially…” (2004, p. 188). This is true of Utah and Queensland. Are visual arts curricula in Utah and Queensland schools based on the tradition of European aesthetics, or do they take into account the aesthetic traditions of all cultures represented by the world art or even by the local students? Even if all schools were to agree upon how culture should define curriculum and teaching strategies (which is very unlikely), the particular ethnic composition of each school would still affect the particular approach within those boundaries.

Language differences create a difficult task for implementing education, particularly when the vast majority of students and the teacher speak a common language. In Utah and Queensland alike, English is the common language, and in both states, many schools are comprised of mostly native English speakers. Each state, however, also has schools with moderate to large populations of students who either do not speak English at all, or who are English language learners. These schools, then, are faced with the added educational challenge of communicating material to students in creative ways. This is a concern because direct communication through common language is clearly more efficient and precise than any alternative measure, and no additional time is afforded to schools dealing with this issue or to the students who are affected by language barriers.

Treatment of ethnic groups might also be an issue. Students who are not members of the predominant paradigm might suffer mistreatment from other students, teachers,
administrators, or even government. Instead of citing specific incidents, which would fall outside of the aims of this thesis, the following questions are presented for pondering: Do predominantly Native American schools in Utah receive funding equal to predominantly White schools? Are Mexican nationals who cannot speak English given equal consideration as other Utah students? Do New Zealander natives have the same chance of success in Queensland as other Queenslanders? Why are Aborigines much more likely to drop out of school than White Australians? Are students of various cultures taught and assessed according to their values and traditions, or according to the traditions of European art theory?

In some cases, schools and teachers may work very hard to ensure equity, but can it be guaranteed? It is apparent is that ethnic diversity raises several issues in terms of equity. It is also apparent is that those issues are similar in Utah and Queensland.

Economy affects education, especially when schools are regionally funded. This is the case in both Queensland and Utah. A significant portion of funding in Utah schools is derived from property tax. Naturally, areas with higher property taxes will generate more school revenue. In addition to this natural bias, tax is determined locally by voters in Utah. Generally, school tax levies are more successful in wealthy communities than in poor communities. Perhaps, this can be attributed to the level of esteem that education carries in different social circles or that wealthy voters have more available disposable income—whatever the reason, the affect is that schools in poor districts do not receive the same funding as schools in middle class or wealthy districts. A common reaction to this is that concerned parents accept this imbalance and move to neighborhoods with reputable schools. In Queensland, a similar trend exists, but is realized differently. Private
(and religious) schools are popular, particularly among residents who can afford to pay the high tuition required. In fact, 29.3% of Queensland students attend independent schools, a 7.9% increase since 1978, according to OESR (http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/views/statistics/topics/health_education/health_ed_fs.htm).

It is worth noting that both government and independent schools in Queensland are subject to the same government authority and must adhere to the same criteria for accreditation. While the specific reasons have not been determined for this research, the observation has been made that some Queensland schools are better funded than others and the schools with the most money are expensive non-government schools, many of which are affiliated with the Anglican Church of Australia.

Regional economy and industry also impact education in the sense that they affect student profiles and, hence, educational goals. For instance, most students in the sugar cane farming region of northern Queensland will probably work in the sugar cane industry as adults, which must be considered by the schools in that region. These schools typically offer a more practical-minded curriculum than most. Expensive non-government schools, on the other hand, generally cater to students preparing for tertiary education and favor a liberal arts curriculum. For art education, this could mean that individual schools have different agendas for teaching art; yet both USOE and QSA have adopted standards. This raises the concern of equity with respect to the implementation of standards, the primary focus of this thesis.

Regardless of which schools are advantaged, and why, or how goals vary among schools, it is clear that differences exist. Not all teachers possess the same skills. Not all schools are equally funded. Not all schools have the same needs. Not all communities
have the same expectations of schools. Not all ethnic groups have the same educational needs, nor do they share learning styles. The simple question, then, is how are schools able to offer the same quality of visual arts education to students when such tremendous differences exist between them? Can students be guaranteed the same quality of education from one school to the next? If the atmosphere of education is different in schools, then what will ensure that assessment is fair, since in both Utah and Queensland assessment is supposed to be criteria-referenced rather than norm-referenced.

In conclusion, the study of Queensland and Utah demographics reveals considerable diversity, in terms of population distribution, physical geography, ethnicity, industry, and socioeconomics. This diversity translates to diverse school parameters, constituents, needs, and resources. These differences between individual schools raise issues of educational equity. The research suggests that these issues are generally the same in Utah and Queensland, because the source of these issues—demographic diversity—is generally the same. Since the two states face similar educational concerns, it is justifiable to compare the two states’ responses to these issues.

Utah Core and Senior Syllabus Comparison

The next step in determining educational compatibility between Utah and Queensland is to analyze each state’s secondary visual arts standards. If Utah and Queensland art education programs are to be compared, it must be confirmed that art education goals of these states are similar. Therefore, official documents from each state’s government must be scrutinized. In the case of Utah, the most recent document pertaining to high school visual arts standards is the Utah Core, released in 2001 by the USOE. In Queensland, the most recent document, which pertains to eleventh and twelfth
grade art students, is the Visual Art Senior Syllabus (Senior Syllabus), updated in 2001 by the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA). For this thesis, current versions of both documents are used.

Analysis of the two documents reveals that Queensland and Utah share common general goals in secondary visual arts education and that every aspect of the documents reflects these general goals. The structure of the two documents is not identical, nor is terminology shared. The purpose of the two documents varies also, as the Senior Syllabus is much more particular with respect to teaching procedures. In spite of formal differences between the art education programs of the two states, the essence is similar. Of particular note is that both states have officially adopted standards and that these standards address similar educational goals. Both documents ultimately intend to declare and ensure standards-based education.

This section consists of three parts: (1) Utah Core analysis, (2) Senior Syllabus analysis, and (3) comparison to Utah Core. It is not possible to compare the documents side-by-side because they are structurally different. Instead, the documents are reviewed independently, with comments throughout; then general aspects of the two documents are compared.

_Utah Core Analysis_

First, the Utah Core (USOE, 2001) is examined. The Utah Core is included as Appendix A of this thesis. The Utah Core has multiple functions: (a) it names and defines courses that may be offered for fine arts graduation credit in Utah; (b) it defines basic goals, standards, objectives, and indicators; and (c) it establishes course portfolios, which adapt standards according to course specificity and serve as official assessment tools. The
Utah State Visual Arts Core (Utah Core) is technically one of four content areas of the Secondary Fine Arts Core, which also includes dance, music, and theatre. The elementary art standards are defined in a separate document, the Elementary Fine Arts Core, which includes objectives and standards through grade six. With respect to USOE regulations, no other official documents exist. At the time of publication, access to all of these documents was available via the USOE Web site (http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us).

Explaining the Utah Core is a cumbersome task. The Core appears simple and consistent but defies organizational logic. The Utah Core contains many discrepancies, inconsistencies, and redundancies. Addressing the Utah Core by its formal constructs would be redundant and confusing. The analysis of the Utah Core is, therefore, approached according to the three main aspects of the document, structure, standards, and assessment. This section is divided into three subsections: (1) Utah Core Structure; (2) Standards, Objectives, and Indicators; and (3) Assessment.

_Utah Core Structure_

The Utah Core consists of two sections: (1) Administrative Overview, and (2) Visual Arts Achievement Portfolios. Basically, the Administrative Overview is a concise explanation of the Utah Core and the Achievement Portfolios are 13 three-page documents for each Core course.
Administrative Overview.

The Administrative Overview is a three-page document entitled Secondary Visual Arts. The overview contains: (a) a list of Core courses, (b) a one-paragraph introduction to the Utah Core, (c) an outline of the four standards and subsequent objectives, and (d) two pages of Core course descriptions, entitled Visual Arts Course Descriptions. The Administrative Overview contains all of the pertinent information expressed in the Utah Core.

First, the Administrative Overview lists the thirteen Core courses: Foundations I (VA 1100), 3-D Design (VA 1110), Printmaking (VA 1130), Drawing (VA 1140), Painting (VA 1150), Jewelry (VA 1160), Photography (VA 1170), Foundations 2 (VA 1200), Art History and Criticism (VA 1210), Ceramics (VA 1220), Sculpture (VA 1230), Film Making (VA 1240), and Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250). All Utah secondary students are required to take fine arts courses for graduation. Visual arts Core courses count toward this requirement. Other visual arts courses may be taught, but are considered elective credits that cannot count toward graduation requirements. Elective courses do not need to meet state standards.

Following the list of courses is a concise introduction to the Utah Core:

The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides the goals of art education into four standards which are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. The standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student through a rich experience with art. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. The individual core courses are
presented in a portfolio format to facilitate student progress and to encourage the support of parents, teachers, and classmates. (USOE, 2001)

This declaration is repeated at the beginning of each Achievement Portfolio, with one addition: “There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art” (USOE, 2001). These basic goals are very similar to the Senior Syllabus basic goals, which are discussed later.

Following this declaration is an outline of Utah visual arts standards and objectives. This outline has been reprinted on the following page (p. 56) as Figure 1. The standards and objectives are explained in detail in the next section of this chapter.

The Administrative Overview of the Utah Core concludes with two pages, entitled Visual Art Course Descriptions. This section contains 13 course explanations, one for each Core course. Each explanation summarizes the course’s purpose and primary media, intended grade level, and prerequisite courses.

*Achievement Portfolios.*

The remainder of the Utah Core document consists of 13 *Visual Arts Achievement Portfolios* (Achievement Portfolios), one for each Core course. According to the Administrative Overview, the primary function of these portfolios is to “facilitate student progress and to encourage the support of parents, teachers, and classmates” (USOE, 2001). Each Achievement Portfolio consists of a title page and a two-page scoring sheet.

The title page displays a header with the course name and blank lines to be used for naming interested parties (such as students and teachers). Below this, the course description that appears in the Administrative Overview is reiterated. Following the
**Standard 1, MAKING**

Students will assemble and create visual art by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

*Objective A*  Explore, understand, refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

*Objective B*  Create visual art using art elements and principles.

**Standard 2, PERCEIVING**

Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating visual art.

*Objective A*  Critique visual art.

*Objective B*  Evaluate visual art.

**Standard 3, EXPRESSING**

Students will create meaning in visual art.

*Objective A*  Create content in visual art.

*Objective B*  Perceive content in visual art.

*Objective C*  Curate visual art ordered by medium and content.

**Standard 4, CONTEXTUALIZING**

Students will find meaning in visual art through settings and other modes of learning.

*Objective A*  Align works of art according to history, geography, and personal experience.

*Objective B*  Synthesize visual art with other educational subjects.

*Objective C*  Evaluate the impact of visual art on life outside of school.

*Figure 1.* Utah State Visual Arts Core standards and objectives.
course description is a brief section entitled *Explanation of Standards*. This explanation briefly addresses (a) the two basic goals; (b) the standards, objectives, and indicators; (c) the use of the scoring sheet; (d) technology requirements; and (e) the names of all Core courses. According to the title page, the scoring sheet is intended as an assessment tool for students and teachers. Basically, the scoring sheets list standards, objectives, and indicators appropriate to each course. The specifics of this are explained in the Assessment section of this chapter.

*Utah Core Standards, Objectives, and Indicators*

The Utah Core visual arts standards are *Making, Perceiving, Expressing,* and *Contextualizing*. Each standard is broken into two or three objectives. Each objective is broken into multiple indicators. Of the 13 Core courses, 11 follow a general pattern of standards and objectives, which is presented in the Administrative Overview. These are reworded to specify media in the Achievement Portfolios. Two courses differ dramatically from the eleven: Film Making uses a different set of standards altogether, and Art History and Criticism uses the same standards, but the interpretation of these standards is different from the studio-based courses. Additionally, the document contains isolated aberrations. The section below assumes the general interpretation of standards, and notes discrepancies. The section concludes by addressing these issues.

*Standard 1, Making.*

Standard 1 of the Utah Core is defined as “Making: Students will assemble and create visual art by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles” (USOE 2001). This statement is adapted to each Achievement Portfolio to emphasize media. For example, the Painting portfolio uses this definition, except that
the term “visual art” is replaced with “paintings.” This pattern is consistent in each
Achievement Portfolio.

techniques and processes in a variety of media,” and, “Objective [2] B: Create visual art
using art elements and principles” (USOE, 2001). Each Achievement Portfolio lists three
performance indicators for Objective [1] A: (1) to experience and control a variety of
media and technology; (2) to select and analyze the expressive potential of specific
media, techniques, and processes; and (3) to practice safe and responsible studio tasks.
Two indicators support Objective [1] B in each folio, one for using art elements, another
for using art principles.

*Standard 2, Perceiving.*

Standard 2 focuses on understanding meaning in art through observation. It is
defined as, “Perceiving: Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and
A: Create content in visual art,” and “Objective [2] B: Evaluate visual art” (USOE, 2001)
Where appropriate, objectives and indicators are reworded to specify media. Objective
[2] A is followed by three indicators, which require students to analyze artwork regarding
the use of elements and principles, to examine the functions of art (specific to media),
and to interpret art of relevant media. Objective [2] B carries two indicators, which direct
students to analyze and compare art using a variety of aesthetic approaches and to
evaluate media-specific art based on technique, elements and principles, fulfillment of
functions, content, expression, and aesthetic merit (USOE, 2001). Both objectives deal
with the critical observation of art, specifically to determine meaning. Objective [2] A
addresses interpretation of art, whereas Objective [2] B specifies art evaluation. In contrast to Standard 1, Standard 2 is more comprehensive in its consideration of content in addition to formal elements.

_Standard 3, Expressing._

Standard 3 of the Utah Core is defined as, “Expressing: Students will create meaning in visual art” (USOE, 2001). The objectives of Standard 3 could have been included in Standards 1 and 2. The Standard 3 objectives pertain to making and perceiving art. This creates a logistical problem, which is necessary to clarify before discussing the objectives.

The Administrative Overview notes three objectives for Standard 3. Of these, Objective [3] A is specific to making art and Objective [3] C is specific to perceiving art. Each Achievement Portfolio, then, omits one of the three objectives. Instead of retaining the original names, objectives are sequentially re-named in each Achievement Portfolio. For example, Art History and Criticism omits the first objective; “Objective B” of the Administrative Overview is thus re-named “Objective A.” Because of this, the objective names are inconsistent between courses and are misleading. Each Achievement Portfolio uses re-named objectives. The below discussion refers to the names of objectives used in the Administrative Overview: “Objective A: Create content in visual art,” “Objective B, Perceive content in works of art,” and “Objective C: Curate visual art ordered by medium and content” (USOE, 2001).

Objective A is present in every Achievement Portfolio, except Art History and Criticism, and Film Making. Objective [3] A uses three indicators. The first indicator is, “Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in works of art” (USOE
2001). The second indicator is “Create works of art that effectively communicate subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content” (USOE 2001). The third indicator is “Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of art media or art elements and principles that express content” (USOE 2001). General terms such as “art media” are redefined to specify media.

Essentially, Objective [3] A is congruent with Standard 1–A, second indicator, and Standard 1–B, indicators one and two. The only distinguishable difference is in the emphasis of meaning versus form, but both of these indicators appear to address the same issue. It is not possible to “create” content without “making,” so by nature Standard [3] A is dependent upon Standard 1. The contrary is not necessarily true, but Standard 1 does obligate that expression be implicated in art making.


Objective [3] C is the only objective that is not represented in the Senior Syllabus, as is discussed later (see Figure 1, p. 56). Objective [3] C has two indicators: “Organize a portfolio according to a purpose, such as mastery of a medium, objectives of [the Utah] Core, or significant content,” and “Exhibit works of art selected by themes [sic] such as
mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content” (USOE, 2001).

Essentially, this objective requires portfolio development and exhibition of artwork.

*Standard 4, Contextualizing*


Objective [4] A indicators also include appropriate historic cultures, which vary according to media. In general, these indicators ask students to use visual characteristics to group artworks into various contexts, to analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on artworks, and to evaluate personal relationships with art from various periods in history.

Objective [4] B indicators call for visual arts to be integrated with dance, music, and theatre, and for exploration of integration across disciplines. This objective encourages visual arts education to be broadened into other subject areas.

The indicators for Objective [4] C require students to consider careers relating to visual arts, sometimes according to specific media, and to predict how art might add to quality of life and lifelong learning. It would be a difficult task to assess art appreciation, which is, perhaps, the reason the Utah Core addresses this in such a narrow manner.

Queensland’s Senior Syllabus includes a third general objective, the *affective*, to address
the importance of this issue. The QSA does not, however, suggest that this objective be assessed in a summative method, and its course structure is written without regarding it.

Exceptions to the general standards and objectives.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, Film Making and Art History and Criticism objectives deviate from an otherwise consistent pattern. Film Making is the most dramatic because it uses entirely different standards: Development, Pre-production, Production, and Post-production (USOE, 2001). The ensuing objectives are specific to film making technology, and relate more to performing arts objectives than visual arts objectives. These standards do not coincide with QSA standards.

The course Art History and Criticism has different objectives and indicators than studio-based courses. For clarity, the following four paragraphs discuss objectives as printed in the Art History and Criticism Achievement Portfolio, not the Administrative Overview. The two studio-based standards, Standard 1, Making and Standard 3, Expressing, make little sense in the context of studying art history. The Utah Core does not grant this, but instead attempts to reinterpret these standards. Standard 1 objectives for Art History and Criticism are “Objective [1] A: Understand techniques and processes in a variety of media,” and “Objective [1] B: Explore how works of art are organized using elements and principles” (USOE, 2001). In both cases, an act of making art has been replaced with an act of art criticism. The ensuing indicators also reflect these changes of action. The effect is that for Art History and Criticism, three of four standards deal implicitly with art observation. It is unclear why the Making standard is broken into objectives that do not involve making anything.
This problem also creates overlap between Standards 1 and 2, between Standards 1 and 3, and between Standards 2 and 3. The clearest example of like objectives between Standards 1 and 2 is Standard 2, Objective A, first indicator, and Standard 1, Objective A, first indicator. These are, “[2, A] Analyze artworks regarding effective use of art elements and principles,” and, “[1, A] Analyze the art elements in architecture, sculpture, painting, and drawing” (USOE, 2001). This is redundant. Furthermore, the objectives state: [1, B] “Explore how works of art are organized using art elements and principles,” and [2, A] “Critique works of art” (USOE, 2001). Clearly the Perceiving objective and indicator assumes the Making objective and indicator as a necessary condition. It would not be possible to critique art according to formal elements without exploring the art in terms of elements and principles. Both actions are explicitly identical, but the Making objective calls for a vague outcome, whereas the Perceiving objective necessitates a specific outcome—it is a step toward interpreting art, not an end itself. Recognition of this ambiguity connotes that it is difficult to categorize art education objectives, because any lines drawn to separate art into distinct entities would often become blurred. Since Queensland and Utah do not place objectives into strictly parallel categories, it is helpful to understand the vagueness of such categories.

Other examples of redundancy in the Art History and Criticism course exist. Many indicators, for instance, deal with analyzing art according to art elements and principles: Standard 1, Objective B, both indicators; Standard 2, Objective A, first indicator; Standard 2–B, third indicator; and Standard 3, Objective A, third indicator (see Appendix A, the complete Utah Core). Standard 1, Objective A, second indicator,
“Analyze the expressive potential of art media, techniques, and processes,” is inseparable from Standard 3, Objective A and its indicators.

The case of overlapping objectives and indicators, which is present among studio objectives and especially art history objectives, exists because the four categories are not of the same essence. Standard 1, Making, is physical; Standard 2, Perceiving, is analytical; Standard 3, Expressing, is a product of physical and philosophical exertions. Thus, sometimes what should be different objectives are reduced to nuances. In the case of the QSA Senior Syllabus, expression is considered within its two general objectives, Making and Appraising. Context, the Utah Core’s fourth standard, is also factored into these two objectives.

Assessment

The Utah Core is brief in its mention of assessment. The title pages of Achievement Portfolios read,

A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied. (USOE, 2001)

Achievement Portfolios are meant to “encourage the support of parents, teachers, and classmates” (USOE, 2001). Within the assessment legend, one box exists to record the average of the scores that are paired with objectives, and a second box for recording the percentage of indicators studied by the class. Thus, the Assessment Portfolios are actually rating scales that address objectives. These presumably complement an unspecified body of student work over the duration of a semester (the standard length of each Core course).
The Utah Core does not specify what curricula should be used to teach standards, nor does it mention what type of work is to be assessed.

This is the extent of the Achievement Portfolios and the conclusion of Utah Core. According to Carol Goodson, Fine Arts Specialist, Curriculum and Instruction of the USOE (personal communication, December 4, 2003), the Utah Core was designed to be accessible, open, and most of all usable. Because of its simplicity, several aspects of art education have not been addressed in the Utah Core, such as curriculum and assessment expectations. These issues are confronted in the conclusion of this section, which compares the similarities and differences, the strengths and weaknesses, and the educational implications of the Utah Core and the Senior Syllabus. The conclusion is preceded by an extensive analysis of the QSA Senior Syllabus, which is included in its entirety as Appendix B.

**Senior Syllabus Analysis**

Major differences in structure and purpose exist between the Utah Core and Senior Syllabus. The provisions for accomplishing general art education goals differ between the documents. In comparing the documents, it was necessary not only to compare state standards but also to evaluate fully the Senior Syllabus. The fact that QSA holds schools accountable to curricula and learning outcomes is reflected in its primary visual arts education document, which necessitates a much more expansive and comprehensive document than the Utah Core. Every section of the Senior Syllabus is integral to Queensland’s art education program, which alone is cause for investigation. It was also important to analyze the differences between the Utah Core and the Senior Syllabus to recognize disparity between the states’ philosophies and mandates. Finally,
all aspects of both documents needed to be considered in order to determine and appraise
disparity between the states and to evaluate the effectiveness of each government’s role
in secondary visual arts education as expressed in its official documents. Figure 2 of this
thesis, located on the following page (p. 67), compares the schema of both documents: (a)
the hierarchy and sequence of components and (b) the information flow between the
documents, teachers, and students.

*Purpose of the Senior Syllabus*

First, the purpose of the Senior Syllabus is to provide a specific guideline to teachers.
This is necessary because curricula and assessment are evaluated by QSA according to
these guidelines. The Senior Syllabus attempts to establish curricular freedom by
expressing guidelines that communicate what is expected and where teachers have
freedom. In Queensland, schools develop unique, comprehensive two-year programs that
ideally integrate a variety of media and learning tasks and capitalize on the contextual
strengths of individual schools. In Utah, on the other hand, the USOE defines specific
courses, which are mostly studio-based according to a specific medium (modal). This
model reflects the longstanding modal tradition in the United States at the secondary and
post-secondary levels. In terms of *what* is to be taught, the QSA offers its schools more
freedom and possibilities, although the guidelines are greater in number.

Queensland places greater emphasis on *how* to achieve standards than Utah. The
Utah Core reports that standards are derived from its two basic goals, *creating meaning
in art* and *perceiving meaning in art*. In contrast, the Senior Syllabus general objectives
*Making* and *Appraising* are integrated with the teaching and learning procedures,
Figure 2. Comparison of information flow between state governments, teachers, and students, according to the USOE (Utah) Core and the QSA (Queensland) Senior Syllabus.
developing, researching, and resolving. These procedures, defined in the Rationale, “focus on knowledge and understanding as being actively constructed by learners” (QBSSSS, 2000a). While the general goals are comparable, the Senior Syllabus demands specific procedures and outcomes.

Assessment and curriculum are also integral parts of the art education system in Queensland. QSA requires its schools to submit work programs and verification folios for evaluation. A work program is basically a two-year curriculum map and assessment strategy, which follows the precise format of the Senior Syllabus, and a verification folio is a student’s assessed two-year portfolio. The details of these and other aspects of the Senior Syllabus are discussed later in this section. Utah, as previously mentioned, does not assess its schools’ curricula, assessment models, or assessment outcomes.

QSA and USOE also express different demands regarding assessment of student work. In the case of Utah, the Achievement Portfolios are offered as uncomplicated assessment tools that directly relate to standards. The Utah Core does not specify how objectives should be achieved, how they should be assessed, what types of assessments should be used, or what products should be represented in a student portfolio. In fact, the Utah Core does not even recommend that the Achievement Portfolios be used for evaluative purposes, but rather to “facilitate progress” (USOE, 2001). The QSA requires teachers to submit copies of student portfolios, and these verification folios “must provide sufficient material to validate judgments made regarding the interim level of achievement,” according to section 6.6, Requirements for verification folios [underlined to distinguish as a title] (QBSSSS, 2000a). These requirements are lengthy and specific; the specifics of verification folios are detailed in this section. The Senior Syllabus also
furnishes a rubric of assessment criteria and performance benchmarks in subsection 6.5.1 (Table 8), Minimum standards associated with exit criteria [underlined to distinguish as a title], and provides assessment overview examples and a template in the Senior Syllabus Appendixes.

**Senior Syllabus Components**

Before discussing the Senior Syllabus components, three notes must be mentioned. First, section titles are not capitalized, italicized, or underlined in the Senior Syllabus, which could be confusing to North Americans. For clarity, these titles are underlined in this thesis (except in thesis headers). For consistency, all single-word Senior Syllabus titles are also underlined. This also helps to distinguish Senior Syllabus titles from Utah Core titles. Second, the term “Visual Art” is used in the Senior Syllabus as the title of the QSA Authority (core) subject, and “visual art” is used in some sections of the Utah Core. In discussing the field of art, the term “visual arts” is usually used in the United States and is consequently used in this thesis when discussing the field in general. Versions of the term are used in this thesis as they are printed in documents. Third, Australian spellings, which may differ from United States form have been maintained.

The structures of the core documents differ tremendously. Whereas the Utah Core is structurally simple, the Senior Syllabus is expansive. While the first page of the Utah Core Administrative Overview summarizes the entire document, the Senior Syllabus contains several sections that sequentially emerge. First, three one-page sections present an overview of Senior Syllabus, its goals and objectives, and the processes that are used to structure teaching and learning. These three sections, 1, **Rationale**, 2, **Global aims**, and
3, **General objectives**, relate closely to the Utah Core Administrative Overview and are explored in detail. Following this are two short sections: 4, **Course organisation**, explains the appropriate contents for a two-year course study, and 5, **Learning experiences**, provides possible general assignment ideas for teachers, as well as media-specific ideas. The next section, 6, **Assessment**, is much more specific, broader, and deeper than Utah Core Achievement Portfolios. Section 7, **Work program requirements**, is a guideline for individual schools. A work program is technically a school’s individual and detailed interpretation of the Senior Syllabus and must meet the strict requirements that are presented in this section. Each school is required to submit a work program to the government for evaluation. The final sections are 8, **Educational equity**, and 9, **Resources**, followed by **Appendix 1**, which is a series of examples, and **Appendix 2**, which is a series of templates.

Beyond the difference in number of structural components, the structural manner in which goals are explained is different between the two models. In the Utah Core, the general objectives and standards are defined precisely and concisely in outline format within the Administrative Overview. QSA outlines general objectives and criteria in early sections of its Senior Syllabus, but reserves other standards for specific sections throughout the document. Because schools in Queensland individually define courses, curricula, and assessment, certain learning criteria are locally defined. These criteria must be established according to specific guidelines, which are declared in their respective sections of the syllabus. Once these criteria are defined, they become standards.
Section 1, rationale.

As previously stated, the first few sections of the Senior Syllabus are similar to the Administrative Overview of the Utah Core. Section 1, Rationale, parallels, but is lengthier than the introductory paragraph of the Utah Core. In the rationale, several key terms are mentioned along with two of three general objectives, Making and Appraising, and the teaching and learning processes of researching, developing, and resolving. This overview is followed by two paragraphs that explain the Making and Appraising objectives. A footnote briefly references the seven Key Competencies, which can be referred to in the 1997 QSA document entitled Integrating the Key Competencies into the Assessment and Reporting of Student Achievement in Senior Secondary Schools in Queensland (as cited in QSA, 2000). These serve as the foundation for all curricula in Queensland. Six of the seven key competencies, excluding KC4, are incorporated into the two aforementioned objectives; these six competencies are also meant to be assessed, according to section 6.5 Assessment of the syllabus. The key competencies are listed in this footnote as: KC1: collecting, analyzing and organising information; KC2: communicating ideas and information; KC3: planning and organising activities; KC4: working with others and in teams; KC5: using mathematical ideas and techniques; KC6: solving problems; KC7: using technology.

Section 2, global aims.

The next section is 2, Global aims. There are nine global aims listed; according to section 7.1 of the syllabus, Components of a work program, global aims are “long-term achievements, attitudes and values…which are not directly assessed by the school” (QBSSSSS, 2000a). The global aims of “evolving a personal aesthetic,” and “develop an
interest in diverse philosophies and methodologies” (QBSSSS, 2000a) are exempt from the Utah Core. This is partial evidence that the mandate of the Senior Syllabus is more personal and more concept-oriented in its approach than the Utah Core. The remaining global aims address Making and Appraising art, problem solving, exploration and exploitation of art materials, social awareness, aesthetic understanding, acknowledgement of artists’ roles in society, and life-long learning—all of which are alluded to in the Utah Core. Because the global aims are not assessable, and because they are not schematically positioned anywhere in the hierarchy of Senior Syllabus mandates, they have been omitted from the Figure 2 diagram (see p. 66).

Section 3, general objectives.

Perhaps the most important section of the Senior Syllabus to this comparison is 3, General objectives. As mentioned earlier, the general objectives and ensuing criteria are closely related to the standards and objectives of the Utah Core. Each of the three objectives is explained in detail. This section also discusses the teaching and learning processes. Together, the objectives and processes are the foundation for the entire Queensland secondary visual arts education system. All curricula and assessment evolve from this two-page section.

Queensland defines three general objectives: 1. Making, 2. Appraising, and 3. Affective (QBSSSS, 2000a). Each of these objectives is explained in paragraph form. The affective objective is concerned with “attitudes, values and feelings” (QBSSSS, 2000a), and should not be assessed for summative purposes. The two assessable objectives of Making and Appraising are broken into measurable criteria. These criteria are defined in section 6.4 as exit criteria. Objective 1. Making is divided into the criteria of visual
literacy and application. Objective 2. *Appraising* translates to the criterion of the same name. For the purpose of this thesis, wherever the term “standard” is used in a generic sense, it refers to a measurable criterion. Thus, the assessable “standards” are the Utah Core objectives and the Senior Syllabus exit criteria. Unlike the Utah Core, which clearly defines its standards (objectives), the Senior Syllabus standards (exit criteria) are written in paragraph form and bullets, making their specific contents more difficult to isolate.

Basically, visual literacy involves communicating meaning in art through teaching and learning processes, problem solving, elements and principles of art, and context. Application entails communicating meaning in art through teaching and learning processes and through exploration and use of art materials. Appraising requires students to determine and communicate meaning by responding to analysis and synthesis of information according to context, concept, and media. Table 4 of this thesis, located on the following page (p. 74), identifies where Utah Core objectives intersect with the Senior Syllabus criteria and acknowledges the rare instances where the two documents’ standards do not overlap. In general, the documents define comparable standards in terms of content. It is clear that the QSA and the USOE have established very similar goals pertaining to learning outcomes in secondary visual arts.

The other main part of section 3 refers to the three teaching and learning processes. “The interrelated processes of researching, developing and resolving are central to this syllabus and are used to structure teaching and learning in *Making* and *Appraising*. The three processes are viewed as non-hierarchical and non-sequential” (QBSSSS, 2000a). Figure 1 of the Senior Syllabus (not Figure 1 of this thesis) illustrates
Table 4

*Comparability of Visual Arts Standards In Utah and Queensland*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah Core</th>
<th>1. Making</th>
<th>2. Appraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Literacy</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Making</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective A</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective B</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceiving</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective A</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective B</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expressing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective A</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective B</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective C</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contextualizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective A</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective B</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Objective C</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Expressing, objective C of the Utah Core, which pertains to curating artwork, is not represented in the Senior Syllabus criteria. Certain aspects of the Queensland criteria are not expressed in the Utah Core with exact language, namely the teaching and learning processes of researching, developing, and resolving.
the relationship of these three processes and explains their purposes. In developing, students are required to generate solutions to art problems; in researching, students are required to react to stimuli; and in resolving, students are required to communicate ideas with visual or linguistic responses. The included chart defines many actions by which each of these might be accomplished.

Section 4, course organisation.

Section 4, Course organisation, contains subsections that pertain to (a) course structure and content and (b) unit structure and content. The work programs that Queensland schools are responsible for developing include course overviews and subsequent units. A course of study is a two-year program comprised of sequential units, which together provide students with a learning continuum. A course of study is structured so that in Year 11, students study a broad array of topics, then for Year 12, students declare an area of specialization. Each unit, then, is comprised of three parts: concepts, focuses, and media areas. Section 4 provides several tools to assist schools in developing course overviews and units. Schools are required to submit work programs to the QSA, and the expectation is that course overviews will meet the stringent content and format guidelines outlined in this section. The Utah Core does not mandate course content, nor does the USOE require schools to report curricula; however, the Utah Core does define Core courses, which narrows and partially defines curricular possibilities. Figure 1 of this thesis (see p. 55) expresses the sources of curricula, the relationships of curricular components to each other, and the implementation of curricula, for both states. QSA work programs are discussed in detail later in this section, in which the relation of Senior Syllabus components is further clarified.
The first subsection, 4.2.1, **Framework for a course of study**, describes the three areas that constitute a unit, concepts, focuses, and media areas. Concepts are unit organizers that incorporate the *Making* and *Appraising* objectives and guide student learning. Concepts can be based on themes or media. Focuses define responses to concepts and should over the duration of a course of study, progress from entirely teacher-directed to entirely student-directed. Media areas define specific art disciplines; students should be given the opportunity to explore a variety of media areas over the course of study, and media areas should not be used to limit possibilities. The media areas are similar to Core courses, except that they are not defined as exclusive courses. Some media areas are absent from the Utah Core: environmental design, fibre arts, installation, performance art, product design, and costume and stage design. Other media areas coincide with Utah Core courses: ceramics, drawing, electronic imaging, graphic design, painting, photographic arts, printmaking, sculpture, and video and film. A few courses from the Utah Core are not represented among these media areas: Foundations 1 and 2, Jewelry, 3-D Design, and Art History and Criticism. Of the typical course offering content and media, only two Utah Core courses are absent, 3-D Design, which is usually taught in Utah as a crafts class, and Jewelry. The others disciplines are assumed into the general objectives and course structure of the Senior Syllabus.

In comparing the concept of integrated media areas to the modal tradition of isolating media disciplines, and comparing the Queensland media areas themselves to Utah Core courses, it seems clear that Queensland values a more contemporary approach to art. Section 5.3, **Learning experiences in the media areas**, bolsters this claim. This section describes the learning possibilities particular to media areas and is similar in form
to the Utah Core explanation of Core courses, which is expressed in the Administrative Overview. An example of differences in media descriptions is the two explanations of painting. Queensland’s painting media area suggests consideration of “conventional and unconventional media such as water-based and oil-based paints, inks, substances of varying viscosity, fluidity and plasticity on grounds and supports such as canvas, paper, wood, masonite, metal, glass, plastic, leather, plaster, gesso, glue, etc” (QBSSSSS, 2000a). Utah, in contrast, declares, “Painting includes wet media with processes such as transparent and opaque painting and focuses on the operations of color” (USOE, 2001). While the Utah Core does not forbid new exploration of media, it does not promote it. Furthermore, all of Utah’s courses relate to traditional media, whereas the Queensland courses include such contemporary domains as installation and performance art. Art News recently published an article on the topic of art education (referring to B.F.A. programs in America) that addressed the issue of emerging media. Columnist Gail Greg (2003) writes,

Gone is the time when a foundation sculpture class would have seen [New York’s School of Visual Arts students] modeling the figure or making plaster casts.

Instead, video, installation, site-specific, earth, conceptual, and performance art have been grafted onto the sculpture syllabi of some of the most prestigious art programs in the nation. A number of schools have even eradicated departmental divisions—an acknowledgement of the increasingly heterogeneous, fluid career paths of many visual artists. (p. 106)

Some top art schools in the United States, namely Yale and the Rhode Island School of Design, still maintain (modal) departments, and these schools value progressive concept over progressive media approach. The debate in the arena of higher education has not
been settled and certainly the implications toward secondary education cannot at this point be reasonably defined. What cannot be debated is that the QSA approach to visual arts is more current than the USOE approach, with respect to course structure and integration of contemporary and emerging media.

Section 4.1.2 also includes Table 2: The features of a two-year course of study, which summarizes and offers abbreviated examples of the basic components of a course overview. Essentially, this table includes one column to summarize the three unit components and two subsequent columns that identify features of both years within the three components. Section 4.1.3, Sample course overviews, refers to Appendix 1 of the Senior Syllabus, in which two sample course outlines and ensuing sample units are provided. The course overviews in the Appendix are in table format and divide the course structure into semesters and semesters into two and three units. The two sample course overviews address different hypothetical school situations, to exemplify that courses of study ought to consider the unique situations of schools.

This information is reiterated in the following section, 4.2, Units of work. A list of instructions is presented in this section to assist teachers in designing units. In addition to basic information, which emphasizes that units should be interrelated and sequentially cumulative, three main clusters are offered. First, teachers should consider the context of individual schools in terms of resources and facilities, student aptitudes and interests, and teacher expertise. Second, units should introduce concepts through diverse philosophies, artworks, and art making tasks. Third, teachers should provide students with many engaging opportunities, along the lines of learning experiences, conceptual approaches that challenge the status quo of visual arts, problem identification and solving, decision
making, art criticism, multiple contexts, depth of media exploration, and a range of assessment tools (QBSSSS, 2000a). Essentially, units should be uniquely tailored to the appropriateness of individual schools, sequential, and should expose art students to the greatest possible breadth and depth of information and approaches.

Section 5, learning experiences.

The next section dissects units into unit activities. Section 5, Learning experiences, provides teachers with activities that have been designed according to key competencies, general objectives, and teaching and learning processes. Section 5.1, Learning experiences in making, furnishes a table (Table 2 of the Senior Syllabus) of nine distinct experiences each year in which students could participate. These activities include such themes as research and documentation, exposure and reaction to social issues, media exploration, exploration of visual elements, and translation of ideas into art. Section 5.1.1, Quantitative concepts and skills, outlines mathematical skills and concepts that might intersect visual arts curricula. Section 5.2, Learning experiences in appraising, first mentions that language education is the responsibility of all teachers. It should be noted that integration of math and English into other subject areas is encouraged by the USOE, and that Utah Core objectives specify integration of other subjects.

Section 5.2 of the Senior Syllabus reveals that the Appraising objective and criterion is most often met through writing, which necessitates fluency in visual art discourse. Students, in discussing art, should express familiarity with appropriate vocabulary and terminology, proper grammar and punctuation, accepted reference conventions, and assessment language and instruments. Table 3 of the Senior Syllabus, Suggested ways of developing students’ facility with language, offers potential sources of
information, purposes for using language, and ways of presenting information. Table 4 of the Senior Syllabus, *Appraising learning experiences in which students could participate*, mimics Table 2 of subsection 5.1, in the context of discussing, not making, art.

The remaining section, 5.3, *Learning experiences in the media areas*, presents information about each of the media areas. This section is similar to the last two pages of the Utah Core Administrative Overview. Unlike the course descriptions of the Utah Core, however, section 5.3 expresses specific ways in which media areas might be explored. Within each area, an extensive list of possibilities that includes art materials and types of art products is discussed. The above example that compares the Senior Syllabus and Utah Core definitions of painting qualifies this point.

*Section 6, assessment.*

The last fundamental section of the Senior Syllabus is 6, *Assessment*. This section is divided into six subsections. Assessment is a decisive aspect of the syllabus for three reasons. First, assessment is considered an integral aspect of education in Queensland that not only results in summative evaluation, but also assists and increases learning. Assessment provides feedback to all interested parties during and at the end of a course of study. Several areas of the Senior Syllabus that have previously been mentioned demonstrate the QSA emphasis on assessment, which the opening paragraphs of this section reiterate. Second, assessment establishes the level of achievement of students, with respect to standards. The introduction to section 6 begins, “The purpose of assessment is to make judgments about how well students meet the general objectives of the course” (QBSSSS, 2000a). Specific information on how teachers should use
assessment for evaluative purposes is detailed in section 6.5, **Determining exit levels of achievement**. At the end of a course of study, students are ultimately graded and receive certification when the proper exit criteria are met. The third reason assessment is a critical element of the Senior Syllabus is that assessment outcomes are evaluated by the state to determine the level of standards achieved by students and to ensure consistent and fair evaluation among schools. Every school submits samples of art products that have been scored; the panel to which these examples are submitted determines if any teachers are unable to assess student work accurately. This practice is consistent with all subjects, to ensure that all schools award the same grades for comparable achievement. Reporting of assessment outcomes also communicates student achievement to the QSA.

To begin with, section 6 introduces the fundamentals of Queensland secondary visual arts assessment. The three main points of this section are (a) that assessment is standards-based, (b) that formative assessment is necessary and beneficial, and (c) that summative assessment is necessary and beneficial. Each of these is concisely explained.

Section 6.1, **Underlying principles of exit assessment**, explains six principles that QSA mandates. All six principles must be considered together when developing an assessment program and must be considered in summative assessments. These principles are named and defined in the following manner: (1) **Mandatory aspects of the syllabus** states that achievement of general objectives must be included in exit assessments. (2) **Significant aspects of the course of study** notes that unit concepts, that are developed contextually and according to general objectives, must be assessed. (3) **Continuous assessment** asserts that assessment pertaining to objectives needs to occur and be recorded on student profiles at suitable intervals and cannot be based on just one project.
(4) *Fullest and latest* builds on the previous clause, declaring that assessment should span the parameters of the objectives, and that recent achievement within the two years must be considered. (5) *Selective updating* notes that as tasks become more complex, new evaluation must be used to update scores, rather than being averaged into the existing score. (6) *Balance* indicates that each of the three exit criteria must be given equal credence over the course of study, but not necessarily within semesters or units.

The next section, 6.2, *Planning an assessment program*, explains the components that a long-term assessment strategy must contain. Each of the components is highlighted and referenced according to which section of the syllabus, if any, explains them. These are: general objectives (3), learning experiences (5), principles of assessment (6.1), assessment techniques (6.3), conditions under which assessment will be implemented, exit criteria and standards (6.5), verification folio requirements (6.6), and consideration as to the minimum amount of assessment necessary to determine achievement. Section 6.2.1, *Special consideration*, addresses the issue of special needs students, and refers teachers to the appropriate QSA document. To be effective, the QSA requires special needs assessment to be considered in advance, not as an afterthought.

Section 6.3, *Assessment in making and appraising*, addresses a considerable amount of information. 6.3.1, *Techniques, instruments and tasks*, defines the components of assessable assignments, or tasks. Techniques are assessment strategies and are part of assessment instruments. Assessment instruments are common assessment tools, such as journals, essays, and critiques that are developed by schools and are used to frame assessment tasks. Assessment tasks are responses to assessment instruments. Thus, students receive assessment tools in advance, the expectations of which teachers must
explain. Teachers are required to equip students with the necessary means for completing tasks by teaching information; by explaining assignments, guidelines, and exit criteria; and by identifying the conditions of the tasks.

Subsections 6.3.2, *Making tasks*, and 6.3.3, *Appraising tasks*, describe and give examples of possible tasks for each of the two assessable objectives. *Making* tasks could include media or idea exploration, interpreting concepts, or responses to stimuli. A work is considered *resolved* when it meets the criteria required by the task due to research and development. Table 5 of the Senior Syllabus, *Characteristics of resolved work in making*, describes the typical qualities of resolved work in *Making* for Year 11 and Year 12. The indicators describe a completed work that demonstrates personal aesthetic, knowledge, media proficiency, research, problem solving, and completion. The syllabus also mentions that borrowing images is acceptable when they are put into a new context and are not culturally sensitive. *Appraising* tasks may reference *Making* activities, demonstrate knowledge of concepts and media, produce relevant information on an art-related topic, critique art, or show a reconsideration of a particular stance. *Appraising* products could be lengthy essays (800–1000 words), oral presentations, or objective tests. Examples of complete assessments are suggested in Table 6 in section 6.3.4 of the syllabus, *Examples of technique, instrument and task*.

Sections 6.4, *Exit criteria*, and 6.5, *Determining exit levels of achievement*, qualify and quantify the three exit criteria that are derived from the general objectives of *Making* and *Appraising*. In a mode similar to section 3, the exit standards of visual literacy, application, and appraising are reiterated in section 6.4. The section to follow explains the culmination of assessment components: For each of the three exit criteria,
schools must establish five exit standards. These standards are not to be confused with the generic term of the same name, which is used in this thesis to refer to measurable learning outcomes. Here, the term is used to describe a level of achievement (LOA). The term LOA is the common term for an exit grade in a core course. LOAs may be represented by letters A–E, or more often by acronyms representing achievement. From highest achievement to lowest, these are: Very High Achievement [VHA or A], High Achievement [HA or B], Sound Achievement [SA or C], Limited Achievement [LA or D], and Very Limited Achievement [VLA or E]. For each of these evaluation marks, three descriptors must be identified. In order to achieve a particular mark for a given criterion, a student must accomplish two of the three descriptors and the third descriptor must not be one level lower or better. For example, if two HA level descriptors are met, and the other descriptor is met at SA level, HA is awarded; if the final descriptor is met at a VLA level, LA is awarded for that criterion. Table 7 of the syllabus, Minimum requirements for exit levels, diagrams this policy, and Table 8 of section 6.5.1, Minimum standards associated with exit criteria, provides a standards matrix, which is a comprehensive analytic scoring rubric. Exit grades are carefully calculated and scrutinized, and carry great importance. Chapter 4 addresses the implication of grades and other measures used by QSA to indicate student achievement and accordingly rank students.

Finally, section 6 closes with 6.6, Requirements for verification folios. As illustrated in Figure 2 of this thesis (see p. 67), verification folios are comprised of assessment instruments, and accompanying student work, and then submitted in October (the end of the school year) to QSA. Every summative assessment tool used must be
included in a verification folio, among which several criteria that constitute “sufficient material” must be met. These criteria are: two Year 12 examples of summative assessment of the three exit criteria; two to four different resolved Making artworks; two to four Appraising responses, of which two must be written, and one of those must be of significant length (800–1200 words); task sheets that include assessment instruments, student responses, and the grade awarded; photographs of any three-dimensional work; hard copies of any electronic media; written summarization of any oral presentations; and a completed student profile (QBSSSS, 2000a). Appendix 2 of the Senior Syllabus presents a student profile template, the characteristics of which are bulleted in subsection 6.6.1, Sample student profile. Schools are free to use this format or develop their own, provided the key elements are represented. These elements include: unit and concept titles, tasks by semester, standards (levels of performance) achieved per criterion and per task, indication of tasks that are included in verification folios, and the interim level of achievement.

Section 7, work program requirements.

Section 7 of the syllabus, Work program requirements, outlines the guidelines for schools to use in creating a work program. A work program, as stated previously, is a school’s interpretation or adaptation of the Senior Syllabus. In addition to the contents described in the syllabus, a work program must also explain how the program will be implemented, must be more detailed and specific that the Senior Syllabus, and must address the unique needs and situation of the individual school and students. Section 7.1, Components of a work program, explains the requirements for each section of a work
program. Many of the existing materials may or must be copied directly from the Senior Syllabus, while other sections may or must be specifically tailored to the school situation.

Following is a brief explanation of what is required. A Table of Contents must be included. The Rationale may be copied from the syllabus, with pertinent information added. Global aims and General objectives must be copied directly from the syllabus. The Course organisation section must include a course overview, for which the template provided in Appendix 2 of the syllabus may be used, and must include two sample units, one from each year, and two assessment tasks, one Making and one Appraising. Specific details are provided. Learning experiences should follow the guidelines of section 5 of the syllabus, and must satisfy legal health and safety requirements, which are explained in 7.1.1 Workplace Health and Safety. For assessment, three things are needed, an assessment overview, for which an example in Appendix 1 of the Senior Syllabus is provided, a student profile as previously discussed, and a determination of exit levels of achievement. Section 6 should be considered in making these decisions. Section 8, Educational equity, should be consulted, and for this section schools may generate their own statements or may use the existing statement. Finally, resources must be indicated in unit overviews.

Sections 8 and 9.

As mentioned, sections 8 and 9 respectively deal with the topics of equity and resources, and with Appendixes 1 and 2 conclude the contents of the Senior Syllabus. It is worth mentioning that section 9, Resources, offers an extensive list of resources to teachers in a variety of art-related areas, including Web sites, books, businesses, videos,
and more. Work programs do not include a list of resources; these are provided to benefit teachers.

_Utah Core and Senior Syllabus Comparison._

Having explored the contents of the two documents, they may readily be compared. Both documents contain aspects that are not present in the other document. These differences mark the strengths and weaknesses of each document, which are now discussed. Some of these are arbitrary and debatable while others are fairly objective. Five factors are compared between the Utah Core and the Senior Syllabus. These factors are (1) document contents, (2) standards, (3) curriculum, (4) assessment, and (5) accountability.

_Comparison of Document Contents_

First, the two documents’ formats are compared. The Utah Core is concise, neat, and simple. The Senior Syllabus is expansive, thorough, and complex. These formats reflect the purposes of the two documents. The Senior Syllabus explains every aspect of secondary visual arts education according to the precise form that teachers must follow. The Utah Core was devised as a readily usable document that teachers will be more likely to use than previous documents. The Utah Core is easy to follow. Standards are clearly defined and categorized and have been adapted to each Core course in manageable indicators. The layout of the Utah Core is appealing. The downside to this is twofold: (a) the objectives are vague in many cases and (b) the compartmentalized categories do not make sense.

The Senior Syllabus, conversely, could be considered too complicated. Although all aspects of the syllabus work together, the document is cumbersome. For example, the
exit criteria that stem from the general objectives are not clarified until late in the
document in an unrelated section and, for that matter, it seems dubious that two
objectives are broken down into just three measurable criteria. The strength of the
Queensland document, however, is its diligence. In order to achieve the result of
completely aligned art programs, a document of this magnitude is perhaps necessary.

Comparison of Standards

Second, the standards of the two states are revisited. It has already been
determined that Utah and Queensland have similar measurable standards. Table 4 of this
thesis (see p. 74) confirms this conclusion. This is the most critical comparison to this
thesis, because it establishes that the fundamental goals of both states are alike. From
here, the two documents and student outcomes can be analyzed to determine the
advantages and disadvantages of the two systems.

Comparison of Curriculum

The third area of comparison is curricula. Each program recognizes media that the
other does not; Utah defines Jewelry and 3-D Design (craft), whereas Queensland
acknowledges media areas of environmental design, costume and stage design, fibre arts,
installation, performance art, and product design. In general, Queensland has accepted
contemporary and emerging media while Utah has not. As noted, further evidence of this
is found in the Core course descriptions of the Utah Core Administrative Overview and in
the “media areas” explanation of subsection 4.1.2 of the Senior Syllabus.

Beyond course description, Queensland repeatedly encourages exploration of
media and concept and clearly focuses more on problem solving and development of
ideas. Utah standards call for exploration, novelty, and unique constructs also, but
development of ideas is omitted. The Utah Core places little emphasis on concept and no emphasis on combined, unusual, or emerging media. Conceptually, more weight is granted by the Senior Syllabus. Another difference in curricular content is specific art disciplines. Utah Core courses are, by nature, studio-based, although the Utah Core lists in its course descriptions that the disciplines of aesthetics, art criticism, and art history be incorporated. The extent and manifestation of these disciplines are not elaborated. The Senior Syllabus focuses more on writing, and encourages tasks that will not be included for evaluative purposes. These issues are subject to debate.

Another aspect of curriculum is freedom. Queensland clearly offers more freedom to its schools in terms of media and a more postmodern approach, but rigidly defines the microstructure of courses. Utah, on the other hand, does very little to specify curriculum or course structure except that it defines courses by mode. This allows teachers curricular freedom within a particular medium. Both states offer considerable curricular freedom, but with certain restrictions. Utah strictly defines course offerings, while Queensland defines form more strictly.

Next, curricular direction is considered. The freedom of the Utah Core comes at the expense of curricular direction. Nothing is specified as to how standards should be met. Aside from the standards themselves and course descriptions, nothing is mentioned in the Utah Core about curriculum. Course descriptions mention aesthetics, art criticism, and art history, but no elaboration exists. For Queensland, considerable guidance is given in the form of explanation, sequential guidelines, and examples. In terms of the abovementioned curricular issues, the Senior Syllabus is much more adequate than the Utah Core. The final section of resources in the Senior Syllabus is also advantageous.
The most important aspect of curriculum to this thesis is how state standards are addressed. The Senior Syllabus strictly defines how curricula are to be written and requires standards to be fully integrated. According to the Utah Core, it is not clear how curricula should stem from state standards, only that they should. By breaking standards into course-specific indicators, the issue is somewhat clarified. The other factor in this equation is accountability, which is discussed below in great detail. Aside from accountability, Queensland offers more assistance in writing standards-based curricula, but from a theoretical standpoint, both states fully demand that curricula be written for the purpose of achieving adopted standards.

**Comparison of Assessment**

Fourth, assessment is analyzed. Utah provides user-friendly assessment tools that also passively define course-specific standards, which allude to curricular needs. These instruments are easy to use and straightforward, even though no explanation as to how they should be used is given. One problem with the Achievement Portfolios is that objectives are scored on a ten-point platform, which assessment experts would consider poor practice because of lack of precision in defining anchors. In fact, no distinction is offered for the 0–6 range defined as “Novice” (USOE, 2001). Greater concerns exist, however. These assessment tools are recommended only to “facilitate progress,” and nowhere else does the Utah Core mention assessment. The lack of consideration for assessment theory in the Utah Core is a serious problem. What the Achievement Portfolios do require to be assessed, however, are the standards. The assessments are poor instruments, but they are standards-based.
In contrast, the Senior Syllabus provides an extensive section for developing long-term assessment strategies and specific assessment instruments. The syllabus stresses assessment-based instructional tasks, and the assessments must stem directly from standards. Formative assessment and summative assessment are emphasized, and work programs must address a variety of assessment tools. Students must become familiar with assessment terminology, and all assignments should be completed according to what will be assessed. In terms of best practices in assessment, and assessment theory in general, the Senior Syllabus is the superior document. Also, accountability is an issue with assessment, because without accountability, there can be no guarantee that standards are assessed, or hence that standards are achieved.

**Comparison of Accountability**

The final factor of comparison is accountability. Because Utah does not hold schools accountable to curricula, there is no guarantee that curricula follow state standards. Without standards accountability, aggregate grades cannot be justified either. USOE provides no indication of how grades reflect performance. The only accountability measure currently provided in Utah is that fine arts graduation credit is limited to Core course specification. According to anonymous members of USOE, it is likely that in some cases non-Core courses are purposefully taught under the names of Core courses so that students illegally receive graduation credit. This would not be possible if curricular accountability existed. Therefore, it is clear that the accountability efforts of the USOE (a) cannot ensure that all schools are addressing state standards in curricula, (b) cannot ensure that students are achieving standards, and (c) cannot ensure comparability or validity of assessment practices or grades.
QSA requires schools to submit curricula and assessment plans and tools as part of their work programs, and eventually student verification folios must be submitted, which confirms that work programs are implemented. The submission and authorized evaluation of these documents promises adequacy and consistency among curricula, assessment tools, and student grades, according to state adopted standards.

In summary, three things were confirmed: First, Utah and Queensland have adopted similar secondary visual arts standards, which schools are required to implement and assess. Second, Utah has no accountability measures to ensure that standards are implemented or assessed. Third, Queensland seems to have created a system that effectively eliminates the possibility of this dilemma. Therefore, it appears that USOE could be strengthened by adopting statewide accountability measures. This would not be an easy task. Also, according to the USOE, the notion of imposing accountability measures was recently discussed and was rejected according to the presumption that Utah art teachers would strongly oppose the idea. This raised two questions: does it matter that art teachers might be angered at the idea of being held accountable to standards (in the same manner as teachers of other core subjects), and, if so, has Queensland attempted to resolve such issues? This could only be determined through further research, which involved investigating QSA procedures, interviewing teachers, students, and administrators, evaluating the actual student products, and observing actual classroom situations. Research was conducted in Queensland to fulfill the mission of this thesis.
CHAPTER 3

This chapter discusses research goals and methodology. Traditional and contemporary research strategies were combined to reach solutions to the Utah dilemma that are not only conceivable but also practical. Chapter 3 is divided into two sections: (1) Research Goals and (2) Methodology. The first section discusses three general goals of the thesis and the preliminary research that was conducted to address these goals. This section then thoroughly addresses secondary research goals, which were established after completion of preliminary research, as reported in chapters 1 and 2. The section on methodology (a) discusses which research methods and methodologies were used to address the identified goals, (b) justifies the use of these methods, (c) explains how research was conducted, and (d) discusses how the research has been verified and used.

Research Goals

Preliminary Research

Chapters 1 and 2 convey a serious problem concerning art education in Utah and other states: mandatory standards have been adopted, but no accountability measures exist to ensure that standards are addressed. It also appeared that Queensland had solved this dilemma. This thesis responds to these factors by addressing three general research goals:

(1) Compare Utah and Queensland demography and secondary visual arts education standards and objectives and investigate existing data on standards implementation and assessment in art education.

(2) Investigate and evaluate the success of moderated school-based assessment in Queensland.
(3) Adopt and adapt aspects of art education in Queensland for Utah and other states.

Within these major goals are many specific sub-goals. Discussion of these follows.

It was determined that the best way to accomplish the first general research goal was through traditional research methods in three areas: (1) review of art education literature, (2) gathering of demographic data, and (3) perusal of state core guidelines. This constituted the preliminary research for this thesis. First, existing literature was investigated according to two overlapping topics, (a) art education assessment theory and (b) art education standards and standards implementation. The review of literature suggested that school-based assessment is preferable to external testing and that little is being done in the United States to ensure that standards are addressed in visual arts. Next, demographic data and state core documents were compared. The comparative analysis of demographic data and the Utah Core and Senior Syllabus showed that Utah and Queensland are very similar in demography and in art education goals and verifies the potential of Queensland’s system. The comparison failed to confirm success of Queensland’s system but justified further research. The results of these comparisons have been omitted here because they are thoroughly reported in chapter 2.

Chapter 2 also provides basic information concerning the second general research goal, “Investigate and evaluate the success of moderated school-based assessment in Queensland.” While analyzing the Senior Syllabus and Utah Core, it became necessary to organize the remaining research according to five key areas of comparative research: (a) structure and protocol of education, (b) standards and objectives, (c) curricular guidelines, (d) assessment strategies, and (e) accountability measures. The Utah Core and
Senior Syllabus provide limited information on each of these key areas of research except standards and objectives. Chapter 2 shows that the standards and objectives of art education in Utah and Queensland are categorized differently, but are comparable. The remaining key areas of comparative research necessitated definition of additional research goals because the documents show that major differences exist in each area.

Principal Research

The structure of education in Utah and Queensland are similar in that both reflect traditional and contemporary Western ideals. The protocols in Queensland and Utah are quite different, however, because of moderation. The Senior Syllabus reveals a number of requirements that have been designed to ensure consistency and comparability among schools. Utah does not have a regulatory system in place. If the structure and protocol of art education in Queensland were to be adapted for another system, then two goals would need to be accomplished. It was determined that more information would need to be gathered on how the moderation process works and that the opinions of Queensland teachers should also be discovered. These goals would best be accomplished through on-site interviews in Queensland, particularly at QSA headquarters or regional centers.

It was determined that the key area of curriculum would require research abroad. Essentially, the Utah Core fails to explain how standards are to be met; only a modal frame is given in the Utah Core. The elaborate guidelines set by QSA, as explained in chapter 2, promote contemporary ideals that are absent from USOE requirements. QSA claims to provide curricular freedom to teachers by allowing them to develop courses around equipment limitations and according to personal expertise and because the contemporary art world favors diverse media and concept. The Senior Syllabus also
demands integration of assessment strategies into curricula. These guidelines initially appeared to be positive, but required verification. Several research goals were devised in the area of curricular guidelines. First, it would be necessary to determine how the Senior Syllabus is actually used. The Senior Syllabus only mentions the philosophy of and guidelines for curriculum development, but does not contain complete examples. Understanding how real work programs address standards, integrate assessment tasks, promote contemporary ideals, and higher-order thinking within QSA guidelines would be important to gain. Second, it would be necessary to learn about the effects of moderation on curriculum development.

For the key area of assessment, the main research concern was to determine the benefits of QSA assessment regulations. This includes the integration of assessment and curriculum, the number and type of required varying assessment strategies, and the presentation of assessments to students in the form of tasks. The Senior Syllabus indicates that curricular units should be designed around assessments. Projects are introduced as assessment tasks so that students know ahead of time exactly what will be assessed. The specifications for assessment design are particular, in terms of number and type. Additionally, assessments must relate to state standards, as is the case with all aspects of work programs. It was determined that analyzing assessment tasks could provide insight as to how diverse assessment strategies could meet like standards. Finally, it was necessary to find out specifically how teachers grade students, particularly how LOAs are derived as the result. In contrast to Queensland assessment, Utah Core assessments are merely a collection of course-specific rating sheets with marking boxes for each of the objectives. No indication is given as to how standards should be assessed
or how the assessments should be used, and no other assessment information is given anywhere in the document. Clearly the Utah Core needs improvement in the area of assessment. Utah and most other states use school-based assessment, but results are not reliable because guidelines are inadequate and assessment is not regulated.

Finally, it was necessary to study the moderation process regarding the key area of accountability. Utah has no official accountability measures, so implementing moderation would be completely new. Several research goals were determined to understand the effectiveness of the moderation process in Queensland. First, it was necessary to learn about the various entities of QSA. To accomplish this, additional resources needed to be obtained, and QSA representatives needed to be interviewed. Second, it was determined that it was advantageous to learn about teachers’ attitudes about moderation. Third, it was necessary to determine how moderation is implemented in its various phases. It was particularly valuable to observe some aspect of the moderation process. One specific aspect of moderation that was necessary to discover was the implication of failure—what happens when QSA disagrees with a teacher’s proposed curriculum or assessment? Fourth, it was helpful to learn about the history of moderated school-based assessment in Queensland. Perhaps, the mistakes made in Queensland could be avoided in Utah if a similar assessment strategy was implemented.

The third general research goal, “Adopt and adapt aspects of art education in Queensland for Utah and other United States,” was accomplished through data analyses, interpretations, and syntheses. It was obvious that this goal could only be accomplished following all data collection. This goal has been achieved in chapter 5, in which
recommendations for Utah and other states have been made as a consequence of all previous research.

Methodology

Methodology is addressed in two subsections: preliminary research and principal research. The first subsection discusses the acquisition, justification, and application of preliminary research. The second subsection addresses the main research, which was conducted in Queensland. This section reports the research goals, followed by the research strategy, which included determining the subjects and methodology, and the implementation of research.

Before discussing the individual aspects of methodology, a brief overview of the research process is necessary. First, three general research goals were determined and preliminary research was undertaken to address these. Basically, these three goals entailed (1) comparing Utah and Queensland demography and art education, (2) investigating moderated school-based assessment in Queensland, and (3) defining recommendations for Utah and the United States based on research results. The preliminary research was very basic and dealt mainly with gathering and comparing facts to satisfy the first and second general research goals. Chapter 1 identifies the problem, and chapter 2 reports the preliminary research results.

The preliminary research was insufficient to satisfy the second general research goal. From the preliminary research, secondary research goals and subsequent research questions were established according to five key areas of comparative research. Many of these demanded research in Queensland. It was determined that the research goals could be met by (a) collecting data that are unavailable in the United States; (b) observing
exhibitions, classroom settings, and the moderation process; and (c) interviewing art teachers and QSA representatives. It was decided that interviews should be conducted openly and freely, allowing teachers to express their perceptions and attitudes without restraint toward the system. A naturalistic methodology was favored over traditional means to maximize the authenticity and breadth of responses. Literature on research approaches was consulted to validate this approach, and a research schedule was then created. The research schedule was implemented in Queensland, resulting in the attainment of personal and published data that successfully addressed the secondary research goals. All data were compiled and compared, and the second general research question was concluded. The results of these data are reported in chapter 4. From this, the third goal was addressed, resulting in recommendations and resources, which are reported in chapter 5.

**Methodology for Preliminary Research**

Descriptive research was used in each of the preliminary phases. In order to compare the visual arts standards and demography of each state, data were gathered, compiled, examined, and compared. Demographic information from the official Utah and Queensland Web sites was compiled, analyzed, and recorded. The same process was applied to the Utah Core and the Senior Syllabus. The resulting research was supplemented by a few other tasks. Representatives of QSA and USOE were interviewed by telephone and email to collect data on policies and protocol. Limited supporting research has been employed to bolster philosophical claims; for example, Gregg’s (2003) article in *Art News*, which suggests that progressive post-secondary art schools are emphasizing concept over mode and moving away from modal curricula. These research
methods, the data used, and the resulting conclusions have been straightforward and reasonably indisputable.

The preliminary research confirmed the initial assumption that moderated school-based assessment in Queensland has several advantages over the Utah system. Several general and specific research questions were constructed, as previously mentioned. It was clear that it was necessary to gather this information through research in Queensland.

Methodology for Principal Research in Queensland

The next step in research was to address the key points of research, which are identified earlier in this chapter. Two types of information needed to be gathered, factual data and personal data. The factual data included scrutiny of several QSA documents and teaching resources unavailable in the United States. QSA agreed to provide an official printed version of the Visual Art Senior Syllabus 2001 (QBSSSS, 2000a), digital examples of exemplary secondary student artwork, and information on Year 1–10 curriculum guidelines. Several Queensland secondary visual arts teachers were asked to prepare copies of work programs and student work, as well as any other valuable resources. In addition to factual information, several of the previously identified research goals pertained to attitudes and values. It was necessary not only to know how moderation works officially, but also how professionals feel about the situation. The QSA system could not have been recommended for adaptation to Utah or other states if undesirable. This could only have been learned by interviewing teachers, QSA representatives and employees, and other professionals. In order to ensure that interviews resulted in usable results, it was necessary to determine the following: (a) reliable subjects and (b) a research schedule.
Establishing Reliable Subjects.

The main goal for establishing the subjects was to include the broadest possible spectrum of professionals involved with moderated school-based assessment in Queensland. QSA assisted in arranging interviews with teachers to match a predetermined profile. Some interviews were scheduled directly by QSA and others were recommended by QSA but arranged independently. In total, 17 attempts were made to schedule interviews, 14 of which were actually conducted. Many parameters for defining the subjects were established. The group needed to be comprised of members representing the various types of school demography: rural, urban, and tourist towns; low, medium, and high socioeconomic status; varying ethnic populations, including mostly white, mixed, and high-Indigenous; small, medium, and large schools; and private, religious, and public schools. The group was to include the span of QSA involvement: district review panelists, state review panelists, review panel chairs, teachers not serving on panels, QSA officials, and university professors. The group was to include teachers who had been continuously successful with submission, teachers who had had minor problems with submissions, and teachers who had repeatedly struggled with submissions. The group was to include teachers spanning the spectrum of years of service and experience. Remarkably, each of these criteria was met, either directly or indirectly. Due to travel constraints, it was not possible to visit the Outback or other remote areas. Three teachers, however, had formerly taught in rural schools. It was also not possible to visit schools with large indigenous populations because of a scheduling conflict. Two teachers had, however, taught in such schools.
Although the diversity requirements of the subjects were met, questions regarding the selection process needed to be addressed. The selection of the group was not random and was arranged by QSA, which the group was asked to judge. It was, therefore, necessary to justify the selection process and members of the group. Three factors support the selection process.

First, QSA is a respected government organization in a free society. QSA was established as an autonomous entity to oversee assessment, partially in an effort to satisfy criticism of Education Queensland. The implication has been that QSA must appease the public and the government. Chapter 4 documents the history of self-improvement in QSA, which has been the result of relentless internal research, response to criticism, and honesty. QSA may have a vested interest in the outcome of this research, but there was no reason to believe that the arrangement of the subjects for this thesis was politically influenced.

Second, the subjects demonstrated trustworthiness. Most members were accomplished veteran teachers with strong professional credentials. One teacher had never served on a review panel and many had not served in years, suggesting detachment from the organization. Most interviewees had experienced some disagreement with review panels and some had experienced considerable difficulty. The information presented by interviewees did not suggest reservation. Only one interviewee seemed reserved and some of the interviewees were described by others as outspoken against the system. These points cannot be considered as indisputable evidence, but they support the legitimacy of the group.
Third, the responses of the subjects were consistent. This is notable because of the open format used in the interviewing process. It is doubtful that any of the interviewees collaborated beforehand, and the interviews were all guided by the interviewees. Therefore, consistency of response indicates truth of response. This final point legitimizes the utilization of this research. The specific points about the research are addressed.

**Determining Methodology for Queensland Research.**

After making appointments, it was necessary to prepare for the interview process by creating an interview schedule. First, clear research goals for the interview process needed to be established. Essentially, it was decided that the interviews should yield information about what teachers feel has been most important regarding the system. It was determined that interviewees needed to discuss personal expertise concerning QSA and the Senior Syllabus, particularly regarding perceived strengths and weaknesses. The interview schedule, therefore, included questions about the strengths and weaknesses with the QSA system and one specific question was asked: “Should the QSA system be replaced, and, if so, by what?” It was also determined that the interviewees could probably share information based on personal experience. Additionally, it seemed likely that other potentially valuable printed materials probably existed and that active professionals involved in the system would know about materials of this nature.

Two possible methods for attaining the desired information were devised. First, a traditional survey that would incorporate questions concerning the most likely strengths and weaknesses of the QSA system could have been designed. Interviewees could have respond to these questions on a scale of some type, as well as the value of each point. For
example: “Is the QSA system fair?” and “How important do you consider fairness?” This method could have yield data that could be easily processed and justified. To discover what other issues interviewees felt were important, open-ended questions could have been added; for instance, “What other issues about QSA do you consider important to this research?” This strategy could have satisfied the research goals.

The alternative to the above approach, which was chosen, was a naturalistic approach. This involved asking teachers general questions and allowing them to control the direction of interviews. Guba and Lincoln (1985) describe the naturalistic approach:

…designs must be emergent rather than preordinate [sic]: because meaning is determined by context to such a great extent; because the existence of multiple realities constrains the development of a design based on only one (the investigator’s) construction; because what will be learned at a site is always dependent on the interaction between investigator and context, and the interaction is also not fully predicable; and because the nature of mutual shapings [sic] cannot be known until they are witnessed. All of these factors underscore the indeterminacy under which the naturalistic inquirer functions; the design must therefore be “played by ear”; it must unfold, cascade, roll, emerge. (pp. 208–9)

Having identified the type of information that would be gathered from interviews, it seemed presumptuous to predict what information could be gleaned through tightly controlled interviews. Guba and Lincoln (p. 209) note that naturalistic research is emergent—it begins with the acknowledgement that the investigator is unaware of the potential outcomes of the research and becomes more focused as the inquiry proceeds. This is not to suggest that naturalistic inquiry is completely random. As salient elements
emerge, theory becomes grounded in consistent data. Naturalistic inquiry demands careful and continuous data analysis.

There are some disadvantages to using a naturalistic approach. One disadvantage is the potential for unparallel data. If interviewees proceed in radically different directions, then the data could be inconsistent and possibly unusable. Paradoxically, this potential could be viewed as an advantage, in that random reporting would suggest that no definitive evidence exists. If, for example, interviewees were to report completely different QSA merits, then it would indicate that teachers cannot agree on the benefits of the system. Another disadvantage is the justification of the process and data use. Guba and Lincoln (1985) have recognized a common misconception about research, that the results of research can be justified by means of methodology. The positivist supposition is that subjective elements must be removed from research, which in turn yields reliable results. Clearly this is not the case, because data can be misinterpreted, misrepresented, or misconstrued. Conversely, it is often assumed that research that is not strictly controlled cannot be trusted. This is only true in cases where the interpretation of research is not reasonably justified. Naturalistic inquiry is a valid form of gathering qualitative research, provided certain steps are followed.

There are several advantages, conversely, to naturalistic research when it is warranted. First, it allows interviewees to express themselves without restriction. Stokrocki (1997, p. 40) writes: “Ethnographic interviewing is a systematic process of asking questions in the form of a natural dialogue. Some interviews are highly structured in advance and others are more conversational (James, 1994).” Stokrocki also acknowledges that questionnaires are often not taken seriously and, if they are used, then
their results should be verified with informal interviews (p. 40). The purpose of the interviews for this thesis has been to discover not what teachers think about particular aspects of the QSA system, but to understand fully their attitudes and perceptions regarding the system. In this sense, different and unexpected information was anticipated. The second advantage to the naturalistic approach regarding this thesis was the ability to clarify and expand responses. Rather than sticking to a strict schedule, interviewees were probed for further information. In certain cases this lead to specific evidence that otherwise would have remained undetected. Third, research results stemming from naturalistic inquiry lead to grounded theory rather than theory that precedes research. Conventional inquiry assumes all possible outcomes and data are gathered to support and refute the assumptions. In short, naturalistic inquiry is intended to capitalize on human interaction and to gain unrestricted knowledge. Because the interview goals for this thesis were of a general nature, and because it was necessary to discover the exact concerns of teachers, naturalistic inquiry could satisfy the research goals.

The next step in determining a research schedule was to commit to one of the two aforementioned methodologies. According to Zimmerman (1994, as cited in Thurber, 1997),

Methodologies for research should be chosen that suit the questions that are asked and not the reverse. To establish a research agenda for the 21st century, content questions of direct concern to the role of art in education should be identified, then investigated through appropriate research methodologies. (p. 497)

Several factors were considered in deciding which methodology to use, including difficulty of implementation, potential quality of results, potential reliability of results,
and research goals. It was necessary to consider what the role of the interviewer would be in each case. In reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the two research options, naturalistic inquiry emerged as the appropriate methodology. In addition to Lincoln and Guba, several well-known researchers in visual arts education have promoted naturalistic research in recent years, as noted in Thurber (1997):

> A significant shift in thinking about approaches to research, subsequently its methods, occurred in general education and in art education as well over the last quarter of a century (MacGregor, 1998). Researchers found that quantitative methodology based on a scientific inquiry model, and once the only respected methodological standard for educational studies, did not always offer an effective means of studying important questions arising in naturalistic settings (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002; Eisner, 1991; Ettinger, 1987; Galbraith, 1995; Pring, 2000). (p. 489)

Naturalistic inquiry not only made the most sense for the purposes of this research, it could be justified according to leading researchers in the fields of assessment theory and art education.

*Principal Research Implementation.*

Next, the interview schedule was determined. Stokrocki explains the use of three stages in conducting qualitative research, originally established by Strauss & Corbin (1990, cited in Stokrocki, 1997, p. 39): (1) data collection, (2) content analysis, and (3) comparative analysis. Each of these is discussed.
Data collection.

Data collection involves recording dates, times, dialogue among participants, and background information, as well as gathering documents (Stokrocki, 1997, p. 39). While collecting data, the researcher should attempt to recognize patterns and, from those patterns, formulate hypotheses and develop questions to be answered. Wherever discrepancies arise, the researcher should attempt to find answers and solutions. Because the naturalistic approach was used, the interview schedule devised for this thesis did not include an extensive list of questions or a proper survey. Instead, the schedule reflected the general goals of the interview process; to discover what teachers felt has been most important regarding art education in Queensland, including the strengths and weaknesses and if anyone would prefer not to have the system. Each interview began by asking teachers to explain their experiences and backgrounds with the system, to then explain the system noting pros and cons, and finally to note additional issues deemed important. From here, interviewees were permitted to direct the conversation. Wherever necessary, clarification or expansion was requested. Over the period of three weeks, patterns were identified, and as questions arose an attempt was made to answer them. The only specific scheduling decision made according to this ideology was that teacher interviews were scheduled before interviews with QSA and university representatives. Interviews were conducted according to these decisions.

The decision was made to request “any other resources that may be of value” beyond the identified printed resources. The assumption was that the experts possessing knowledge of the system could provide information that researchers would overlook.
Because these individuals were being trusted to provide information anyway, it seemed sensible to allow them to contribute resources in addition to thoughts.

Next, the research schedule was implemented in Queensland and data was collected. As mentioned previously, research questions in three key areas had been identified: curriculum, assessment, and accountability. In the data collection process, all of the research questions were satisfied, either through interviews or material resources. QSA representatives and visual arts teachers contributed the requested printed materials as well as some that were not expected. This information included: copies of pages from visual diaries; copies of completed submission forms for verification; work programs; photographs of student work; extensive lesson plans and supporting teaching tools; a presentation for parents explaining rankings for tertiary entrance; the QBSSSS publications, *The Moderation Handbook* (1999), *Handbook for Review Panel Chairs* (2000b), and *Guidelines for the Preparation of Review Submissions, Art* (1996); past copies of the Queensland Core Skills (QCS) Test; and information about Internet sites. The questions that could only be answered through interviews, namely those regarding the perceptions and attitudes of teachers, were satisfied through interviews. The specifics of how these research questions were satisfied are explained.

*Content analysis.*

Content analysis, the second stage of qualitative research explained by Stokrocki (1997, pp. 40–47), calls for applying evidence to hypotheses. Content analysis bridges and overlaps the other two stages of qualitative research by reviewing, sorting, and interpreting data as they are acquired over time. In content analysis, the researcher should write down evolving questions and hypotheses, look for patterns, attempt to identify and
answer emerging questions. No evidence should be discarded, including observed behavior.

During the content analysis stage for this thesis, new evidence was conducted daily. Upon arrival in Queensland, some minor scheduling changes were made. The profile of interviewees and sites are recorded in Table 5, which is located on the following page (p. 111). The names of interviewees have been omitted for their privacy.

A result of the research was the satisfaction of all research questions. Regarding the key area of curriculum, questions concerning the effects of the Senior Syllabus and moderation on curriculum development were answered by gathering work programs and by reviewing teachers’ explanations of how they were developed. Some interviewees discussed their work programs extensively, in terms of how they meet QSA standards and how student work results from them. Several interviewees provided complete or partial copies of work programs. Other interviewees provided QSA publications that were distributed to help teachers develop work programs. The combination of these research components led to a clear understanding of how individualized curricula could address like standards. Finally, it was necessary to interview QSA representatives and teachers to understand how moderation affects quality and consistency of curricula. Most interviewees discussed the moderation process at length, some from a teacher’s perspective, others from a panelist’s perspective. The important aspects of these research questions are addressed in chapter 4, which summarizes this research.

For the key area of assessment, the goal of determining the benefits of assessment in Queensland was accomplished by analysis of work programs and assessment tasks and
Table 5

Queensland Research Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District, City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>QSA Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane North, Kedron</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Boy’s</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>District Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Central, East Brisbane</td>
<td>Indep</td>
<td>Boy’s</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Central, Coorparoo</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>District Panel Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane North, Albany Creek</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>State Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Central, South Brisbane</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast, Burleigh Waters</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>District Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast, Southport</td>
<td>Indep</td>
<td>Girl’s</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich, Corinda</td>
<td>Indep</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>State Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Central, Kelvin Grove</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane South, MacGregor</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toowoomba, Toowoomba</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Central, South Brisbane</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns, Manunda, Cairns</td>
<td>Gov</td>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Former Panelist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. 1. Type refers to control of school, government (Gov), Catholic, or independent (Indep). Most independent schools in Queensland are affiliated with the Anglican Church. Senior Colleges also exist, but are not represented in the control group. 2. The Socioeconomic status (SES) of schools have been arbitrarily estimated according to interviewee nominations. SES does not necessarily reflect school funding. 3. Positions have been vaguely described to protect the anonymity of interviewees. Positions listed are current unless otherwise noted. Former panelists include district panelists, state panelists, district and state panel chairs, and QSA Officers.
through interviews. The research provided information on the integration of a variety of assessment tasks. The explanation of actual work programs provided a clear picture of how students benefit from different kinds of assessment and from knowing what is being assessed in advance. Because assignments result in the fulfillment of assessment tasks, and because assessment tasks are standards-based, student outcomes can easily be assessed according to standards. Teachers also discussed how LOAs are calculated and how two years of work results in a single LOA. The research has provided a clear understanding of assessment in Queensland and how changes to the system have improved reliability and esteem. The results of this research appear in chapter 4.

The final key area of research questions pertain to accountability. Understanding the history of QSA and the moderation process was a significant research goal. This goal included learning how moderation has changed, how these changes have affected the system, and how teachers and panelists perceive the current system of moderation. This was accomplished through interviewing teachers and panelists about moderation and by gathering historical information about QSA. *The Moderation Handbook* (QBSSSS, 1999) and historical information about QSA were particularly insightful. Through this research, information has been gained on how the initiative was originally implemented and how the program has changed over three decades. The research also revealed how moderation works, including the structure of QSA, moderation procedures, and the implications of moderation, including protocol to remedy problems with submissions. Teachers have also commented on their satisfaction with the system, including its perceived strengths and weaknesses. The results of this research are reported in chapter 4.
Comparative analysis.

The final stage in research implementation, comparative analysis, involved validating the above data. Stokrocki (1997) explains that comparative analysis should combine internal and external research. For this thesis, QSA and Education Queensland literature, especially the independent history reports furnished by Education Queensland, *Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools: Two Decades of Change 1964–1983* (Education Queensland, 2003a) and *Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools 1983–1990* (Education Queensland, 2003b), has been considered external research. The internal research has included interview dialogue and observations.

Internal research was first checked against itself. The interview data were compiled and sorted into three categories: (a) information, (b) perceived strengths, and (c) perceived weaknesses. To justify internal reliability, the results were checked for agreeability and consistency. The research was agreeable in that no contradictory facts were reported. The research was consistent in that most of the value judgments were confirmed by others. Only responses of opinion varied. For example, many interviewees reported conceptual art as a positive consequence of recent changes to the Senior Syllabus, while one interviewee complained that recent syllabi place too much emphasis on concept. This confirms the QSA report that it has promoted conceptual art in the past decade, which most teachers like. Since the interviews were open, consistency in responses suggests validity. Also, interview results were compared by interviewee profile (e.g., teacher, panelist) with no discrepancy. The data were grouped and compared by categories of teachers, QSA officials, review panelists, and university professors, and were found to be consistent and agreeable.
Internal research was then compared to the external research. The information provided by interviewees was checked against published literature and no discrepancies were found. Comments about moderation, about the affects of changes to the system, and about rumors for future changes have been verified wherever possible. External research was also compared, namely the historic report and past and current QSA documents, and no bias or fictitious information was detected.

In conclusion, the research methodology used in this thesis is sound, and, therefore, the results are trustworthy. This is verifiable in two ways. First, accepted methodologies were appropriately used to acquire and interpret data. Several respected sources have been cited to verify the research methodologies, methods, and procedures. Second, the research results are agreeable and consistent. The results of each type of research validate the others.
CHAPTER 4

It was determined that research in Queensland was necessary to discover the quality and protocol of its art education system. Chapter 4 summarizes this research, and chapter 5 concludes with suggested improvements for art education in Utah and other states. Chapter 5 also includes a curriculum guide that is designed to help secondary art teachers in Utah and other states develop standards-based curricula and assessments that incorporate a variety of authentic assessment tasks and promote cognitively rich art processes.

The Queensland research results are presented in four parts in this chapter: (1) Queensland secondary education basics, which include explanations of (a) administrative structure, (b) secondary course types, (c) the structure of higher education in Queensland, and (d) the student ranking system; (2) moderated school-based assessment, including the (a) the moderation processes of Accreditation of work programs and study plans (Accreditation), Review (which includes Monitoring, Verification, and Approvals), and Random sampling, and (b) the calculation of student rankings; (3) the history of education in Queensland; and (4) strengths and weaknesses of the QSA system.

Queensland Secondary Education Basics

Secondary education in Queensland is regulated by two autonomous cooperative government entities: Education Queensland and QSA. This thesis is concerned mostly with QSA, because it is the agency that develops and monitors core curriculum and assessment guidelines, including those for secondary Visual Art. *Moderated school-based assessment*, also known as *moderation* and *the moderation process*, refers to the accountability system by which curricula and assessment practices take place and are
evaluated in Queensland. Before discussing QSA, the role of Education Queensland should first be clarified. Education Queensland is the primary government agency under the Minister of Education in the Department of Education and the Arts in the State of Queensland that oversees the operation and accreditation of all primary, secondary, and tertiary state schools. Independent schools (private and religious) must also follow Education Queensland guidelines to be accredited. Education Queensland controls most universities and tertiary vocational schools. The guidelines and parameters established by Education Queensland dictate most other educational mandates.

QSA Administrative Structure

QSA is a small autonomous agency that was once a branch of Education Queensland prior to moderated school-based assessment. The major tasks of QSA are to oversee curricula and assessment, to rank eligible graduating students, and to issue report cards. QSA communicates directives to schools through guideline publications and seminars. Schools design curricula and assessment tools in each of the core disciplines, including visual arts according to QSA guidelines. Schools then submit completed curriculum and assessment proposals to local committees of peer experts called review panels (district and state) for approval. Review panels act on behalf of QSA to approve or amend proposals through communication with schools. In rare cases, when review panels and schools cannot reach agreements, proposals are sent to QSA headquarters. QSA also requests samples of curriculum and assessment proposals (assessed student work) to ensure consistency among review panels. Eligible students may also compete for rankings, which are usually used for tertiary entrance and scholarships. Rankings are calculated by scaling grades according to school-wide performance on the Queensland
Core Skills (QCS) Test, an external test on that QSA administers. The QCS Test “is designed to measure achievement on the Common Curriculum Elements (CCEs) underpinning Authority [core] subjects, independent of specific subject content” (Queensland Studies Authority, 2004a, p. 2). Finally, graduating Seniors are issued exit grades and rankings.

The basic hierarchy of QSA is the Office of the Authority, the state review panels representing each Authority subject, and district review panels. The Office of the Authority is comprised of leaders nominated by various entities involved in education, such as teachers’ unions, universities, and parents’ organizations. The Office is ultimately responsible for regulating the review panels that carry out the moderation process. Review panels are subject-specific and are comprised of experienced field experts. District review panels are comprised exclusively of elected teachers, headed by a panel chair. State panels consist of a chairperson, a higher education professional, a subject advisory committee or subcommittee member, an industry professional for vocational subjects, and six secondary teachers. Teachers apply to QSA to serve on review panels and are selected based on past success as teachers and panelists, knowledge and expertise of subject area, professionalism, and endorsement by school principals. District and state review panels are reconfigured every six years, usually four years after syllabi updates. During this rollover, a third of the members must be newly appointed, and panel chairs may only serve two terms. Occasionally, panelists relinquish appointments and new panelists are added to replace them. Panelists interviewed for this thesis cited several advantages to serving on
review panels, including monetary compensation, political positioning, prestige, and, most of all, that service enables expertise in the system.

Each aspect of the moderation process begins with schools submitting materials to QSA district offices. QSA hosts 11 district offices where district review panels convene a few days each year to analyze school submissions for each step of the moderation process. District offices also host professional development seminars. According to QSA, the purpose of district review panels is to affirm submissions rather than to challenge them. Disputing submissions is the necessary means of establishing fairness wherever submissions present inconsistencies or fail to provide clear justification of contents.

District review panelists attempt to verify work program and verification folio proposals according to QSA guidelines, based on evidence submitted by schools. Submissions are typically reviewed blindly by multiple panelists and panel chairs consider their remarks. When panelists agree with a school, the proposal is usually validated, although in certain cases the state review panel may also review the submission. If the district review panel does not agree with a school, then the school is usually asked to revise the submission. Sometimes the submission is forwarded to the state review panel instead.

State review panels have two main purposes: (1) to ensure consistency and accuracy among districts, which is determined by reviewing random work programs and verification folios, and (2) to intervene when district review panels and schools cannot reach an agreement. State review panels sometimes act as district review panels in rare cases where remote schools are not included in any district domain.

The Office communicates directly with state review panel chairpersons, who relay information to other panelists. The Office will intervene in the rare occasion when
schools reject state review panel advice. As a last resort of moderation, a QSA officer may summon all interested parties to discuss a school’s program or assessment procedures. The exact procedures for each aspect of the moderation process are outlined later in this chapter.

Queensland Secondary Education Course Types

Queensland recognizes three types of courses: (1) Authority subjects, (2) Authority registered subjects, and (3) recorded subjects. Authority subjects are core subjects for which QSA has designed syllabi. Visual Art is an Authority Subject. Subject moderators (teachers) construct school-specific work programs (curriculum maps), as explained in chapter 2. Authority subject grades have the greatest impact on student rankings and are the most stringently regulated. Authority subject Levels of Achievement (LOAs) are the primary source for calculation in all student ranking methods and are regulated in the moderation process.

Authority registered subjects are all courses other than Authority subjects for which QSA has approved course outlines. Authority registered subjects are of two varieties. If schools design a registered course, then a work program is submitted. If QSA designs a registered course, then subject moderators prepare study plans. Study plans are similar to work programs, but are reported through form R9 of *The Moderation Handbook* (QBSSSS, 1999), which provides uniformity and brevity. *The Moderation Handbook* has been included as an appendix to this thesis (see Appendix C). Authority registered subjects are typically vocational and may result in vocational education certificates. Authority registered courses are considered elective and factor less or not at
all in student rankings. QSA does not regulate the LOAs awarded for completion of Authority registered subjects, although the grades are reported on exit certificates.

Recorded subjects are all approved courses other than those previously mentioned. Registered subjects are considered non-academic elective credits and do not carry major implications for student rankings. Recorded subjects are not graded in the same manner as Authority and Authority registered subjects and, therefore, are not regulated by QSA.

Unofficially, almost all students take some Authority subjects. Students wishing to attend university usually take mostly Authority subjects, because of their importance in the calculation of student rankings. Students wishing to pursue post-secondary vocational training usually take Authority registered courses in the vocational areas of interest. Recorded subjects are typically taken by students who are not serious about academics or who are not particularly interested in the curricula.

Queensland Student Rankings

Two documents, the Senior Certificate and the Tertiary Entrance Statement, combine to form the Student Educational Profiles (SEPs), which summarize all major scholastic accomplishments. A Senior Certificate is issued to every Senior graduating from an assessing (accredited) secondary institution. The Senior Certificate reports the following information, as earned: (a) the name, number of semesters studied, and final LOA for each Authority and Authority registered subject and the name and result of any recorded subjects; (b) the earning of any vocational education certificates and competencies; (c) the grade earned on the QCS Test; and (d) technical information about the student, school, and Certificate. The information reported on the Senior Certificate is
intended for consideration by both tertiary institutions and employers. The Senior Certificate functions similarly to the high school diploma in the United States, including Utah.

Tertiary Entrance Statements report Overall Position and Field Position rankings and are issued only to students who are eligible to receive OPs and FPs. These rankings are calculated by using a student’s individual LOAs in Authority subjects, as well as school-wide, and occasionally individual, QCS Test scores. OPs and FPs are the primary sources used by tertiary institutions for admission purposes. Post-secondary education is highly selective because it is more limited in Queensland than in Utah and is usually subsidized. Although Queensland hosts more universities than Utah, the student populations are small and a lower percentage of secondary graduates are admitted. The Tertiary Entrance Statement is used in a similar manner to the use of combined SAT and ACT scores and of secondary grade point average in the United States. Grades are considered comparable in Queensland and are, therefore, more useful than secondary grades in the United States. The arbitrary nature of grades in Utah and other states devalues their meaning and high-stakes testing is often considered the only reliable measure of student achievement. QSA aims to eliminate reliance on high-stakes tests through moderation.

Another ranking system is Selection Rank, which factors all three course types. Basically, courses are weighted according to type, and weights are multiplied by course grades, yielding a raw number scored for each course. The highest of these are combined, and the individual result of the QCS Test is added (if taken) to form the Selection Rank. It is possible to attain university admissions with this ranking, although OP is preferred.
Selection Ranks can also be calculated for non-traditional students, the specifics of which have been omitted from this thesis.

Below is an explanation of the tertiary education system in Queensland, which is centered upon SEPs. Alternative routes to tertiary studies are also discussed. Complete information on how exit rankings are used for tertiary admissions is reported in the explanation of how each ranking is calculated.

*Queensland Tertiary Education System*

To grasp the importance of OPs and other rankings, it is necessary to understand tertiary education in Queensland. Three types of tertiary institutions exist: (a) university, (b) TAFE, which stands for Technical and Future Education, and (c) private (non-university) providers. Three types of courses are offered by these institutions, which loosely correspond to the types of institutions previously mentioned. They are: (a) higher education, (b) Vocational Education and Training (VET), and (c) non-accredited courses.

Universities typically offer higher education courses that lead to undergraduate and graduate degrees. Higher education courses can only be offered through accredited programs, which are designated as Registered Higher Education Providers. Universities in Queensland only offer accredited courses. University is usually preparation for professional work of some type. Queensland is home to forty universities, most of which are public. The number of university applicants in Queensland exceeds the number of openings in most fields, and most students are financially supported at some level. Admissions and scholarships are typically scaled according to OP rankings. OP1 (the best ranking) students are essentially guaranteed acceptance and full tuition scholarships to most university programs, whereas average OP students have little chance of acceptance.
FP rankings allow further discrimination between students by identifying particular
strengths and weaknesses. The standard minimum admission requirements for university
entrance include Year 12 graduation and the earning of an OP. The most common paths
to tertiary admission in all three types of institutions are discussed following the
explanation of TAFE and private providers.

TAFE institutions usually offer VET courses, although sometimes university
programs are offered. TAFE is a national program and receives federal government
funding. Students usually pay for TAFE courses, but some scholarships exist. Queensland
Department of Employment and Training operates 15 TAFE institutions, each with
multiple campuses. TAFE accepts a span of students ranging from entry-level trade
students who have not completed secondary school to career professionals seeking
continuing education to advance in their current field. Admission to TAFE is program-
specific and requirements vary considerably. Most VET programs share two
commonalities: (a) credits and degrees are nationally recognized, and (b) courses are
designed in conjunction with industry, so most employers acknowledge TAFE
certificates. VET courses can only be offered by accredited Registered Training
Organizations (RTOs).

Private provider institutions offer non-accredited training and sometimes
accredited higher education or VET courses. In order for these universities to offer higher
education or VET courses, they must be designated as Registered Higher Education
Providers or RTOs. Private providers usually require full fee payment from students, and
admission requirements vary.
Alternative paths to tertiary education for non-traditional students exist. For example, QTAC offers a Special Tertiary Admissions Test, and TAFE institutes and universities will assign Selection Ranks based on grades, work experience, and personal qualifications. Many universities and TAFE institutes have developed specific procedures and qualifications for admitting non-traditional students as well. Also, higher education is currently transitioning to a system similar to that of the United States, where more students are admitted and less funding exists. OP and FP, then Selection Rank, however, continue to be the major paths to tertiary education and scholarship. The following section on moderation includes information on how QSA calculates these rankings following explanation of moderation procedures.

Moderated School-Based Assessment

The moderation process involves three aspects: (a) Accreditation of work programs and study plans (Accreditation); (b) Review, which consists of three phases: Monitoring, Verification, and Approvals; and (c) Random sampling. Accreditation involves the submission of work programs for Authority subjects and study programs for Authority registered subjects to QSA for approval. Approximately every seven and four years respectively, subject moderators must submit new work programs and study programs to QSA. With work programs, the time frame coincides with syllabus revisions. New work programs are submitted to QSA near the end of the school year following the issuance of a new syllabus. Syllabi contain curriculum and assessment guidelines, while submission regulations are covered in *The Moderation Handbook*. The moderation process also results in OPs and FPs, and contributes to Selection Ranks. This section
addresses (1) the procedures of the moderation process and (2) the calculation of student rankings.

Moderation Procedures

Accreditation

The process for Accreditation in each review subject begins with schools submitting their work programs to district review centers. For each work program, the panel chair sends a copy to two panelists who independently review the submission. Panelists make written comments on work programs and return them to district review panel chairs. If the reviewers and district chairperson disagree on a submission, then the three discuss the submission and try to reach a consensus. A third blind reviewer may be called upon, or in rare cases the submission may be sent to the state review panel. When a consensus is reached, the panel decides to agree or disagree with the school. If the panel agrees with the proposal, it is then recommended for Accreditation and the school is notified. The state review panel occasionally requests that a recommended work program be sampled, in which case the proposal is sent to one member of the state review panel for analysis. If a work program is sampled and the state panelist agrees with the district panel, or if it is not selected for sampling, then the work program is accredited and returned to the school.

When a district review panel does not initially recommend a work program for Accreditation, or when a sampled work program is found disagreeable by a state review panelist, the submission is sent back to the school with specific instructions or advice on how to amend it. The school then modifies and resubmits the work program to the district review panel. The district review panel then reviews only the parts of the work program
that have been revised, not the previously approved parts, and determines whether or not
the revised work program should be accredited. If the work program is recommended,
then the previous procedure for completing the Accreditation process is followed. If the
work program is not suitable for recommendation, then it is again returned to the school
with suggestions. If a work program fails to pass three times, then it is forwarded to the
state review panel via the Office of the Authority.

When a work program is forwarded to the state review panel, either because it has
not been recommended by the district review panel, or because the school is not a part of
any district, the state review panel chair reviews it. If the chairperson finds the work
program acceptable, then it becomes accredited. If not, then the chairperson will work
with the school to resolve discrepancies.

Panelists may talk directly with teachers or visit schools to discuss problematic
submissions. According to QSA, review panels are always able to work with teachers to
revise work programs until they are suitable for Accreditation. It is believed that the few
teachers who really struggle with these are usually unable to perform other professional
duties and they often leave the profession. Brendan Lea, former Key Learning Officer,
the Arts, of QSA, noted that developing work programs is difficult for art teachers,
particularly veterans (personal communication, July 18, 2004). Lea also reported that
weak assessment or theory tasks are the most common problems in work programs. For
example, it is common for traditionalists to write Making assessment tasks that are too
teacher-directed and Appraising (writing) assessment tasks that focus on job applications
rather than critical analysis. As the Senior Syllabus has evolved, creativity and concept
have increasingly been emphasized. Lack of a theme explanation is another common
problem. Work programs should indicate the manner in which concepts are explained to students and how students might interpret them. Struggling teachers are assisted by review panels in improving their work programs through the moderation process to meet curriculum standards.

Review

Monitoring.

Monitoring is the first of three Review processes. Schools submit five folio samples (if available) of assessed Year 11 student work to review panels. Panelists review the samples the following year to see how well the samples match the approved work program assessment guidelines. Feedback is then given to the schools. Monitoring helps teachers and students to understand how students may fair in Year 12 Verification and yields insight for potential improvement. Since Year 11 grades are not recorded on students’ permanent records and students and teachers are given the opportunity to devise strategies for improvement.

Each school must submit a general folder and student samples to district review panels wherever possible, or to state review panels in certain remote areas. The general folder must include the following items: (a) a copy of the accredited school work program; (b) a statement if not accredited; (c) a complete set of assessment instruments and conditions, which explain the expectations of assessment instruments; and (d) the cover form R3 of The Moderation Handbook, which provides a concise summary of the entire submission and is used to document QSA comments. Student art samples include: (a) five sample folios of art-related work representing middle performance in each of the five LOAs, including Making and Appraising tasks; (b) completed task sheets attached to
assessment instruments, including detailed marking schemes with suggested responses; and (c) student profile forms for each folio, which report and explain the awarded interim LOAs. Form R3 also requires that details of other data collection methods be submitted if applicable. *Making* submissions are artworks. *Making* submissions should include evidence of diversity in art and design approaches, evidence of research and development of ideas, and responses and resolution to problem-solving tasks. Artworks do not need to be complete for Year 11 submissions. Folios must contain two *Appraising* tasks per student. *Appraising* tasks include extensive writing assignments, tests, and interviews. All *Making* and *Appraising* submissions should reflect the structure and intent of work programs.

Two panelists independently review each submission and produce written reports, and then discuss comments among themselves. When panelists do not agree, a third panelist blindly reviews the submission and the three panelists meet. Once a consensus is reached, notes are summarized by panelists and edited by the panel chair and form R3 is completed with notes and advice to the subject moderator. The submission is then returned to the school, and panelists’ comments are discussed between all teachers of the subject. In some cases, either the review panel or the school may request a consultation to discuss the comments.

*Verification.*

For the second phase of the Review process, schools send verification folios to the appropriate QSA review panels. Verification is more critical than Monitoring because it involves the review of exit grades for Year 12 students, which have serious implications. Review panels evaluate student work according to assessment descriptors and compare
these results to the LOAs proposed by subject moderators. The requirements of verification folio contents are explained in chapter 2, but more specificity needs to be revealed in order to understand the moderation process.

Verification submissions are similar to Monitoring submissions, requiring general folders and student samples, but greater number and depth of materials are required. Each submission is accompanied by form R6 of *The Moderation Handbook*, which is considered the most important part of the submission by QSA. Each of the five LOA standards is divided into ten increments, and every student is awarded a single exit ranking per subject, such as “VHA 8” (i.e., near the top of the Very High Achievement band). Intermittent LOAs are calculated by averaging the “fullest and latest” performances of students in each area of assessment. This information is detailed on a profile sheet for each student, which is submitted with the verification folio. The complete general folder for Verification must include the following items: (a) a copy of the accredited school work program; (b) a statement if not accredited; (c) a complete set of assessment instruments and conditions; (d) information about areas of study that are present in student work but absent from the work program; and (e) the cover form R6, which must be signed by the school moderator, usually the principal. The student samples include: (a) nine sample folios of work (if that many students are enrolled), including those of the top and bottom students and a representation of middle performance for each LOA, each of which must include *Making* and *Appraising* tasks; (b) all completed task sheets and assessment instruments, including detailed marking schemes with suggested responses; and (c) student profile forms for each folio, which report and explain the awarded interim LOA scores, as well as the previous year’s interim LOA. If a
discrepancy between the school and QSA exist in Monitoring, then evidence must be provided to show that this has been addressed. Making and Appraising examples must demonstrate that all assessment criteria standards have been met and must include evidence of researching, development, and resolution of ideas. Each folio documents two major completed works plus journal documentation of research and development for those pieces. These pieces should be indicative of the strongest recent student work.

The Verification review process follows the exact initial protocol as Monitoring, but the outcome is more tedious. Verification folios and supplemental materials are submitted to district review panels during the first week of the fourth quarter of the academic year. As in Monitoring, two panelists independently review the submission and meet to discuss the results. When panelists disagree, a third panelist reviews the submission and the three panelists meet. When a consensus is reached, notes are summarized by panelists and edited by the panel chair and form R6 is completed. In this case, the review panel either agrees with or recommends changes for student achievement levels, and comments are made wherever achievement levels are to be changed. The submission is then returned to the school.

Once a school has received the returned submission, a ten-day period of negotiation is granted for schools whose submissions were found disagreeable by review panels. When this occurs, it is necessary for the panel chair to meet with a school delegate, who could be any teacher of the subject in question or the principal. According to Brendan Lea, the initial disagreement rate is 48% (personal communication, July 18, 2004), but only 2% fail to be resolved during the negotiation period. In some cases, verification folios may simply lack adequate information for panelists to confirm the
proposed achievement levels, particularly in terms of research documentation in journals. Several interviewed panelists and teachers indicated that it is difficult to provide the correct amount of documentation, since QSA requests that verification folios not be excessive. Another minor issue is when students have extraneous circumstances that cannot be detected blindly. Occasionally, a student will be ranked higher than her or his verification folio demonstrates because of an exceptional reason. Since QSA requests indicative folios, larger schools can omit such submissions, but smaller schools may be forced to send this type of folio. These and other minor setbacks can usually be resolved in favor of the school through supplemental submissions and discussions between panel chairpersons and subject moderators. In other cases, students may need to rework their artworks, and then resubmit folios to meet the initially proposed achievements. In some instances, teachers incorrectly assess students or improperly document progress. In such cases, teachers can either accept panel recommendations or appeal to the state review panels. The state then typically requests all available documentation from the school and arbitrates between the district review panel and the school. If the school and the state review panel cannot reach an agreement, which happens once every few years, then a meeting including every involved party is held, the state and district panelists, teacher, principal, other teachers, and possibly QSA officials. At this meeting, the teacher must show evidence of achievement. No QSA official interviewed for this thesis could recall a time when a teacher was successful in pressing this issue. These cases usually involve a teacher who refuses to acknowledge error.
Approvals

Approvals is the last phase of Review, in which QSA validates proposed LOAs for all students and prints Senior Certificates. At the end of each school year following Verification, teachers submit final Year 12 grades. Schools submit complete paperwork for each student in every subject. The period between submission of these exit proposals and the issuance of Senior Certificates is known as the “approval period.” Proposals should identically match decisions reached during Verification, although it is conceivable that students could have made changes to their work, which might alter Verification decisions. Changes must be minor and backed with substantial evidence and must be agreed upon by QSA and schools. Schools must contact a moderation officer of QSA if they wish to propose changes. In some cases, QSA will demand that supporting evidence be mailed overnight, and sometimes a meeting is necessary. QSA contends that since grades reflect long-term work, major changes are improbable and unacceptable. Senior Certificates are printed and issued to students once grades are approved.

Random sampling.

Random sampling is the final aspect of moderation and is intended to ensure integrity in the moderation process. At the beginning of the following school year, QSA requests verification folios of randomly selected students. This deters teachers from withholding skewed folios, because any folio could be sampled. It is, therefore, necessary for teachers to document the progress of all students. This encourages teachers to assess all students fairly. Several interviewed teachers expressed skepticism with the claimed randomness of this process, although no evidence was cited to verify this concern. Some believed that QSA may request samples of suspicious teachers along with actual random
samples. The frequency is such that eventually every teacher is called upon to submit random samples.

Calculation of Student Rankings

The above procedures of moderated school-based assessment—(a) Accreditation, (b) Review (Monitoring, Verification, and Approvals), and (c) Random sampling—ensure comparability of LOAs. Because LOAs are considered comparable, QSA and universities trust the LOAs of students, regardless of schools attended. It is possible, however, that a wide range of performances exists within a single LOA. It is necessary, especially for tertiary entrance, to rank students more precisely than the average of LOAs can specify. QSA believes that the 10-point rungs within LOAs are not reliable enough to use for this purpose. Thus, LOAs are insufficient for acutely ranking students. QSA has developed a system for scaling LOA scores, following a long history of unsatisfactory ranking methods. The two major rankings, which are discussed below, are OP and Selection Rank. Both rankings rely on the comparability of LOAs.

As mentioned previously, a student’s Overall Position is the main pathway to tertiary studies. Basically, OP is a statewide ranking that is calculated by taking each student’s grades, comparing these grades to other students’ grades within the school, and comparing schools with each other according to group performance on the QCS Test. Only OP eligible students are considered in the equation, and the criteria for eligibility are completion of at least four semesters of study in each of five Authority subjects. All students are placed into 25 performance bands as a result. The highest score is OP1, the lowest score is OP25. In order to fairly make these comparisons, a series of intermediate rankings are devised according to norm-referenced and criteria-referenced standards. The
QSA document entitled *Calculating OPs: The Basic Principles* (Education Queensland, 2004a) provides a detailed account of the OP ranking process and has been included as Appendix D of this thesis. The QSA Web site contains this document and other information on OP calculation. An abbreviated explanation of OP calculation follows.

*Scaling* is the process by which within-school rankings are realigned to a statewide scale according to QCS Test scores. The scaling process involves sorting grades into series of intermediate rankings, then into OP bands. Two stages of the scaling process exist, the Within-School Stage (Stage 1) and the Between-School Stage (Stage 2). Each stage involves several steps.

The first step of the Within-School Stage of scaling is the awarding of Subject Achievement Indicators (SAIs). The SAI is a relative scale used in distinguishing how well students perform against each other in a particular subject within the school. For each subject area, the OP-eligible student receives a ranking on an arbitrary numeric scale from 400 (highest) to 200 (lowest). Because QSA only recognizes base LOAs as valid, not the incremental rungs within each LOA, it is necessary to define achievement further and this is the first step toward that aim. SAIs must be consistent with LOAs—a student with a high Sound Achievement (SA, or C), for example, cannot earn a higher SAI than a student with a low High Achievement (HA, or B).

The next step of Stage 1 scaling is the assignment of overall school rankings, called Within School Measures (WSMs). All OP eligible students within schools are compared and are awarded “wins” and “losses” according to SAIs. The relative performance in all subjects is equally considered, and all OP-eligible students are assigned WSMs. These rankings are then used to validate the relative performance of
students on the QCS Test. Wherever a discrepancy is found, the weight of that student’s QCS Test score for scaling purposes is lessened. WSMs are calculated for the purpose of identifying uncharacteristic QCS Test scores, which, if used, would skew scaling results.

Arbitrary SAIs are then reset as scaled SAIs. For large programs, which are any larger than 13 students, SAI scores are reset according to the average and spread of school-wide QCS Test performance. In small schools, less than 10 students, results of large schools’ scaling results are used as the basis for assigning scaled SAIs. This eliminates problems that could arise due to insufficient data. Intermediate programs’ scaled SAIs are derived by calculating and averaging both methods. Scaled SAIs are used to compare students accurately within schools, not between schools.

Once scaled SAIs have been determined, performance of students across subjects is determined by adding together each student’s five best scaled SAIs in Authority courses that have been studied extensively (four semesters each). All Authority subjects are considered equally in student rankings. This yields a rank called Overall Achievement Indicator (OAI), which relates to a student’s relative performance in the school. This is the final process in Within-School Scaling.

The second stage of scaling, the Between-School Stage, uses the same concepts in scaling students across Queensland. In most schools, the average and spread of OAI for each school are scaled to the average and spread of QCS Test results within that school, in a similar manner to which scaled SAIs are determined within each school. This yields scaled OAI. QCS Test results are then factored into the equation, again considering WSMs. QSA considers raw OP ranks unjustifiably precise. Therefore, students are grouped according to twenty-five OP bands, which are based on criteria rather than
relative performance from year to year. Because insufficient data would cause questionable results, schools with fewer than 16 Seniors do not receive scaled OAIs. Instead, raw OAIs are used. For intermediate-sized schools, with 16 to 19 students, scaled OAIs are calculated, and then averaged with raw OAIs. OP is then used by universities and TAFE to distinguish between students. The importance of OP depends on school competitiveness, not program quality.

Field Positions are similar to OPs, except that they are specific to five basic skills: Field A, extended written expression involving complex analysis and synthesis of ideas; Field B, short written communication involving reading, comprehension and expression in English or a foreign language; Field C, basic numeracy involving simple calculations and graphical and tabular interpretation; Field D, solving complex problems involving mathematical symbols and abstractions; Field E, substantial practical performance involving physical or creative arts or expressive skills. FPs are used by universities and TAFE institutions in admitting students into certain courses, whenever necessary, because OPs do not indicate specific strengths and weaknesses of students. FP calculation involves similar methods to OP calculation, except only skill-specific information is used. Each FP considers LOAs in Authority subjects that emphasize relevant skills, and questions groups on the QCS Test that relate to the FP. Only OP-eligible students receive FPs, and FPs are only issued for applicable basic skills. FPs are granted on a ten-point scale, 1 being the highest, 10 being the lowest.

Selection Rank is an alternative student ranking method. The Selection Rank is a number from 99, which is the highest rank, to 47, the lowest rank. Selection Rank allows Authority registered subjects and select VET courses to be considered in addition to
Authority subjects. This allows OP-ineligible students to be ranked as well as OP-eligible
students. As in OP calculation, 20 semester credits are used in the calculation, but only
the best twenty are used from all of the eligible courses. Each type of course is weighted
differently, according to rigor—Authority subjects offer the most points, followed by
Authority registered subjects, then recorded subjects. Each LOA is converted into raw
points and all are averaged. The QCS Test, which is optional for Selection Rank, also
yields points. Group results do not matter in this calculation. The Selection Rank is
created by adding the converted LOAs and QCS Test results. Selection Ranks are not
scaled.

The Selection Rank system was co-created by QSA, Queensland Tertiary
Admissions Centre (QTAC), and tertiary schools, and is considered an acceptable
admissions standard by tertiary schools that are affiliated with QTAC. Selection Rank is
more favorable for some students. Generally, students who fail or barely pass one or
more Authority courses are ranked higher with Selection Rank compared to OP, because
Selection Rank will ignore the weakest grades. Some interviewed teachers worry that
Selection Rank discourages certain students from taking Authority subjects. Acceptance
to university or TAFE using Selection Rank depends on school competitiveness, not
program quality.

Other paths for tertiary entrance exist for non-traditional students. For example,
QTAC offers a Special Tertiary Admissions Test and TAFE institutes and universities
can assign Selection Rank based on grades, work experience, and personal qualifications.
Many universities and TAFE institutes have developed special admittance procedures and
qualifications for non-traditional students. OP and FP, then Selection Rank, continue to be the major paths to tertiary education.

History of Education in Queensland

If the success of art education in Queensland is to be emulated in an existing system, then the history of Queensland education should be reviewed. Although moderated school-based assessment was introduced to solve different problems that Utah and other states currently face, the QSA system has resolved many problems that currently exist in the United States. School-based assessment was primarily implemented to replace an unpopular external evaluation system that was controlled by university institutions. This is not a major issue in United States’ art education, although the No Child Left Behind Act threatens to usher in more stringent assessment techniques. If left to the United States Government, new demands would likely take a similar form to the former Queensland system. Otherwise, Utah and the United States at large currently lack some key assessment components that are included in moderated school-based assessment, including accountability to standards in curriculum and assessment, and reliability and usability of summative assessment. Below is a report on how the QSA system has evolved to include authentic assessment and how QSA has improved since its inception in the early 1970s. Unless otherwise noted, the information below has been compiled and reorganized from two documents provided by Education Queensland on the Education Queensland Web site, *Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools: Two decades of change 1964–1983* (2003a) and *Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools 1983–1990* (2003b). The first document is a compilation of historical papers on education.
in Queensland. Both documents were written by Eddie Clark of the Department of Education, Queensland.

Until the inception of QSA, curriculum and assessment in Queensland was essentially controlled by and geared toward meeting the needs of universities. Shortly after the first secondary schools had been established in the 1860s, universities assumed the role of writing the syllabi. This was solidified in 1909 when The University of Queensland was approved to open and was legally established as the organization responsible for conducting public examinations and issuing certificates of achievement.

The reign of university-driven curriculum and assessment continued even through a series of events that attempted to distribute such authority among all interested parties. In 1941, for example, two acts were passed to provide representation to secondary education decision making outside of the university arena by providing a board that was to oversee education. This was unsuccessful because the majority of top board members were affiliated with universities. In 1951 and 1956, Queensland education was revised so that all students successfully completing at least one course of Junior and Senior levels of high school studies would receive a certificate indicating such, replacing the traditional high diploma standards. Grade markings were also rescaled. These revisions encouraged lower performing students to stay in school longer, which prompted broader curricula. The increased diversity of the graduating population presented a problem with the narrow focus of curriculum and assessment. Junior examination responsibility was transferred to the government from the University of Queensland in 1959, in another attempt to create an equitable situation for students. Junior exams were given to students at the end of Year 10, because traditionally only university bound students completed Senior studies (Years
University staff continued to hold important panel positions regarding syllabi and assessment, and their presence continued to dominate. In 1964, the compulsory exit age for students was raised to 15 years, which added to the growing trend for students to remain in secondary school longer. According to an Education Queensland document describing the history of education between 1957 and 1982 (2002), three major influences caused increased demand for secondary education in Queensland during this period: (a) increased birthrate in Queensland, (b) the affluence of the Western World, and (c) an increase in professional and service occupations. To meet these needs, and in response to the complaints of teachers, students, and others, the first serious attempt was made to reform assessment practices in Queensland.

*The Education Act of 1964* was instituted partly to devise new boards that would oversee secondary education with the purpose of providing opportunities to students who were not planning to attend university, while maintaining appropriate opportunities for the minority of university-bound students. These were the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies and the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies. Both boards were comprised of members from the University of Queensland, the Queensland Teachers Union (QTU), the Department of Education, and non-government schools. The responsibility of these boards included advising the Minister for Education on school needs and examination criteria, issuing certificates, arranging for examinations to take place, and appointing committees for each core subject. These subject committees were comprised of the span of interested constituents, and for preparing and validating the appropriateness of subject examinations. Over the course of a few years, grading scales
were changed, the distribution of marks was reconfigured, and non-academic or “special” subject tests were added to the traditional core to appease less capable students.

While these attempted improvements were continually being made to this system, opponents to external testing were trying to abolish it. Recent evidence had suggested that internal assessment was freer and more accurate than external testing. The board had concluded in 1965 that parents would not trust or support internal testing as a valid means of rating students, and there were concerns that the abolition of external exams would erase teacher accountability and make it impossible for employers to predict worker success. On the other hand, the QTU called for the Junior examination to be discontinued because it dictated curricula and neglected certain subjects, because test performance was a poor indicator of vocational work potential, and because school grades more accurately depicted students’ abilities. Several controversies also arose about certain subject tests and the continued role of university members. Even certain professors began to speak against external examinations. One proposed solution was to issue diplomas, or Leaving Certificates, that would specifically indicate secondary school performance, and that student performance would simply be based on school grades. The boards began to conduct research on the matter of eliminating external testing by polling parents and industry officials, but a resolution was never reached. The Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, however, agreed to establish a committee that would consider Leaving Certificates. This committee, headed by George Bassett, Professor of Education at the University of Queensland, produced a report in 1968 known as the “Bassett Report.” The report determined that Leaving Certificates should be issued to students, because the
current test failed a significant portion of students, who were then left with no indication or proof of performance.

In June of 1969, the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies met to discuss the Bassett Report and the criticisms that external examinations were not educationally valuable and dominated by university concerns. A variety of sources distrusted the effectiveness of external examinations, including the University of Queensland. The board, however, concluded that this problem could not be solved by simply replacing the examinations with Leaving Certificates. Instead, the board recommended that the Minister for Education construct a committee to review the current system of examinations and make recommendations for assessing student achievement. The ensuing committee was comprised of eight persons representing each major entity that would be affected by a revamping of the educational system and was headed by William C. Radford, Director of the Australian Council for Educational Research, for which the committee has been named.

The Radford Committee considered 26 written submissions and studied the public examination systems of other Australian States, New Zealand, England, Scotland, Canada, and the United States. An independent committee was also formed by the QTU to advise the Radford Committee and it recommended several of the radical changes agreed to by the Radford Committee. The Radford committee released the Radford Report in May of 1970, from which moderated school-based assessment was instituted. The report recommended replacing external examinations with a series of internal examinations accompanied by a moderation system to achieve comparability between schools. The report considered the advantages and disadvantages to this proposal, and it
was determined that the potential advantages far outweighed the disadvantages. The major recommendations were that: (a) a single board, the Board of Secondary School Studies (the Board), should replace the two existing boards; (b) assessment should be school-based instead of external; (c) exit results should be reported on Junior and Senior Certificates and that these should indicate which subjects are Board subjects and which are devised by schools; (d) the Board should maintain Certificate comparability through a Moderation Committee and Chief Moderators and should only issue Certificates to schools that agree to moderation; (e) an order of merit list should be prepared according to scaled school assessments and special examinations; and (f) the Board should create an external exam for correspondence and part-time students. These and other recommendations provided the basic framework for the Board, which is now QSA.

The initial reaction to the Radford Report was mixed. The three groups that generally opposed the changes were veteran teachers, industry representatives, and the general public. The public’s main concerns included assurance of validity and fairness, the absence of which could be caused by poor moderation or cheating private schools, and how teachers would be prepared for such a complex process. The main concerns of teachers and the QTU were time consumption, moderation processes, storage issues, class sizes, staffing, and teacher competence. Research for this thesis has revealed that Queensland teachers still hold many of these concerns. Most teachers, university professors, and administrators supported the Radford Report. In 1970 the findings were introduced to Parliament as a Bill by the Minister for Education, the Honorable Alan Fletcher. This Bill was implemented on December 21 of that year as the Education Act Amendment Act of 1970 No. 2.
The Act provided for the introduction of the Board of Secondary School Studies, which consisted of representatives of each major interested party including public and independent school teachers, administrators, government officials, professors, union representatives, and various staff members. The new Board was assigned the main tasks of (a) giving advice to the Minister for Education; (b) determining assessment procedures and issuing subsequent Junior and Senior Certificates; (c) approving and designing syllabi; and (d) appointing a Moderation Committee, Subject Advisory Committees, and other committees wherever necessary. The new Board was placed outside of the authority of Education Queensland, giving it considerably more autonomy than previous boards.

The initial format of the new Board and its moderation procedures was similar to the current QSA model, but without review panels. Essentially, the descending order of command was (1) a moderation committee, which was comprised of the chief moderators (top Board officials) as well as representatives from other involved institutions, and which was responsible for overseeing moderation and making recommendations to the Minister for Education concerning moderation; (2) chief moderators, who were appointed by the Board and were responsible for all aspects of moderation relating to individual subject areas; (3) district moderators, who were elected by local principals and were responsible for conducting district moderation meetings and carrying out Board guidelines; (4) school moderators, usually school principals, who were responsible for overseeing subject moderators; and (5) subject-area moderators, who were teachers in charge of ensuring consistent and accurate assessment within particular subjects. According to Tony Luttrell (personal communication, June 6, 2004), who taught art when the Radford Report was implemented, later served as the (equivalent) chief moderator,
and has since returned to teaching, every art teacher in Queensland was once required to bring every students’ work to an annual moderation meeting in Brisbane. Soon after moderation began, district moderation meetings were introduced. These meetings took place between subject-area moderators and district moderators for the purpose of reaching a consensus on assessment. School representatives brought samples of student work and accompanying work programs, and defended the assessment proposals for that work. District moderators then made recommendations for approving or modifying these decisions. Schools were given the option of accepting this advice or appealing to the chief moderator (or representative).

From the outset, the Board of Secondary School Studies was determined to convey its mission clearly and positively. The Board published a regular bulletin, the Board of Secondary School Studies Information Bulletin, to transmit information and answer questions regarding its new procedures. On two occasions, the first in 1971, and again in 1973, the Board explicitly addressed its fear of being mistaken as a domineering authority: “The only constraint imposed is that the school fulfil the objectives of the syllabus” (cited in Education Queensland, 2003, p. 31). The Board also frequently surveyed teachers for feedback on moderation. In one such survey, conducted in 1972, the Board asked subject area moderators and district moderators to express their opinions on whether Junior and Senior moderation should (a) not change, (b) change slightly, (c) change radically, or (d) be abolished. The majority result was that Junior moderation should be abolished, while Senior moderation should be changed slightly. In 1973, the Board also distributed a booklet to Year 11 and 12 students, which explained the moderation process.
In addition to attempting to establish positive public relations, the Board and unaffiliated organizations conducted research on assessment practices and implemented assessment guidelines to address concerns relating to comparability and ranking students. The Board initiated parameters for awarding student rankings according to a strict norm-reference scale of 7–1. The Radford Report had called for rankings to be scaled and this action clearly violates that principle. The Board was concerned, however, that many schools were ranking students higher than they deserved in order to improve their reputations, and perhaps, this measure was intended as a temporary remedy to the rumored problem. To scale rankings, the Radford Report had proposed that examinations unrelated to syllabi be produced to determine the ability of students to operate independently and creatively within core fields. The Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education determined two important factors from different research efforts in 1972: first, that local assessment could provide assessment at least as valid and reliable as the previous Senior Examination and second, that a study of certain tests and beta test results provided evidence that a particular test, the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test (ASAT), would yield results reliable enough that it could fairly be used as the measure for scaling student rankings. Meanwhile, the Board had asked that its early efforts in assessing students not be used to award scholarships and prizes, but that the institutions and organizations awarding such accolades should use their own systems to determine such matters.

In spite of these efforts, the early years of moderation in Queensland were plagued with internal problems and criticisms. It is worth noting first that few desired a return to the previous external examination system. Nevertheless, each group involved
with secondary education objected to some aspect of the early moderation system. The main concern of teachers was the amount of time it took to store, document, and assess work. In retrospect, it appears also that many older teachers may have complained due to apathy and general resistance to change. The teachers’ union, which was also worried about over-testing, was most worried about moderation procedures and results, in that it did not approve of all four Senior semesters counting toward final markings, and it did not believe the Board could guarantee comparability. The general public was represented by critics who believed the implementation of the Radford Report had occurred too quickly. School principals and headmasters were concerned with over-testing.

Universities felt that they were not appropriately consulted in forming the Board and that the Board had been assigned the contradictory task of at once providing assessment freedom to teachers and objectifying assessment outcomes. Consequently, the University of Queensland decided not to follow the advice of the Radford Report and refused to accept the Board’s decisions as sufficient criteria for determining acceptance and scholarships. Parliament formally reiterated a variety of the aforementioned complaints.

It became difficult in 1972 for the Board to find people to serve as district moderators. This was likely because of low prestige associated with the position. In large part, the low esteem of these positions directly related to the lack of faith in moderation results, particularly with respect to comparability. Other internal problems are supposed to have existed, but the available research is not specific.

As criticisms of the Board mounted and internal problems persisted, the Board responded. Board members occasionally acknowledged certain problems and refuted others. The Board generally felt that moderation procedures could be improved, while
some of the criticisms were unfair or biased according to the particular aims of the groups filing them. To reconcile some of the problems, the Board met with members of the University of Queensland to design immediate and long-term assessment changes.

The Board implemented several changes to moderation in 1974. To address the criticism of excessive Junior testing, the Board significantly reduced moderation requirements for Year 10. The major change for Senior moderation was the introduction of advisory panels. These panels were constructed of experienced teachers who served as advisors to Chief Moderators. The initial use of advisory committees reduced the amount of lost time for teachers, but did not adequately address feedback concerns. Peripheral benefits also resulted from this change, including higher quality assessment practices and increased professional development opportunities for teachers.

The Board also pressed for universities to use its system of ranking students for determining entrance. Each graduating Senior was given a Tertiary Entrance Score (TE Score), which was calculated by scaling grades against the ASAT. The reaction by universities was that they all either used this score or something similar to determine entrance. The methodology was criticized, but the positive effect of this method was that it removed some of the pressure for students to perform flawlessly during Year 11 studies. The Board conducted research on the validity of this system and determined that the ASAT could be used as a reasonable basis for scaling scores.

Meanwhile, two important research efforts were being conducted yielding separate documents. Three research officers were commissioned by the Board to conduct an investigation of questionnaires and interviews regarding post-Radford secondary education for the purpose of analyzing conflicting reports. In November of 1975, the
group presented a report entitled *Schools Under Radford* to the Board. Generally, the report concluded that the respondents favored the new system over an external examination, but that key problems were perceived, especially with moderation. Students and teachers did not trust the claimed comparability measures, felt that assessment was excessive, and believed that certain schools were disadvantaged, namely small schools with unusually gifted student bodies. The report made a variety of recommendations for the Board, most importantly that (a) the Board should locate and assist struggling teachers, that (b) TE Scores should reflect the best three semesters instead of all four, and that (c) TE scores should be produced in a timely manner.

In December, an unrelated report was submitted to the Board by the Australian Advisory Committee on Research in Education, which had commissioned the University of Queensland Department of Education to evaluate the changes brought about by the Radford Report. The document produced, the *Campbell Report*, noted that schools were slightly better off than before as the result of certain improvements, that many things had changed very little and that promises had gone unfulfilled, and that the Board should allow others to assist with moderation. The report was based on evidence provided by data collected in 1974, and by the time the report was released, some problems had been resolved. Nevertheless, the *Campbell Report* and *Schools Under Radford* report clearly validated some serious rumors concerning moderation.

Two other organizations put pressure on the Board to change shortly thereafter. First, the Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens Association (QCPCA) urged the Department of Education to limit the use of moderation results to communication between schools, students, and parents. QCPCA contended that since moderation did not
yield unquestionably reliable results, they should not be used as the basis for awarding university placement or scholarships. The organization believed that assessment results should be transmitted face-to-face and not become part of students’ permanent records.

Of greater significance was pressure brought forth by QTU, to which the Board necessarily responded by promising specific changes. The union strongly opposed the method of deriving an order of merit list (TE Scores). QTU requested that moderation should be entirely local, that schools be responsible for courses, assessment, and issuance of certificates. The union also sought abolition of Junior Certificates and Year 11 moderation. QTU sent a newsletter to teachers in early 1976 instructing them not to provide examples of work to anyone for any purpose other than local moderation. This would effectively block the Board’s ability to issue Senior Certificates. This decree was also supported by organizations representing independent schools. Consequently, the Board was put in a position that demanded cooperation.

In May of 1976, the Board requested the QTU to defer action until it was able to institute changes relating to four in-process developments: (a) the Board was considering several suggestions for changing moderation procedures; (b) a committee was formed to examine the proposals presented in the Campbell Report and Schools Under Radford; (c) the Board Executive Officer was investigating developments in California, Canada, England, and Scotland; and (d) the Board was awaiting response to its official request for reconstitution and restatement of powers and functions. The union accepted the proposal, and upon the resolution of these issues, QTU became reasonably satisfied with the results.
QTU conducted a seminar in June of 1976 to investigate moderation procedures in secondary schools. The seminar concluded that there was no support expressed for retaining the existing moderation system. Two general revisions to the system were determined necessary: (1) official ratings should only occur at the end of Year 11 and at the end of Year 12, and (2) student ratings should be derived from a criteria-reference system instead of the existing norm-reference system.

The University of Queensland Professorial Board also conducted research on the effects of the new system and, in 1976, determined its implications for the University. The Professorial Board concluded that: (a) external examinations should not be reinstated; (b) universities should monitor first-year students for the purpose of defining and remedying deficiencies; (c) TE Scores should only reflect grades in courses that universities have approved for this purpose; and (d) the ASAT was not sufficient for scaling scores. A separate study conducted by the Department of Education yielded opposing results, in which the ASAT was considered nearly as effective as the previous system of external examination.

In 1977, the Research Branch of the Department of Education released a report that addressed school assessment procedures. In favor of the new system, several points were made. The research indicated that teachers were more satisfied with the system at that time than when it was first introduced and that teachers generally approved of the mechanical procedures of moderation. The new system had also succeeded in increasing the flexibility and variety of assessment methods, including increased formative assessment and the quality of assessment had improved. On the other hand, problems still existed. The main issue with moderation was comparability, particularly TE Scores. The
main problem with schools was that in some cases poor assessment techniques were being used and not all teachers were capable of implementing quality assessment models. The Research Branch recommended that research continue in the areas of determining TE Score calculation and in setting parameters for schools so that only valid and reliable assessment techniques and models would be allowed. This recommendation supported the previously mentioned concerns of QTU.

Of all the research and outcries, the most important changes to the new system resulted from a series of reports furnished by a subcommittee of the Board. The Scott Committee was headed by Professor Ted Scott of the James Cook University and was comprised of six important leaders representing each entity affected by moderation. The committee was given the primary task of devising recommendations to the Board based on data presented in the *Campbell Report* and *Schools Under Radford*. The Scott Committee produced its first report in December of 1976, which consisted of five recommendations:

1. Assessment should be changed from a norm-based system to a competency-based system.
2. More attention should be placed on professional development and dialogue between the Board and individual secondary institutions and teachers.
3. Curriculum should be emphasized, and the Board should assist schools in devising curricula.
4. The Board should devise a system to more clearly convey its aims, policies, and procedures.
(5) A research program should be instituted to address the needs of the Board and proposals of others. The Board adopted these as the basic principles for determining future policies. The QTU and others supported this initiative.

The final report of the Scott Committee was issued in April of 1978, *A Review of School-Based Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools* (ROSBA). This report called for major revisions to moderated assessment based on a variety of conditions relating to recent changes in Australian society as well as educational needs and changes. Scott cited a high unemployment rate, the increase of student retention through Year 12, an increased awareness of multicultural concerns, and an increased demand for standards and performance accountability. ROSBA recommended several major assessment revisions. First, the report called for a change in assessing student achievement, that norm-based assessment should be replaced with competency-based procedures. Also, a Senior course study should result in a single defining grade instead of a series of grades representing each semester of work. The marks used to report grades should reflect competency, not arbitrary numbers or letters. Second, to ensure good curriculum and assessment, the Board should accredit course outlines and assessment models. Third, district-wide meetings should be made mandatory. In these meetings, curricula and assessment practices should be compared and discussed among all same-subject teachers within a district. Fourth, competency tests should be implemented for the purpose of helping teachers to understand where benchmark performances should be set. The tests should not be used to scale student performances and would not be documented. Fifth, TE Score calculation should persist, but the Board should continue to research the issue in hopes of finding a more accurate and acceptable way of determining these. Sixth,
Junior and Senior School Certificates should only report information determined by the Board relating to core subjects. Schools should also issue School Leaving Certificates, which should report information determined by individual schools, such as athletic capability, leadership, citizenship, and elective subject performance.

In 1978, the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education determined that there was a clear need for cooperation and consensus between the public and government regarding education. Board membership positions were reorganized to include three prominent non-education community members. The Committee agreed with criticisms that sometimes smaller schools were disadvantaged in the scaling process and that students should, therefore, be able to appeal TE Scores. Finally, the Committee generally approved the major points of ROSBA.

The final say in ROSBA came from the Minister for Education. After consulting public opinion on ROSBA, the government approved the recommendations of the report, with the minor exception that the names of achievement levels be changed to the current names (VHA = Very High Achievement, HA = High Achievement, SA = Sound Achievement, LA = Limited Achievement, VLA = Very Limited Achievement). The results of ROSBA were scheduled to be implemented over a five-year period beginning in 1981. Additionally, the Board would be restructured according to the Education Act, the implications of which were yet to be determined. The new provisions of ROSBA were introduced between 1981 and 1985 in three phases, each demanding one year of development and two years of implementation.

The implementation of ROSBA and the Education Act brought about several significant changes to the structure and procedures of the Board. These changes directly
affected the demands on teachers, and consequently, the manner in which education was conducted in Queensland. The cumulative result of the revisions was a system very similar to the current QSA system in form and spirit. Only one major function, the calculation of student rankings, would be revised at a later point. Below is a discussion of the changes made, the problems experienced during the implementation of ROSBA, and the resolution of student rankings.

Three major areas of education were affected by the implementation of ROSBA: (a) curriculum, (b) assessment and evaluation, and (c) moderation procedures. It should be noted that these combined to form the single major change—that all aspects of education be integrated and standards-based. To establish this, the Board rewrote all syllabi, from which teachers wrote work programs and assessment models.

Many of the new curricular directives reflect those of today and have already been thoroughly discussed in this thesis. To clarify the new aspects, a few points should be mentioned. First, the new syllabi required teachers to use objectives spanning four broad functions including higher-order thinking. Teachers now needed to assess outcomes in content (factual knowledge), process (cognitive skills), skill (practical skills), and affect (attitudes, values, feelings). These objectives were necessarily met through statewide standards. Also, in the interest of recognizing diversity, new courses began to be approved beginning in 1985. These courses included vocational interests and elective interests relevant to regions. These changes served to provide greater freedom in course offerings and curricular approaches and to expand the types of learning that were assessed, while strengthening the commitment to standards across the curriculum. For this to work, assessment was integrated into the curriculum writing process.
The most important aspect of the new assessment guidelines was that assessment became a pervasive part of the education process. Compared to the traditional view of assessment as an evaluative mean, it now came to the forefront of consideration in writing and implementing curriculum. Assessment now needed to be standards-based, and assessment outcomes needed to report levels of achievement concerning those standards. It also became necessary to clarify assessment to students, as assignments were presented in the form of assessment tasks, which listed methods of assessment and assessment criteria. Work programs were required to utilize a variety of assessment types including formative assessment. Assessment needed to be done continually throughout a course of study, covering as many standards as possible, and this enabled a drastic change in summative evaluation. Performance over a course of study now resulted in a single grade, which reflected the fullest and latest performance. Because three types of subjects were now being assessed—Board, Board-registered, and Board-recorded—the Board distinguished these from each other on exit certificates.

Once the Board was restructured, moderation functioned in basically the same manner as it does now. District and state review panels were instated. These replaced District Moderators and assumed the present duties of accrediting work programs and elective courses, and validating student grades. As mentioned, Junior and Senior Certificates now distinguished between Board and Board-registered subjects (recorded subjects were not reported on Board certificates during this time period), and each course of study resulted in a single grade according to the present performance indicators. Between 1985 and 1987, the Board established the Assessment Unit, a committee responsible for researching and applying assessment theory for its system of school-based
assessment. The committee was particularly concerned with criteria-based techniques. While ROSBA was being implemented, TE Score calculation remained the same and research was continually conducted in hopes of finding a favorable alternative.

The fact that this system of moderated school-based assessment has remained fundamentally unchanged for two decades, after considerable volatility and change, is an indication that the current system is agreeable. The revised system of school-based education, however, was not problem-free. The ROSBA implementation phase was extremely taxing on the Board, which at once had to implement new procedures and continue to practice old procedures. The Board could not simply abandon old methods because it was still responsible for creating TE Scores, which required monitoring and scaling to take place. Although this system was heavily criticized, it remained essential and necessary for the Board to carry out its in-place duties until they were revised.

During the implementation phase of ROSBA, two broad controversies persisted. One was regarding the Board’s decision to continue using existing methods, particularly in generating TE Scores. Tertiary institutions were disappointed with this decision, as some professors had determined TE Scores as completely irrelevant. The Board contended that TE Scores should not be too heavily relied upon and blamed universities for placing impossible demands on the scores. Still, the Board acknowledged that small schools sometimes faired poorly and that certain subjects require special assessment treatment. Changes were made accordingly in hopes of achieving greater comparability among schools and thus increasing the validity of TE Scores while the Board continued to search for an alternative to the TE Score system.
The other principle problem during the phase-in period of ROSBA was the inability of the Board to provide adequate time and communication to teachers. The period was plagued with frequent disagreement between the Board and the QTU on workload versus time allotment. The QTU toggled between accepting and threatening the Board during the entire period, because it felt that teachers were repeatedly asked to do unfair amounts of work in a short time without compensation or provisional time. The Board sporadically met QTU demands, and by 1985 the new system had been implemented across Queensland. Not all teachers, however, understood certain crucial aspects of the new system, including how to integrate assessment, how to determine LOAs, and how to avoid unnecessary work. Many believed this was due to a lack of professional development opportunities, and that the materials released by the Board fell short of explaining its guidelines.

In addition to these serious problems, other less pressing problems arose. One problem was excessive assessment and administrative procedures. Early review panels required an extraordinary quantity of work, a problem the Board acknowledged and eventually fixed. Storing, filing, and transporting this work added to the QTU contention that teachers were now being overworked. Some teachers seemingly misinterpreted the continuous assessment to mean frequent intense assessment. Consequently, teachers, administrators, and students complained about the amount of assessment, and various entities requested that the Board focus more on quality of assessment than quantity. This problem persisted for several years. The amount of documentation necessary to show the fulfillment of standards and the time involved in assessing and documenting work continues to be an issue as recent research for this thesis has revealed.
The attitude toward review panels was another problem. Apparently many teachers were skeptical of the motives and competency of review panels. Some teachers considered review panel members elitist and many felt that initial moderation procedures focused only on negative points, and were thus unpleasant and degrading. Recent interviews with experienced panelists for this thesis have verified this. The procedures for review panel conduct have continued to evolve into a much more formal, objective approach, as is discussed later in this chapter.

Finally, the press complicated matters considerably. Many misconstrued reports tarnished the reputation of the Board and its revised procedures. Perhaps, this problem was an extension of the Board’s failure to adequately communicate its intentions, or, perhaps, it was an unavoidable annoyance. It has been reported that the Board did attempt to publicize its revised aims through publications, discussions, displays, and newspaper advertisements. The problem eventually diminished.

Once the revised system had been implemented, the Board began to address criticisms mounted against it. The Board noted in 1987 that, although the majority of teachers had accepted the principles and philosophies of ROSBA, it would still be necessary to continue developing and refining the system for a decade. Educators in other Australian states and overseas had begun researching the developments in Queensland, which was emerging as a world leader in criteria-based assessment.

The Board continued to be criticized for its intense focus on assessment, however, especially regarding the unchanged TE Score calculation methods. Two case studies, one conducted by a member of the QTU and another by three James Cook University professors, plus two internal research reports (cited in Education Queensland, 2003a)
suggested that while external examinations were not the answer to the dilemma, the Board would need to change some aspects of its protocol. The internal reports announced that teachers generally supported ROSBA theory but complained about the amount of work ROSBA created. It also recommended that the Board offer more professional development opportunities. The internal reports confirmed that teachers and students remained confused about certain aspects of assessment. Most importantly, controversy regarding TE Score calculation was clearly hurting the public reputation of the Board.

In addition to the above studies, several entities called for the abolition of the TE Score calculation system. Many universities found the system inadequate. The cost of generating alternative methods probably prevented universities from investigating such methods and instead, the Board was pressured to develop a solution. The QTU and a union for independent schools also demanded that the situation be resolved. The Queensland Trades and Labor Council also wanted the Board to remain in charge of determining rankings, but agreed that TE Scores should be replaced with some alternative. The QCPCA believed that institutions should develop their own methods of determining admittance criteria, that TE Scores should not be used. A 1990 Department of Education Research Report (cited in Education Queensland, 2003b, pp. 14, 32) displayed results of a survey of students, which indicated that they had considerably less appreciation for TE Scores than for school in general or for assessment. The press was also quite critical of TE Scores among its complaints. A report entitled Tertiary Entrance in Queensland: A Review provided 52 recommendations for change in the system. Fairness was the main goal of these recommendations and many of the suggestions pertained to TE Score problems and possible solutions. One proposed solution involved
placing the students into Overall Achievement Positions, which were bands of performance based on exit LOAs. The gist of this suggestion was similar to the current system of OPs and FPs. The suggestions were not immediately implemented. In the 1989 State elections, Wayne Goss of the Opposition Labor Party vowed to replace the TE Score system if elected. Goss won the election and appointed a new Minister for Education in 1990.

Consequently, the new Minister for Education, Paul Bradley, declared in 1990 that Nancy Viviani had been appointed to review tertiary entrance procedures and present a report with recommendations at the end of June, 1990. Viviani was, at the time, a Professor of Political Science at the Australian National University with extensive knowledge of the tertiary entrance systems of Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Asia. Her task was to recommend a fair, simple calculation system that would be based on LOAs and resolve the existing problems associated with TE Score calculation. Viviani was assisted by a reference committee of qualified individuals representing the span of interested parties.

The research cited in this thesis, specifically *Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools 1983–1990*, fails to explain the final replacement of TE Scores with the current system of OPs and FPs. Based on the existing research, it appears that what may have occurred was that the committee headed by Viviani decided to recommend a system similar to the current system and that the Board realized this suggestion. This cannot be verified, however, from the research compiled for this thesis. The only requisite of Viviani that current OP calculation violates is the use of scaling based on group test performance. One criticism of TE Scaling was that results were skewed
because some students did not care to perform well. Current scaling for OP addresses this issue by only considering the performance of OP-eligible students who voluntarily take the QCS Test. TE Scores were eventually replaced by the current system of OP and FP calculation. As the following section reveals, tertiary entrance calculation is not currently among the concerns of most Queensland Visual Art teachers.

Research for this thesis, namely the interviewing of diverse teachers, review panelists, and QSA officials associated with the field of Visual Art, has provided insight on changes to the system since ROSBA, especially following 1990 where the previous historic report leaves off. Because the interviewees are all associated and concerned with the discipline of Visual Art, the results tend to lean away from general happenings toward matters that have affected the field. Significant general changes typically affect all disciplines, however, and these have been included by interviewees wherever applicable.

One point to note is that the Board of Secondary School Studies at some point divided again to form the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies for Senior years, and has recently merged and been renamed the Queensland Studies Authority. The current term and its abbreviation (QSA) and associated terminology will be used henceforth.

Dating back to the early implementation of ROSBA, Brendan Lea of QSA (personal communication, June 18, 2004) that two curricular problems existed. One of these problems was appraisal tasks, which are the written assignments demanded of all Authority subjects. Visual Art students are required to produce creative written tasks, usually in the areas of art history and art criticism. Appraisal tasks demonstrate deep research and critical analysis that relate to students’ individual artistic pursuits. Art
teachers have struggled with this aspect of the curriculum, perhaps because they do not enjoy or value writing compared with image making. One interviewee mentioned that recent mandated syllabi have demanded that Making and Appraising tasks be linked and they must be unique, which prevents the likelihood of cheating and strengthens purpose. The other problem that dates back to early ROSBA according to Lea was assignments that were too teacher-directed. Many teachers using modal curricula would assign tasks that resulted in identical products, such as contour line tree drawings and pointillism eggs. QSA has made several changes to general syllabus requirements and specifically to the Senior Syllabus in pursuit of advanced cognitive skills.

Recent syllabi have focused more on concept development and student-directed explorations. This has been accomplished in a number of ways, some general and some specific to art. In general, recent QSA syllabi in all subjects have operated thematically, which, in art has been accomplished by increasing assessment of concept and abating traditional modal approaches to art. The trend in Queensland education has been to favor depth over breadth at the Senior level. In art, this is now accomplished by assigning a wide variety of experimental projects in Year 11 and narrowing Year 12 tasks to a single theme per student per task that normally culminates with three major art products. Students are free to experiment in Year 11, because LOAs only score fullest and latest work, which is accomplished in Year 12. Research is an integral component in creating depth in artwork and is documented in visual diaries. Under the direction of Tony Luttrell, QSA introduced visual diary documentation as a mandatory major aspect of curriculum and assessment in the 1996 Senior Syllabus. Students are prepared for the rigorous conceptual demands of Year 12 through extensive visual diary work in Year 11,
which teaches them how to develop sophisticated research on themes and convert research into imagery or other forms of art. Visual diaries also establish emphasis on process in art. The end result is that Year 12 artwork is highly individual and steeped in meaning. Lea believes (personal communication, June 18, 2004) that some teachers, particularly veteran teachers, may struggle with the current conceptual focus, and that the next Senior Syllabus will be more specific in its language and directives by requiring and explaining *developmental* concepts as themes.

QSA is expanding this philosophy by introducing *rich task* curricula in Years 1–10, which are extensive projects in one or more subject areas that deeply explore a single idea or theme and cover the span of standards and objectives. Focusing on conceptual depth in Senior studies has improved learning outcomes, and QSA speculates that young children would benefit from this approach. This focus on depth could also improve Senior Visual Art, because traditionally art at younger ages has been less studious than at the Senior level, and it has been reported that some students have trouble making the transition into serious work. Rich tasks would prepare students for the conceptual rigors of Senior studies. Rich tasks will probably be implemented in the coming years in Queensland; the initiative is currently still in the pilot stage and needs final government approval. This will directly affect Visual Art, which has recently gained status by becoming a part of the compulsory elementary core.

Because Visual Art is an Authority subject, it receives the same treatment and consideration as other academic subjects. As mentioned, art is tested in the QCS Test and has traditionally been tested as a part of the core along with other core subjects. While this legitimizes art, it sets a high precedence for the subject that some students cannot or
wish not to fulfill. Because of the demand for less rigorous art and art-related ventures, an applied arts course is currently being developed.

Reduction of assessment is another example of continuous improvement by QSA, especially regarding documentation and storage of art. When moderation began, every work needed to be kept for review and these were transported to a single location. Later, the amount of work that needed to be brought to review was reduced. Photographing became an acceptable manner of documenting work and submissions could be mailed. The introduction of visual diaries, however, increased the bulk of work sent to panels, a problem QSA is still addressing. Recently, QSA has required teachers to send just enough information to validate their assessment claims in all aspects, including visual diaries. Some teachers interviewed felt that too little was demanded while others felt that too much was required. Digital documentation is also being considered as an acceptable standard method of submitting verification folios. Oral examinations and reports are two former assessment requirements that have been eliminated as methods contributing to LOAs, although they are still encouraged.

In summarizing the evolutionary history of QSA, it has clearly survived because of its commitment to an assessment ideal and its relentless attention to refinement. QSA was introduced because Queensland demanded assessment authenticity and could no longer accept external high-stakes testing as a viable option. Through extensive research of national and international assessment models, Education Queensland settled on school-based assessment for freedom and standards-based curriculum and assessment for consistency and equity. Moderation would ensure comparability among schools, without which school-based assessment could not be justified. Because this formula ultimately
provides the greatest freedom to schools and teachers and guarantees fair and consistent assessment outcomes, Education Queensland has worked diligently to overcome the problems of implementing this radical, initially untested system. Through many changes and modifications, some of considerable magnitude, Queensland has emerged as a leader in school-based assessment.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the QSA System

In weighing the strengths and weaknesses of the existing QSA system of assessment accountability, especially Senior Syllabus guidelines and the moderation process, one of the most important factors to consider is the opinions of teachers in Queensland. A select group of Queensland Visual Art teachers was interviewed, and each was asked to express his or her feelings on the QSA system, including the Senior Syllabus and moderation. Interviewees were probed for elaboration wherever necessary, but in all cases the conversations were steered by the interviewee. This section reports the research of these interviewees in three parts: (1) perceived strengths of the QSA system, (2) perceived weaknesses of the system, and (3) a summary and evaluation of the perceived strengths and weaknesses.

Chapter 3 justifies the selection of subjects and addresses the specific profile of this group. Basically the group consisted of fourteen art teachers in Queensland whose cumulative experience spans the spectrum of QSA positions, geography, and demography (see Table 5, p. 111). Two aspects of research have added further credence to the group. First, the factual information mentioned about QSA has been verified with official documents wherever possible and no contradictory information was discovered. Second, the consistency of responses concerning strengths and weaknesses suggests reliability.
Because naturalistic inquiry was used in the interviewing process, response possibilities were infinite, making coincidental like responses improbable. Several strengths and several weaknesses were repeatedly mentioned by viewers, however, yielding a clear consensus about QSA.

Perceived QSA Strengths

Following each interview, the interviewee was asked if any alternative to QSA would be welcomed. One hundred percent of interviewees agreed that the benefits of QSA outweigh any problems and that the system should remain. Interviewees also generally agreed on the strengths of the QSA system.

Fifty-seven percent mentioned accountability as an important effect of the moderation process. The process of Accreditation ensures that each student is exposed to a contemporary and valid curriculum that emphasizes contemporary art and sophisticated theme exploration. The implication of Accreditation is that students across the state are given the opportunity to produce artwork that meets relevant standards, which is necessary for success in the QSA system. Accreditation also ensures that teachers utilize a variety of valid assessment techniques and that assessment is standards-based. Verification holds teachers accountable to evaluation, which must follow work programs and be standards-based, and LOAs must be assigned according to statewide ideals. This prevents teachers from marking students too high or too low, either intentionally or unintentionally. Students, parents, and universities can be confident that teachers have evaluated students fairly and that resulting LOAs in Authority subject such as Biology, English, and Visual Art, are accurate indicators of achievement, regardless of school or
teacher. The accountability that QSA demands adds credibility to school programs and students’ grades.

Many (57%) noted general or specific improvements within the QSA system during their tenures. Teachers noted that QSA accepts and responds to teacher feedback, which has resulted in removal of poor panelists and improved efficiency and sensibility in the submission processes. A variety of improvements was mentioned, including current and near-future initiatives. Many of these have been mentioned in the history section of this chapter. The change most cited was the move toward more conceptually rooted, student-directed art versus traditional modal, teacher-guided tasks. A number of teachers credited such changes to Tony Luttrell, during his service as a former Key Learning Area Officer [the current term for the position] for the arts. Several interviewees also mentioned improvements in the objectivity and fairness of the moderation process, which is reflected in the next statistic. Two teachers noted that while there are good points to Visual Art being a rigorous Authority subject, a need exists for less conceptual art or craft courses, which are currently being established. In contrast, not one interviewee accused QSA of ignoring input.

Half of the interviewed teachers (50%) commented on the fairness of QSA in terms of the moderation process and the Senior Syllabus. As mentioned, this has improved over the years according to many. One interviewee, who has served as the state review panel chair, cited the example of a particular high-performing student attending a low-performing school. The student had earned a VHA in all subjects, including Visual Art, and her work was highly conceptual and used new media (video). The district panel lowered her LOA because it could not find evidence of meeting formal standards at the
VHA level [the standards were met through atypical means], so the state panel agreed to review the folio. The state panel agreed with the school and restored the student’s VHA. The student then earned an OP1. This example not only shows that QSA strives for internal fairness but also demonstrates the possibility of success for students who cannot afford excellent private schools. Beyond mentioning fairness explicitly, several interviewees prefaced negative comments about QSA by acknowledging that for the most part the system is effective and fair. In fact, not a single interviewee described QSA as generally unfair, and wherever inequalities in treatment were mentioned, QSA was not blamed.

Forty-three percent mentioned the high quality of assessment, which is dependent upon both the Senior Syllabus and the moderation process. Most of those who commented on assessment expressed their appreciation of QSA for not relying entirely on exit testing as the only or major source of assessment, which they had experienced while teaching in other Australian states and other countries. In fact, one teacher complained that the QCS Test is unfair and should not be used in determining OP scores, indicating that the moderation process is sufficient. This teacher felt that the scaling process occasionally discriminates against certain programs, in this case a relatively strong Visual Art program in an average school. This teacher believes that the moderation process is stringent enough to adequately rank students without scaling. Through its literature and Web site, QSA denies both claims. Variety and quality of assessment models were also mentioned by several interviewees, the specific points of which are previously mentioned in the explanation of comments about accountability.
Thirty-six percent of interviewees cited professional development opportunities. QSA provides several seminars each year: to initiate new teachers, to train new panelists, to explain new guidelines, and more. Often, teachers are given professional development days for this purpose and it was reported that the majority of teachers attend these. Teachers are also allowed to observe Year 11 Monitoring, which helps teachers to understand the moderation process concerning their proposals and the process in general. A variety of documents is also made available to teachers explaining how to prepare different submissions. QSA also provides Internet access to all of its documents and tutorials.

Thirty-six percent noted that serving on review panels benefits teaching. Working on panels immerses teachers in the system, yielding a thorough understanding of how the moderation process works, which in turn helps these teachers in their own efforts to prepare submissions. Being a part of the review process also exposes teachers to a vast spectrum of work, which sparks new ideas. The review process serves as a networking tool according to some. One interviewee felt strongly that service should be mandatory because it is beneficial to teaching. QSA only accepts highly skilled expert teachers, however, and not every teacher meets this qualification. In terms of perceived prestige of serving, interviewees disagreed. In some districts, particularly urban, applications to serve are competitive, while in other districts it is difficult to fill all of the necessary positions. Accordingly, some teachers considered serving a great privilege while others viewed it as a thankless (albeit worthwhile) job.

Thirty-six percent cited freedom as an attribute of the Senior Syllabus. Queensland teachers confirmed the benefit of the openness and options allowed by Senior
Syllabus guidelines, as discussed in chapter 2. This compliment parallels the move from modal art into thematic art. Teachers liked the ability to address contemporary art and emerging media, as well as interdisciplinary topics according to the interests and expertise of individual teachers. These are reported below as separate issues. Others specified appreciation for the ability to focus on and incorporate local culture into the curriculum, especially in areas with high Aborigine populations. Only one interviewee felt limited, in that the focus on contemporary student-driven art eliminated the possibility of incorporating proven teacher-initiated assessment tasks. This criticism more precisely challenges current QSA objectives than the procedures established to meet these objectives.

Thirty-six percent of interviewees specifically applauded the attention to higher-order thinking in the two most recent Senior Syllabi. The interviewees who mentioned this were mostly the same people who commented on freedom. They believed that without the freedom and flexibility of the Senior Syllabus, watered down standards would likely exist and it would be impossible to implement cutting edge curricula.

Along these lines, 29% appreciated that the Senior Syllabus favors creative and contemporary approaches to art versus traditional modal foci. Furthermore, 21% noted variety and experimentation in Year 11 as a promising aspect of the Senior Syllabus. These teachers agreed that this works because Year 11 is no-risk in terms of enduring assessment, so students do not need to worry about a particular idea or technique failing. A few teachers felt that approaching art from a conceptual angle and addressing thematic art at an earlier age would help Seniors. In fact, this is currently being explored, as the
Year 1–10 Syllabus is in the process of being updated to include all core subjects more conceptually and with greater depth (i.e., the rich tasks initiative).

Because interviewees reported an overwhelming consensus, no individual points about the positive attributes of the moderation process or the Senior Syllabus need to be discussed. The consensus of the subjects concerning previously addressed points, regarding the four standard questions and the volunteered attributes, suggests that most teachers approve of QSA’s efforts and methodology and that they appreciate the same attributes about the system. This also lends credibility to the subjects and establishes reasonable justification for deriving suggestions for Utah from this research.

Perceived QSA Weaknesses

There was considerably less consensus on perceived weaknesses compared to perceived strengths. The most cited problem did not pertain directly to QSA; 64% identified poor teaching as a problem with the system. Of these, several specific problems were identified, including teachers who are not committed to success, novice teachers, veteran teachers who disagree with contemporary philosophy, and most of all, teachers who fail to grasp an understanding of the system, especially in terms of assessment. Within this category, 29% cited poor university training as a contributing factor. According to interviewed university professors, the aim of the university is to prepare teachers for international potential, not just in-state teaching. As such, there is little formal discussion of the Senior Syllabus or the moderation process in pre-service teacher preparation programs. The only experience pre-service teachers receive is from student teaching, which is inconsistent. Many of those interviewed remarked that teaching in a school with a large program is advantageous for novices, because assessment and
preparation of submission materials can be done as a group. Others mentioned serving on review panels and professional development opportunities as solutions, but little can be done about apathetic teachers. Given the inevitable problem of poor teachers, moderation at least keeps all teachers in check, by analyzing their curricula and assessment proposals. From here it becomes the responsibility of individual schools to deal with poor teachers.

The next most commonly reported concern with moderation is individual panelists. None of those interviewed identified QSA as corrupt or unfair, but 57% either directly experienced or believed rumors of panelists following poor procedures. Multiple interviewees noted that when incompetent or agenda-driven teachers become panelists it is difficult to oust them. One teacher noted that if a poor panelist is promoted to panel chair, the entire district suffers. Most agreed that eventually weak panelists lose their positions, and, in fact, QSA does require a percentage of panelists to be replaced occasionally, but there is no distinct provision for removing specific persons, and the requirement does not specify a maximum tenure for individual panelists. Some do not trust that the review process is as anonymous as reported, but they do believe QSA has taken steps to improve this. The alleged problem is that even though reviews are blind, districts are small enough that panelists recognize submissions in terms of subject monitors. Several teachers acknowledged that QSA has improved the fairness of moderation over time by changing the review format from group reviews to multiple independent reviews. An alleged past problem was that certain panelists operated according to a particular agenda and would unjustly influence other panelists, especially novice panelists. The current process reduces the possibility of this happening.
The next most commonly reported problem was dishonesty among teachers. Thirty-six percent believe that certain teachers attempt to misrepresent student work in some capacity, in most cases so that students receive higher grades than they should. Part of this has to do with the understanding that grades are statewide and accurate and that teachers can be held accountable to student performance. Several interviewees believe that private schools are particularly guilty of this, not just in visual arts but in all core subjects. Top private schools in Queensland charge exorbitant tuition, boasting high performance. Others mentioned that large schools may withhold certain portfolios, knowing that the proposed LOAs would be reduced. Brendan Lea admits awareness of this, but he and the interviewed teachers agree that this is probably minor because of random sampling. Others believe teachers attempt to sway panelists by altering photographs digitally or by presenting “beautiful” portfolios. Some worry that allowing digital submissions would increase the likelihood of this happening, but it could be argued that any photograph could be digitally altered and undetectable if the resolution is high enough; the only way to combat this would be to send actual work. Along this line, two teachers noted that actual work is always superior to photographs, because subtleties and details cannot be detected in photographs. According to Tony Luttrell, QSA at one time required not only actual work, but also the entire body of work to be sent, which was a logistical nightmare. Over time, QSA has tried to simplify this process to relieve teachers and panelists of excessive work, due in part to teacher feedback. The official purpose of moderation is to affirm assessment, not to re-assess, and QSA believes that seeing actual artworks is beyond that which is necessary in almost every case. Interestingly, the following two issues relate to this broad issue.
Thirty-six percent of teachers interviewed expressed frustration in the submission requirements for Verification. Over the years, Queensland has drastically reduced the amount of work that must be submitted. The most recent change has included two parts, the increasing acceptance of digital submissions, and the elimination of the requirement to submit entire visual diaries. Currently, QSA is allowing verification folios to be submitted in photograph format, which could be digital or traditional, and is considering allowing or possibly even requiring verification folios to be submitted digitally. The confusing change has to do with visual diaries. QSA requires teachers to submit photographs of pages out of each student’s visual diary that clearly document research and progress. The problem is that QSA has asked teachers not to submit more than necessary, and some teachers respond by sending less than necessary. As long as work has been documented properly, this is more of an inconvenience than a problem. In order for students to perform well, it is necessary for students to produce visual diaries that express considerable depth in research and thought, and teachers must document these processes. QSA uses visual diaries to ensure that artworks are built upon complex and sophisticated concepts.

The main problem with submission requirements is that teachers are overwhelmed with the work involved in documentation and folio assembly. Twenty-nine percent of teachers interviewed cited this as the most laborious part of teaching. When asked to elaborate, some mentioned that they did not mind documenting and submitting work, while others were displeased with the amount of work those tasks required. One teacher in particular mentioned that it is very hard to find time during the year to document progress, and that on occasion students have been graded down by review panels when
teachers do not properly document work. This teacher did not blame QSA, but simply mentioned this as an unfortunate reality. The same teacher and others were skeptical about the authenticity of the documentation process, mentioning that some teachers may document work retroactively, and that some students may be guilty of working in visual diaries after the fact. Others mentioned storage as the problem. Some teachers photograph work and release it to students when it is complete, but others fear that the final documentation may be inadequate, so they find it necessary to hold the work in case review panels ask for more proof.

Although the moderation process is thorough and specific, 21% reported a problem of certain loopholes that could be exploited by lazy teachers and students. QSA folios are supposed to include work that is indicative of what students produce. It is believed by some that certain schools submit only the best work, not typical work. Also, work programs include more assignments than what is required for submissions. Some believe that certain schools allow students to spend the entire year preparing the two required submissions, while three projects should be completed. This can backfire if an LOA is recommended for lowering by review panels, because no other work exists to justify the proposal, or if a single project fails it must be submitted. Another version of this is that lazy students complete the bare minimum of work, and then stop. This can happen in multiple ways, but it is generally understood that it takes less time to produce average work than acceptable work, and the possibility exists for students to finish early and then do nothing. Those interviewed unanimously agreed that the biggest down time is the month between Verification and the end of the year. Students who are marked down
by panels, or who simply want a higher LOA, may work hard during this period, while students who are pleased with the result of moderation have no incentive to work.

The only injustice cited by multiple interviewees is the perceived disadvantage of small, particularly rural schools. Twenty-one percent believe that it is much more difficult for rural schools to function within the QSA system than urban schools and large schools. The teachers who raised this issue had all personally experienced this problem. Several aspects were cited as reasons why remote schools may suffer, most of which are associated with or contribute to other problems. The opportunities for professional development are far less for teachers in small or rural schools than others. Most professional opportunities are located in the Brisbane metropolitan area, as are contemporary art galleries and museums. Consequently, rural students and teachers have less potential exposure to current art than those close to metropolitan Brisbane. Working with veteran teachers as mentors is also an important opportunity that is unavailable to many rural art teachers. For example, new teachers might assess students according to norm-referencing, and working with others helps to clarify standards-based assessment.

The other major issue with small rural schools is resources, which are lacking in poor, remote areas. Teachers, spanning the spectrum of resource availability, mentioned that it is easier to achieve results with ample budgets and access to contemporary art. Although those interviewed agreed that such schools are disadvantaged, they also mostly agreed that QSA addresses this in terms of work program flexibility and by providing online resources. Teachers with experience in these environments cited the Internet as a valuable equalizing tool.
Twenty-one percent cited poor school administrative support or administrative dishonesty as a problem. Some believed that administrators will cheat to advance school image in terms of performance. Others suggested that art sometimes suffers from the promotion of personal agendas, most notably religiosity (specifically that of morally conservative Christians). Some conservative administrators are said to undermine visual arts because of its political and moral controversies. Little insight was given about the effects of poor administrative support, although one teacher mentioned that resource distribution can be affected. Others mentioned, conversely, that positive administrative support is helpful.

Several teachers mentioned that in some cases the moderation process itself can be perceived as negative. In most cases, teachers had heard rumors about this or had known another teacher who had experienced some form of negative moderation experience. A few teachers had personally encountered conflict with review panels, although typically the incident was minor and easily resolved. No one reported a general dislike for how review panels handle the moderation process. Interviewees and QSA officials generally agreed that the teachers who dislike the moderation process and QSA are those who disagree with or object to QSA goals, particularly formalists, in their philosophical approach to art education. In some cases, teachers challenge QSA by attempting to pass work programs that do not meet Senior Syllabus objectives or because of incorrectly assessed verification folios, while others genuinely struggle with submissions. The fact that only 2% of submission problems cannot be resolved at the district level suggests that the moderation process is generally tolerable for the vast majority of all teachers, including Visual Art teachers.
Several individual points were noted that are worth considering. One teacher believes that the system strongly favors girls over boys indicating a gender bias. This teacher has observed through teaching many years in different environments that the current emphasis on extensive preliminary development of concept appeals more to girls, whereas boys excel more in the Making stage of art and in realizing goals through process. Boys, the interviewee asserted, prefer an active approach to concept development versus girls’ preference for theoretical development and that the curricular and assessment demands of the Senior Syllabus favor the latter, resulting in a gender bias. This teacher also felt that the Senior Syllabus is weak in terms of reflection, and that students are not credited for their abilities to reflect. This could be a gender bias, according the interviewee. No research is currently available to validate or refute these claims, and the interviewee identified these as issues warranting research.

Another point raised by a single interviewee is that QSA recently removed oral examination assessment results from its submission requirements, yet it still wants teachers to use this type of assessment. Oral examination is an acceptable appraisal task technique, which may be advantageous to some students over writing. This teacher, who serves as a panelist, does not believe that this type of unregulated request (urge to continue using oral examination) will be fulfilled by many teachers. This echoes a problem that Utah faces with all of its standards—there is no way of knowing whether or not anyone is implementing them.

One teacher pointed out several problems with the QCS Test and QSA’s ranking system. This teacher’s school is generally low-performing, but the Visual Art program is particularly strong. Other teachers, panelists, and QSA officials confirmed this claim.
This teacher believes that students are cheated by the OP process because QCS Tests are considered in the equation. The QSA Web page on *Tertiary Entrance FAQ* (Education Queensland, 2004b) denies this type of allegation, insisting that its calculations consider all aspects of individuals and schools, and that the strength or weakness of a school cannot harm a student, other than its effect on the learning process. The particular complaint here is that the entire group suffers, not just one individual, because of the spread created by unparallel program results. The research conducted for this thesis is insufficient for responding to this claim. Another problem created by the ranking system, according to this teacher, is that low-performing students are often advised by counselors not to take Authority subjects. The reason for this is that a low LOA in an Authority subject will affect most Selection Ranks more negatively than a high Authority registered (elective) subject. This reduces enrollment in Visual Art, which often appeals to non-academic students. Also, the interviewee is suspicious of private schools preventing low-performing students from taking the QCS Test, which would skew results in their favor.

Finally, one teacher emphasized the importance of class size, asserting that a maximum of 15 to 20 students is necessary to accomplish teaching objectives. Because students do not work modally and in the senior year every student is engaged in different projects, it is nearly impossible to tend to the needs of students in an overpopulated classroom. In Utah and many states, the average class size is consistently much higher than this suggested range.

*Summary of QSA Strengths and Weaknesses*

Suggestions for modifying art education in Utah and other United States are extracted from the research and presented in chapter 5. In order to draw sensible
conclusions from this research, it is necessary to first summarize the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the Senior Syllabus and the moderation process. Basically, Queensland art teachers approve of QSA, the moderation process, and the Senior Syllabus. The best evidence for this is that every teacher interviewed agreed that art education would suffer without the QSA system, and that when asked to comment freely on the merits of QSA, a majority of interviewees reported teacher and student accountability to standards, fairness of the system and its implementation, and constant commitment to improvement. Additionally, no interviewee expressed dismay with QSA or with the system of moderation in general. A majority of teachers also praised the quality of the Senior Syllabus, for its propensity to quality assessment and relevant curriculum. On the other hand, the system is not perfect. While a number of particular complaints were declared, only one recurring criticism about QSA was registered: poor panelists exist. Most of the interviewees who mentioned this noted that QSA had made improvement in this area, but the concern remains. According to QSA, there is currently no specific procedure for removing problem panelists. The other common concern of interviewees is that certain schools attempt to cheat the system. Most believe that QSA minimizes the likelihood of cheating by its feature of Random Sampling.

In conclusion, the research has clearly shown two points: (1) that over time Queensland has provided accountability measures that are acceptable by all involved parties through moderated school-based assessment, and (2) that QSA is superior to USOE regarding standards accountability, curriculum, and assessment. QSA has accomplished its goal of establishing accountability measures to ensure that all curricula and assessment are standards-based and that grades are comparable. At the same time,
QSA has earned a positive reputation and respect among teachers through constant refinement. The research conducted in Queensland has validated initial assumptions and has given further credence to the merits of the QSA system. Chapter 5 discusses the various ways in which the Senior Syllabus and moderation process might be harvested for application in Utah and other states.
CHAPTER 5

The previous chapters of this thesis have thoroughly compared art education in Utah and Queensland. The official stance of NAEA, Utah Art Education Association, USOE, and many state legislations and NAEA state affiliates, as well as Education Queensland, is that meeting standards is a vital function of visual arts education. Research shows that Utah and the majority of the United States cannot currently ensure that standards are met, and no evidence suggests that comparability of grades exists. The U.S. Department of Education could decide to hold visual arts teachers accountable to standards implementation with monetary implications. If so, then it is likely that external high-stakes testing would be implemented and that teachers’ jobs would be affected. It would be wise for Utah art teachers and representative groups to proactively seek an alternative to this possibility.

Queensland was at one time forced to rely on external high-stakes testing as an attempt to accomplish standards accountability and teachers demanded that this be changed. Evidence shows that QSA is currently able to ensure (a) that secondary visual arts curricula and assessments are standards-based; (b) that students pursue sophisticated, creative approaches to art; (c) that standards are achieved by all passing students; and (d) that grades are valid and comparable. QSA has solved the task of ensuring standards and grade comparability through moderated school-based assessment.

Because Utah and Queensland are very similar in terms of demography and education standards, it is reasonable to believe that Utah could benefit from adopting aspects of the QSA system of moderated school-based assessment. Chapter 5 concludes this thesis with (1) a recommendation for adopting school-based moderation in Utah,
based on the research for this thesis; (2) recommendations for other states that struggle with ensuring standards, based on the research of this thesis; and (3) a practical secondary visual arts curriculum guide that is compatible with the existing Utah Core, which utilizes features of the Senior Syllabus.

Recommendation for Utah Art Education

The evidence in this thesis shows that Queensland performs more favorably than Utah in terms of curriculum, assessment quality, accountability, and professional development. Utah has established mandatory standards, and Utah schools report student outcomes that impact students’ futures. All states are increasingly being pressured to hold schools accountable to assessment for such reasons. Three states have implemented accountability measures for assessment in the arts, and other states are working toward that resolution. The recommendation of this thesis is for Utah to take a proactive stance on accountability of secondary visual arts standards implementation.

There are two primary accountability options available: external testing and moderated local assessment. The evidence in this thesis shows that external testing in visual arts is inappropriate and that moderation can provide a reliable, amicable alternative. USOE should consider implementing moderation of standards assessment. The potential benefits of moderated school-based assessment are evident.

Eight major benefits of the QSA system of moderated school-based assessment are (1) accountability of schools, teachers, and students to standards; (2) the integration of curriculum and assessment, based on standards; (3) curricular attention to concept development and contemporary art over mode; (4) curricular freedom; (5) variety and quality of assessment; (6) aggregate grade comparability; (7) standardization of ranking
students for university entrance; and (8) professional development resources. These benefits have been discussed throughout this thesis. The success of QSA is confirmed by its acceptance of professionals throughout Queensland, including the Queensland government, general public, teaching professionals, QTU and other unions, labor unions, and universities. This acceptance is reported on government Web sites and independent reports, and was verified by representatives of these groups in interviews for this thesis. The most compelling indication of the success of QSA is the attitudes of art teachers expressed through the personal interviews. This acceptance strongly contrasts the objections of all of these entities against the previous system in Queensland, which relied heavily on external testing.

It would be presumptuous to infer what attitudes Queensland art teachers might have if students, teachers, and schools were not formally held accountable to standards, which is the current situation in Utah art education. It is not possible, either, to assume that Utah art educators and the Utah public would appreciate the exact format of the QSA system. It is reasonable, however, to suggest that the QSA model provides a potentially satisfying formula for how Utah might develop its own system of moderated standards accountability.

It is important to consider the negative aspects of moderation in Queensland. Two sources of information must be considered, (a) complaints about the system, and (b) past problems with the system. When compiled, five clear issues emerge: (1) teacher workload; (2) curriculum and assessment freedom; (3) the difficulty of orchestrating a fair and efficient system of guidelines and moderation; (4) resource issues, including class size and professional development; and (5) comparability. First, Utah would want to
minimize unnecessary work for teachers, and USOE would need to provide fair compensation for preparing submissions. Next, USOE would want to consider the measures that QSA has taken to maximize curricular freedom within the reasonable boundaries. Moderation would reduce the freedom that some Utah art teachers currently have, which is limited to district policies. USOE should, however, assume the advantages of the Senior Syllabus in terms of media approach and curriculum design freedom compared to the Utah Core. Along these lines, setting guidelines for curriculum, assessment, and submissions would be a serious issue to consider. The Senior Syllabus provides many guidelines that promote high quality art education, which USOE could glean. A key concern with moderation anywhere is the qualifications of panel members. Establishing panels would be a challenge that would require research by USOE. Adequate training is another issue that would need to be addressed. QSA has struggled with this for many years. Professional development continues to be a problem, especially in rural areas. USOE would need to assume that all universities would not prepare students adequately, particularly teachers who received out-of-state training. Resources, class size, and other issues affecting equity would also need to be considered. Finally, comparability would need to be addressed. Moderation should be used to ensure comparability concerning standards achievement. Student ranking, however, has been very controversial and unpopular in Queensland historically, although only one interviewee noted this problem. Perhaps, ranking all students in a large state is too difficult a task.

These and other sources of contention have been discussed throughout this thesis. Implementing a new or drastically revised education format would most likely have
problems. Research on the history of QSA and interviews of current Queensland art teachers has provided insight as to what should be avoided. This insight should be considered for recommendations of how Utah and other United States might benefit from moderated school-based assessment in Queensland.

To implement moderation in Utah, it would be necessary for USOE to form one or more research committees and task forces to investigate instituting moderation. Before proceeding, it would be advisable to devise a few general options and survey Utah art teachers. Although art teachers are not used to accountability standards, most teachers are. Holding art teachers accountable to standards is not a problem unless it is done unfairly, confusingly, or unprofessionally. Teachers and UAEA must be considered partners in the decision making process. The philosophy of moderated school-based assessment rests on the core belief that teachers are best equipped to assess students. A survey of this nature should gather insight about current curriculum and assessment practices in the state, local community and school resources, professional development needs, and teachers’ attitudes and perceptions. A survey of Utah students might be considered as well.

Three major aspects of moderation should be addressed: (a) curriculum, (b) assessment, and (c) logistics. First, the Utah Core would need to be revised. The current standards of the Utah Core reflect NAEA national standards. These standards are appropriate, but the Utah Core does not reflect the values proposed in current art education literature. If the Utah Core were to be revised, current literature should be considered, including visual culture and postmodern theory. The current modal focus should be replaced with a conceptual approach that reflects contemporary art and
educational theory. Documentation of process and thought should become a mandatory aspect of visual arts curriculum. QSA revises its syllabi every six years in order to remain current. Because the arts are perpetually evolving, periodic revision is necessary and should be routine.

In terms of assessment, the Utah Core currently recommends portfolio evaluation, but provides no guidelines. For moderation to work, assessment guidelines would need to be specific and clear. Journals and portfolios should be used but many teachers would need to be educated on how to properly create and use these tools. Other assessment strategies should also be used. Assessments should be standards-based, should be integrated with curricula, and should be presented in the form of tasks. Assessments should be authentic. Teachers should be able to select assessment models that best address learning objectives. It is likely that considerable professional development would be required in the area of assessment.

To determine the logistics of moderation, more research is necessary. This thesis does not address details of QSA administration. The establishment of administrative directives should result from research on QSA, the International Baccalaureate program, and other moderation systems, as well as the particular needs of Utah. It would be wise to consider the problems that QSA has worked through since its inception in 1970.

Recommendation for United States Art Education

The research also has implications for the United States. First, all states should adopt mandatory standards for visual arts. If the national standards are considered inadequate today, then new or additional standards should be devised. State education departments must define the basic goals of visual arts education. Standards should reflect
the essential outcomes of visual arts education, and should not suffocate curricular potential. Second, teachers should be obligated to meet standards. Curricula and assessments should be standards-based. Third, visual arts should be assessed by all states. Visual arts is a national core subject and can be reliably assessed. Visual arts should not be subject to high-stakes multiple-choice testing, which is inadequate for the discipline. Instead, assessment should occur locally and should be moderated. Moderation should ensure accuracy and comparability of aggregate grades.

The above recommendations for implementing moderation can easily be adapted for other states, particularly those that have adopted a version of the national standards. Every state that lacks accountability measures could benefit similarly from the above recommendation for Utah. It is important to include unique state needs when devising any state guidelines.

Curriculum Guide

Finally, this thesis concludes with a secondary visual arts curriculum guide (see pp. 192-199). The guide is intended as a practical tool for teachers, incorporating features of the Senior Syllabus and Utah Core. The guide is designed to be compatible with the existing Utah Core and other states’ frameworks. The guide consists of seven pages: (1) Curriculum Guide, a title page that concisely explains the guide, (2) Secondary Semester Course Outline Template; (3) Secondary Unit Outline Template, (4) Secondary Semester Course Outline (sample) (5) Secondary Unit Outline (sample), (6) Contemporary Artists, and (7) Unit Themes. The guide is meant to be reproduced and used as a packet.

The goal of this guide is to encourage creativity, conceptual thought, and independence among students. The guide promotes thematic, developmental, conceptual
art by adapting integrated, authentic, standards-based assessment tasks from the Senior Syllabus. The guide also promotes discipline-based art education from the Utah Core and adds visual culture. The *Contemporary Artists* and *Unit Themes* pages are not meant as exhaustive resources, but as practical references.

To use the guide as intended, teachers select four increasingly open and abstract themes for a semester of study. The guide provides simple templates similar to tables in the Senior Syllabus. The semester outline is compatible with Utah Core courses, which are non-sequential and modal. Teachers ideally control the curricular flow and the guide can be expanded to accommodate longer studies. Teachers then declare concepts to be explored, a basic focus, and possible media applications for each theme. These are the constructs of the semester course outline. The semester course outline sample demonstrates this approach.

After establishing a semester outline, individual units should be developed. In addition to the template, it is necessary to design assessment instruments, handouts, process examples, and the like. The unit outline template provides space to record standards and objectives for each of the disciplines and quasi-disciplines of art education, plus visual culture. These can be considered as separate or integrated components. Space is provided for declaring possible research, possible products, and possible assessments. Over the four units, research tasks should become progressively independent and student-directed. Research should be documented, and should be a major consideration of assessment. Products may be critical and historical writings, experiments, art objects, critiques, interviews—anything relevant to the curriculum that is assessable. Assessments should vary and do not need to contribute to a student’s aggregate score. Assignments
should be presented in the form of assessment tasks and should contribute to the learning process. Such assessments mention the way in which standards are to be met, in terms of how and by what measures they will be assessed. Assessments should be reliable, valid, and standards-based.
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Curriculum Guide

This curriculum guide is intended to serve as a framework for designing secondary visual arts curricula in the United States. The goal of this approach is to develop creativity and originality over a course of study. Ideally, the length of progression with this model should be two or more years—this guide is based, however, on a (terminal) modal semester course format. This guide provides the following resources:

- Course Outline Template
- Unit Outline Template
- Course Outline and Unit Outline Samples
- Contemporary Artists List
- Unit Themes List

The system works by introducing a variety of experimental and formal tasks and research early, then progresses into more obscure, open-ended assignments. Each assignment should become increasingly complex by defining difficult problems with many possible avenues of solution, by demanding additional research, and by allowing students to help define and resolve problems. Each unit should revolve around a theme that provides opportunity for multiple interpretations. Each unit may contain lessons pertaining to aesthetics, art criticism, art history, art production, and visual culture. Assessment should be integrated into the curriculum. Journals should be used extensively to document research and progress.

This guide is the result of research on art education in Utah and Queensland, combining features of both. This research has been supported by the BYU Office of Graduate Studies and MA Art Education program. Copyright © 2005 John Derby.
## Secondary Semester Course Outline Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Research &amp; Experimentation</th>
<th>Conceptual Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Theme</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td>2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Explaination of Concept</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Media Application</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Secondary Semester Course Outline (sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Theme</th>
<th>Research &amp; Experimentation</th>
<th>Conceptual Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course:</strong> Printmaking, VA 1130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explanation of Concept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Layers</td>
<td>Students will create meaning according to the theme by showing layers of self, physical layers of dissected objects, etc. Students will explore layering single prints, layering different types of prints over top of each other, and combining prints into collages.</td>
<td>Elements and Principles of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Invasion</td>
<td>Students will explore natural, psychological, and political forms of invasion, and recognizing and developing symbols of such. Patterns, color, space, and textures will be explored to show visual invasion as intrusive, curious, or compelling.</td>
<td>Symbolism; Abstract representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Façade</td>
<td>Students will show false representation and superficiality through layers of varying transparency, utilizing previous explorations. Drawing media will be employed. Projects to be codeveloped by teacher and students.</td>
<td>Individual statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Void</td>
<td>Students will research voids of astronomical, geological, sociological, and psychological form. These will be expressed in three-dimensional forms (sculpture, installation, bas relief, book) that are printed on. Projects will be student initiated.</td>
<td>Independent direction of meaning and form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course:</td>
<td>Unit #:</td>
<td>Unit Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary Unit Outline Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards Objectives</th>
<th>Possible Research</th>
<th>Possible Product(s)</th>
<th>Possible Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discipline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Discipline’</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Possible Research</th>
<th>Possible Product(s)</th>
<th>Possible Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Define literal and common-use meanings of façade, and its subsequent meanings in art</td>
<td>Look at Renaissance churches, René Magritte, Barbara Kruger</td>
<td>Create an architectural façade for a person; write about this activity</td>
<td>Journal; Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Culture</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Investigate façade in visual culture: vanity drugs, movie star images, politicians</td>
<td>Find examples of visual culture examples that demonstrate façade</td>
<td>Acquisition and alteration of media images exhibiting façade</td>
<td>Self assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Discuss the creation of meaning through context and how context might reveal façade</td>
<td>Discuss how Fred Wilson changes meaning of art by changing contexts</td>
<td>Written dialogue and imagery explaining how context could be used in project</td>
<td>Journal; Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>1A 1B 3A 4A</td>
<td>Cooperative development between student and teacher of printmaking project dealing with façade</td>
<td>Brainstorm ways of bringing images and theory together into one composition</td>
<td>Original printmaking and drawing project that uses layers to show façade</td>
<td>Analytic rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Criticism</td>
<td>2B 3B</td>
<td>Students curate and evaluate a show of student prints about façade</td>
<td>Investigate different tasks involved in curating a show</td>
<td>Students plan, curate, and judge a show on façade; critique to follow</td>
<td>Exhibition; Group discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contemporary Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Style and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rita Ackermann</td>
<td>loose paintings on social downcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art Guys</td>
<td>unusual art and performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Chicago</td>
<td>installation and painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Chihuly</td>
<td>large blown glasswork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Close</td>
<td>photorealist paintings of self and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Estes</td>
<td>photorealist paintings of urban landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Fish</td>
<td>realistic, bright watercolor painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Flack</td>
<td>photorealistic, symbolic still life painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Frankenthaler</td>
<td>abstract painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Friedman</td>
<td>unusual artwork of household materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Goldsworthy</td>
<td>environmental art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrilla Girls</td>
<td>feminist activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hamilton</td>
<td>installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Haring</td>
<td>cartoon, graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hawkinson</td>
<td>sculpture; installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heap of Birds</td>
<td>text on U.S. treatment of Native Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian Hirst</td>
<td>three-dimensional work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Holzer</td>
<td>public display of words, often LED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselm Kiefer</td>
<td>abstract, dirty landscape painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Kruger</td>
<td>text, especially added to advertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrie Levine</td>
<td>appropriates past artworks as own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya Lin</td>
<td>landscape and architectural art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry McGee</td>
<td>graffiti and graffiti-inspired painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Murray</td>
<td>abstract, shaped, multiple canvases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Pearlstein</td>
<td>plasticized nude painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Ringgold</td>
<td>quilt heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rothenberg</td>
<td>abstract painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Schapiro</td>
<td>feminist collages celebrating textiles, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Serra</td>
<td>minimalist steel sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Sherman</td>
<td>still photography of movies starring self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Skoglund</td>
<td>neo-surrealistic installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiki Smith</td>
<td>feminist sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Turrell</td>
<td>works with artificial and natural light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Tansey</td>
<td>photorealistic painting about art history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Puryear</td>
<td>abstract sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Viola</td>
<td>video art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wegman</td>
<td>photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Wilson</td>
<td>alters context of museum artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes and Villains</td>
<td>Void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Myths</td>
<td>Catch 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Legends</td>
<td>Faded Memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webs</td>
<td>Personal Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors, Windows, Portals</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess</td>
<td>Saying Goodbye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Invasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandora’s Box</td>
<td>The Eye of the Beholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay</td>
<td>Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camouflage</td>
<td>Past, Present, Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illusions</td>
<td>Survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Rite of Passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Victory and Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td>Healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapped In Limbo</td>
<td>Radiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Adversity</td>
<td>Reason and Emotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A

Utah State Visual Arts Core
SECONDARY VISUAL ARTS

*Foundations 1 (VA 1100)  *3D Design (VA 1110)  *Printmaking (VA 1130)  *Drawing (VA 1140)
*Painting (VA 1150)  *Jewelry (VA 1160)  *Photography (VA 1170)  *Foundations 2 (VA 1200)
*Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)  *Ceramics (VA 1220)  *Sculpture (VA 1230)
*Film Making (VA 1240)  *Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)

The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides the goals of art education into four standards, which are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. The standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student through a rich experience with art. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. The individual core courses are presented in a portfolio format to facilitate student progress and to encourage the support of parents, teachers, and classmates. Listed below are all the visual art objectives (excluding Film Making). Each course includes the objectives relevant to its focus and provides indicators to detail the emphasis indicated in the course descriptions that follow. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools. Computer with art/graphic software, color printer, image projector and appropriate new technologies are required for Visual Arts Courses.

Standard 1  **MAKING**
Students will assemble and create visual art by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

  - Objective A: Explore, understand, and refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.
  - Objective B: Create visual art using art elements and principles.

Standard 2  **PERCEIVING**
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating visual art.

  - Objective A: Critique visual art.
  - Objective B: Evaluate visual art.

Standard 3  **EXPRESSING**
Students will create meaning in visual art.

  - Objective A: Create content in visual art.
  - Objective B: Perceive content in works of art.
  - Objective C: Curate visual art ordered by medium and content.

Standard 4  **CONTEXTUALIZING**
Students will find meaning in visual art through settings and other modes of learning.

  - Objective A: Align works of art according to history, geography, and personal experience.
  - Objective B: Synthesize visual art with other educational subjects.
  - Objective C: Evaluate the impact of visual art on life outside of school.
VISUAL ART COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)
This is an entry-level course for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. It is designed to provide an overview and appreciation of the Visual Arts. With an overview of studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Ceramics (VA 1220)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Ceramics develops basic skills in the creation of 3D forms and pottery from clays. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. CAEM is an overview of traditional art media and new electronic art media used in modern communications. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Drawing (VA 1140)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Drawing focuses on black and white or monochromatic rendering from life, pictures, masterworks, and imagination. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Film Making (VA 1240)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. It is designed to provide an overview and introduction to the four most basic phases of film making: Development, Pre-Production, Production, and Post-Production. This course covers higher level thinking skills and art-related technology skills with an emphasis on the creation of films in either traditional or electronic media.

Foundations I (VA 1100)
This is the required Junior High/Middle School Visual Arts Core course. It is designed to provide an overview of Visual Arts while studying a broad variety of art tools and materials. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skills, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics.
Foundations II (VA 1200)
This is an entry-level course for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. It is designed to provide an overview and introduction to Visual Arts through studying a variety of art tools and materials. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics.

Jewelry (VA 1160)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Students are taught basic jewelry making skills such as filing, sawing, soldering, casting, and stone setting. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Painting (VA 1150)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Painting includes wet media with processes such as transparent and opaque painting and focuses on the operations of color. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Photography (VA 1170)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Photography includes the inventive use of light and photographic equipment to create art. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Printmaking (VA 1130)
This is an entry-level course for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Printmaking teaches how to make fine art prints using studio processes such as relief, intaglio, planography, and stencil. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Sculpture (VA 1230)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Sculpture is an overview of basic skills used to create 3-dimensional works of art. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

3-D Design (VA 1110)
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. 3-D Design provides an overview and introduction to fine crafts, their media, and the cultures they represent. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The pre-requisite for this course is Foundations I or II.
Description of Art History
This is an entry-level course for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. It is designed to provide an overview and appreciation of the Visual Arts. With an overview of studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.*

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Art History and Criticism

Student Achievement Portfolio

Periods explored: _________________________________________________________

Objective A: Understand techniques and processes in a variety of media.

• Identify a variety of media including current arts-related technologies.
• Analyze the expressive potential of art media, techniques, and processes.
• Understand the physical demands of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Explore how works of art are organized using art elements and principles.

• Analyze the art elements in architecture, sculpture, painting, and drawing.
• Analyze how the art elements interact to form the art principles in architecture, sculpture, painting, and drawing.

Objective A: Critique works of art.

• Analyze artworks regarding effective use of art elements and principles.
• Examine the functions of art.
• Interpret works of art.

Objective B: Evaluate works of art.

• Analyze and compare works of art using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
• Evaluate works of art based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 1 MAKING
Students will examine how works of art were created by manipulating media and by organizing images with art elements and principles.

Objective A: Perceive content in works of art.

• Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in works of art.
• Assess which works of art effectively communicate subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

Standard 2 PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating works of art.

Standard 3 EXPRESSING
Students will discover meaning in art.
• Interpret subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or content through divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of art media and art elements and principles.

Objective B: Curate works of art ordered by medium and content.

• Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

• Exhibit works of art selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

Standard 4 CONTEXTUALIZING
Students will find meaning in works of art through settings and other modes of learning.

Objective A: Align works of art according to history, geography, and personal experience.

• Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

• Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on works of art.

• Evaluate own relationship with artworks from various periods in history.

Objective B: Synthesize art with other educational subjects.

• Integrate art history with dance, music, and theatre.

• Explore how art history can be integrated across disciplines.

Objective C: Evaluate the impact of art on life outside of school.

• Examine careers related to art history.

• Predict how art history can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

ART HISTORY AND CRITICISM LEGEND
Each box to the left of the indicator contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished: 10
- Independent: 9
- Fluent: 8
- Developing: 7
- Novice: 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the indicators:

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
**Description of Ceramics**
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Ceramics develops basic skills in the creation of 3D forms and pottery from clays. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.*

**Explanation of Standards**
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.
Ceramics  
Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Objective A: Explore, understand, refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of ceramic media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of ceramic media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create ceramics using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive ceramics using art elements, including form, shape, negative space, and texture.
- Create expressive works of art using principles to organize the art elements, including contrast, repetition, balance, and unity.

Objective A: Critique ceramics works.

- Analyze ceramic works regarding use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of ceramics.
- Interpret ceramic works.

Objective B: Evaluate ceramics.

- Analyze and compare ceramic works using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate ceramics based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 3  EXPRESSING
Students will create meaning in ceramics.

Objective A: Create content in ceramics.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in ceramics.
- Create ceramics that effectively communicate subject matter.

Standard 2  PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating ceramics.
metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of ceramic media or art elements and principles that express content.

**Objective B: Curate ceramics ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

- Exhibit ceramics selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

**Objective A: Align ceramics according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group ceramic works into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on ceramics.

- Evaluate own relationship with artworks from various periods in history.

**Objective B: Synthesize ceramics with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate the ceramics with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how ceramics can be integrated across disciplines.

**Objective C: Evaluate the impact of ceramics on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to ceramics.

- Predict how ceramics can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

### Standard 4 CONTEXTUALIZING
Students will find meaning in ceramics through settings and other modes of learning.

**CERAMICS LEGEND**
Each box to the left of the indicator contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished 10
- Independent 9
- Fluent 8
- Developing 7
- Novice 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the indicators: 

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed: 

For resources to support progress through this document visit:
http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/FineArt
The space below is for written communication between student, teacher, and parent.
Description of Commercial Art and Electronic Media
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. CAEM is an overview of traditional art media and new electronic art media used in modern communications. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.
Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of CAEM media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of CAEM media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of CAEM media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create works of CAEM using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive works of CAEM using art elements, including color relationships, line, and shape.
- Create expressive works of art using principles to organize the art elements, including composition, emphasis, and eye movement.

Objective A: Critique works of CAEM.

- Analyze CAEM regarding use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of CAEM.
- Interpret works of CAEM.

Objective B: Evaluate works of CAEM.

- Analyze and compare works of CAEM using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate works of CAEM based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.
matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of art media or art elements and principles that express content.

  **Objective B: Curate works of CAEM ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

- Exhibit works of CAEM selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

  **Objective A: Align works of CAEM according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on works of CAEM.

- Evaluate own relationship with artworks from various periods in history.

  **Objective B: Synthesize CAEM works with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate CAEM with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how CAEM can be integrated across disciplines.

  **Objective C: Evaluate the impact of CAEM on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to CAEM.

- Predict how CAEM can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

---

**COMMERCIAL ART & ELECTRONIC MEDIA LEGEND**

Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished: 10
- Independent: 9
- Fluent: 8
- Developing: 7
- Novice: 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives: 

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:  

Visual Arts Achievement Portfolio

Drawing

(VA 1140)

Practice Develops Confidence

Student

Art Teacher

Parent

School and District

Description of Drawing
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Drawing focuses on black and white or monochromatic rendering from life, pictures, masterworks, and imagination. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses included in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 1  MAKING
Students will assemble and create drawings by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.
- Experience and control a variety of media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of drawing media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create drawings using art elements and principles.
- Create expressive drawings using art elements, including line, shape, form, value, contour, and perspective.
- Create expressive works of art using principles to organize the art elements, including mood, emphasis, and unity.

Objective A: Critique drawings.
- Analyze drawings regarding use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of drawing.
- Interpret drawings.

Objective B: Evaluate drawings.
- Analyze and compare drawings using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate drawings based on their forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 2  PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating drawings.

Objective A: Create content in drawings.
- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in drawings.
- Create drawings that effectively communicate subject matter,
metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of art media or art elements and principles that express content.

**Objective B: Curate drawings ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

- Exhibit drawings selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

**Objective A: Align drawings according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on drawings.

- Evaluate own relationship with drawings from various periods in history.

**Objective B: Synthesize drawing with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate drawing with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how drawing can be integrated across disciplines.

**Objective C: Evaluate the impact of drawing on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to drawing.

- Predict how drawing can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

---

**DRAWING LEGEND**

Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished  10
- Independent  9
- Fluent  8
- Developing  7
- Novice  0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives:

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
Description of Film Making
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. It is designed to provide an overview and introduction to the four most basic phases of film making: Development, Pre-Production, Production, and Post-Production. This course covers higher-level thinking skills and art-related technology skills with an emphasis on the creation of films in either traditional or electronic media. *The prerequisite for this course is any other High School Fine Arts Course.*

Explanation of Standards
The discipline of Film Making is a high tech form of story telling. It requires diverse talents from many people and a broad range of equipment and locale. This Core is designed to direct the student through the film making process from the concept of the story line to exhibition of the final project. The Core assists the student to both participate in and oversee the actual creation of a film. The Core is divided into four standards; each standard is broken down into several objectives. Each objective is further broken down into a range of actions (bulleted) that achieve the objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective by marking a number ranging from 0 to 10 in a box to the left of each objective. At the end of the Core is a legend wherein the student or teacher tallies the average score from the objective boxes and the number of objectives the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projector, image capturing devices such as digital camera and camcorder, playback device, and editing hard- and software, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective A: CONCEPTUALIZATION
Create a story line and a vision.

- Develop a story line; e.g., retell or interpret an event or parody previously made film or event.
- Evaluate integration of genres.
- Address ethical, moral, and legal considerations.

Objective B: RESEARCH
Add detail to the story line.

- Uncover and develop logical or compelling detail to the story line.
- Study the context of the story line’s time period.
- Design a complete image of characters.
- Explore sources for historical information.

Objective C: SCREEN WRITING
Write a script that unfolds the story line over time and from the point of view of a camera.

- Create dialogue between characters.
- Break down the story into scenes.
- Describe settings.
- Use screenplay format.

Objective A: BUDGETING
Configure needs, resources, expenses, and scheduling for the script.

- Assemble crews and divide tasks.
- Assess materials and help that are at hand and free of charge.
- Account and track expenses.
- Schedule all phases of the project to avoid wasting resources.

Objective B: CASTING
Search out appropriate actors, acting styles, and valuable interview sources.

- Arrange auditions, screen tests, and readings for parts.
- Cast doubles, stunts, and understudies where necessary.
- Research characters by actors selected for the parts.
- Coordinate interviews.
- Write effective interview questions.
- Prepare release forms.

Objective C: VISUALIZATION
Plan the appearance of the filmed script.

- Scout out appropriate and workable locations.
- Create storyboards to define the visual interpretation of the script scene by scene.
- Design/construct the sets.
- Create needed scenic painting.
- Find or create props.
- Design/create wardrobe, makeup, hairstyles.
- Plan and locate materials for visual effects and special effects.
- Plot obvious camera movements.

**Standard 3 PRODUCTION**
Students will orchestrate all teams, equipment, and sequences of the shoot.

**Objective A: DIRECTING**
Orchestrate the film making team.
- Choreograph the actors’ positions and movements with the camera’s movements.
- Coach performance and portrayal of character in relation to the story.
- Review the history of directorial styles.

**Objective B: REHEARSAL**
Practice coordinating team tasks.
- Refine characters.
- Develop characters’ individual growth and relationships with each other.
- Troubleshoot and problem solve.

**Objective C: LIGHTING AND SOUND**
Light the sets to enhance the expression or art of the story and capture sound.
- Create mood through lighting.
- Create emphasis.
- Discover uses of ambient lighting and bouncing sources.
- Capture sound.

**Objective D: SHOOTING**
Record collective efforts on film/video.
- Pull all elements together and execute.
- Review and assess the dailies.
- Reshoot the pickups.

**Standard 4 POST-PRODUCTION**
Students will collect additional material, edit, and exhibit the film.

**Objective A: COLLECTING**
Collect additional materials to support the story line.
- Research available film and video archives.
- Shoot background and supporting sequences.
- Collect stills and documents.

**Objective B: EDITING**
Enhance the recorded footage.
- Arrange and cut scenes to enhance the telling of the story, tension, or continuity.
- Score music for mood and emphasis.
- Add sound effects, dubs, and quality control to the soundtrack for realism and clarity.
- Assess the efforts of editing by screening the modified film.

**Objective C: PROMOTION**
Promote a screening.
- Submit films to festival to assess audience reaction.
- Advertise film.
- Distribute film to public via theaters, Internet, and television.

**FILM MAKING LEGEND**
Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:
- Distinguished  10
- Independent    9
- Fluent     8
- Developing    7
- Novice     0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives: 

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed: 

Visual Arts Achievement Portfolio

Foundations I

(VA 1100)

Practice Develops Confidence

_________________________________ Student
_________________________________ Art Teacher
_________________________________ Parent
_________________________________ School and District

Description of Foundations I
This is the required Junior High/Middle School Visual Arts Core course. It is designed to provide an overview of Visual Arts while studying a broad variety of art tools and materials. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skills, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics.

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foundations I  Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Objective A: Explore a variety of art media, techniques, and processes.
- Experiment with a variety of media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Experience the expressive possibilities of art media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create works of art that show the use of the art elements and principles.
- Create expressive works of art using art elements, including line, shape, form, value, and color.
- Create expressive works of art using the art principles, including balance, repetition, color relationships, and emphasis, to organize the art elements.

Objective A: Critique works of art.
- Describe artworks according to use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of art.
- Interpret works of art.

Objective B: Evaluate works of art.
- Learn how to use aesthetic approaches to compare and discuss works of art.
- Evaluate works of art based on how they were created, effective use of the art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, and expressive qualities.

Standard 1   MAKING
Students will assemble and create works of art by experiencing a variety of art media and by learning the art elements and principles.

Objective A: Create content in works of art.
- Identify subject matter, themes, and content in works of art.
- Create works of art that show subject matter, themes, or individually conceived content.
- Express subject matter, themes, or content through applications of art media and by applying the art elements and principles.

Standard 2   PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating works of art.

Standard 3   EXPRESSING
Students will create meaning in art.
Objective B: Curate works of art ordered by medium and content.

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.
- Exhibit works of art selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

Objective A: Align works of art according to history, geography, and personal experience.

- Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist views of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.
- Analyze the impact of culture on works of art.
- Evaluate own relationship with artworks from various periods in history.

Objective B: Synthesize art with other educational subjects.

- Integrate the visual arts with dance, music, and theater.
- Explore how visual arts can be integrated across disciplines.

Objective C: Evaluate the impact of art on life outside of school.

- Examine careers related to visual arts.
- Predict how the visual arts can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

Standard 4 CONTEXTUALIZING
Students will find meaning in works of art through settings and other modes of learning.

FOUNDATIONS I LEGEND
Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished 10
- Independent 9
- Fluent 8
- Developing 7
- Novice 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives: 
This is the percentage of indicators the class completed: 
Description of Foundations II
This is an entry-level course for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. It is designed to provide an overview and introduction to Visual Arts through studying a variety of art tools and materials. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I (VA 1100).*

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.
Foundations II     Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Standard 1  MAKING
Students will assemble and create works of art, manipulate art media, and organize images with the elements and principles of art.

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

• Experience and control a variety of media, including current arts-related technologies.

• Select and analyze the expressive potential of art media, techniques, and processes.

• Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create works of art using art elements and principles.

• Create expressive works of art using art elements, including form, texture, value, and depth.

• Create expressive works of art using principles to organize the art elements, including unity and emphasis.

Objective A: Critique works of art.

• Analyze artworks regarding use of art elements and principles.

• Examine the functions of art.

• Interpret works of art.

Objective B: Evaluate works of art.

• Analyze and compare works of art using a variety of aesthetic approaches.

• Evaluate works of art based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 2  PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating works of art.

Objective A: Create content in works of art.

• Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in works of art.

• Create works of art that effectively communicate subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

Standard 3  EXPRESSING
Students will create meaning in art.
• Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of art media or art elements and principles that express content.

Objective B: Curate works of art ordered by medium and content.

• Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

• Exhibit works of art selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

Objective A: Align works of art according to history, geography, and personal experience.

• Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

• Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on works of art.

• Evaluate own relationship with artworks from various periods in history.

Objective B: Synthesize art with other educational subjects.

• Integrate the visual arts with dance, music, and theater.

• Explore how visual arts can be integrated across disciplines.

Objective C: Evaluate the impact of art on life outside of school.

• Examine careers related to visual arts.

• Predict how the visual arts can add quality to life and lifelong learning.
For resources to support progress through this document visit:
http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/FineArt
The space below is for written communication between student, teacher, and parent.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Description of Jewelry
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Students are taught basic jewelry making skills such as filing, sawing, soldering, casting, and stone setting. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practice Develops Confidence
Jewelry Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of media including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of jewelry media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create jewelry using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive jewelry using art elements, including line, shape, form, and texture.
- Create expressive works of art using principles, including emphasis, contrast, balance, and unity, to organize the art elements.

Objective A: Critique jewelry.

- Analyze works of jewelry according to use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of jewelry.
- Interpret works of jewelry.

Objective B: Evaluate jewelry.

- Analyze and compare jewelry using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate jewelry based on its forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Objective A: Create content in jewelry.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in jewelry.
- Create jewelry that effectively communicates subject matter,
metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of jewelry media or art elements and principles that express content.

**Objective B: Curate jewelry ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

- Exhibit jewelry selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

**Objective A: Align works of jewelry according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural context; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Broque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on jewelry.

- Evaluate own relationship with jewelry from various periods in history.

**Objective B: Synthesize jewelry with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate jewelry with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how jewelry can be integrated across disciplines.

**Objective C: Evaluate the impact of jewelry on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to jewelry.

- Predict how jewelry can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

---

**JEWELRY LEGEND**

Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished 10
- Independent 9
- Fluent 8
- Developing 7
- Novice 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives: [ ]

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed: [ ]
Description of Painting
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Painting includes wet media with processes such as transparent and opaque painting and focuses on the operations of color. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.
Painting     Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

• Experience and control a variety of painting media, including current arts-related technologies.

• Select and analyze the expressive potential of painting media, techniques, and processes.

• Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create paintings using art elements and principles.

• Create expressive paintings using art elements, including value and form.

• Create expressive paintings using art principles to organize the art elements, including aerial perspective, color relationships, emphasis, and mood.

Objective A: Critique paintings.

• Analyze paintings according to use of art elements and principles.

• Examine the functions of painting.

• Interpret paintings.

Objective B: Evaluate paintings.

• Analyze and compare paintings using a variety of aesthetic approaches.

• Evaluate paintings based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 1  MAKING
Students will assemble and create paintings by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

Objective A: Create content in paintings.

• Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in paintings.

• Create paintings that effectively communicate subject matter,
metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of painting media or art elements and principles that express content.

**Objective B: Curate paintings ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

- Exhibit paintings selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

**Objective A: Align paintings according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group paintings into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on paintings.

- Evaluate own relationship with paintings from various periods in history.

**Objective B: Synthesize painting with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate painting with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how painting can be integrated across disciplines.

**Objective C: Evaluate the impact of painting on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to painting.

- Predict how painting can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

---

**PAINTING LEGEND**

Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished: 10
- Independent: 9
- Fluent: 8
- Developing: 7
- Novice: 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives:

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
For resources to support progress through this document visit:
http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/FineArt
The space below is for written communication between student, teacher, and parent.
Description of Photography
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Photography includes
the inventive use of light and photographic equipment to create art. With an emphasis on
studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related
technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course
is Foundations I or II.*

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of
art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core
divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are
Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards
organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a
deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into
objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each
objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a
number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally
both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the
class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software,
color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There
are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many
schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photography Student Achievement Portfolio

Media and equipment explored: ______________________________________________

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of photo media including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of photo media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of photo media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create photography using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive photographs using art elements, including value, texture, contrast, and depth.
- Create expressive photographs using principles, including mood, emphasis, composition, and unity, to organize the art elements.

Objective A: Critique photography.

- Analyze photos regarding use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of photography.
- Interpret photography.

Objective B: Evaluate photography.

- Analyze and compare photography using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate photography based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 1 MAKING
Students will assemble and create photography by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

Standard 2 PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating photography.

Standard 3 EXPRESSING
Students will create meaning in photography.

Objective A: Create content in photography.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in photography.
• Create photography that effectively communicates subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

• Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of photo media or art elements and principles that express content.

Objective B: Curate works of art ordered by medium and content.

• Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

• Exhibit works of art selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

Objective A: Align works of photography according to history, geography, and personal experience.

• Use visual characteristics to group photography into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

• Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on photography.

• Evaluate own relationship with photography from various periods in history.

Objective B: Involve the creation of photography with other educational subjects.

• Integrate photography with dance, music, and theater.

• Explore how photography can be integrated across disciplines.

Objective C: Evaluate the impact of photography on life outside of school.

• Examine careers related to photography.

• Predict how photography can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

Standard 4 CONTEXTUALIZING
Students will find meaning in works of art through settings and other modes of learning.

PHOTOGRAPHY LEGEND
Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished: 10
- Independent: 9
- Fluent: 8
- Developing: 7
- Novice: 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives:

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
For resources to support progress through this document visit:
http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/FineArt
The space below is for written communication between student, teacher, and parent.
Description of Printmaking
This is an entry-level course for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Printmaking teaches how to make fine art prints using studio processes such as relief, intaglio, planography, and stencil. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.*

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Printmaking  Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of printmaking media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create prints using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive prints using art elements, including line, value, texture, space, shape, form, and depth.
- Create expressive prints using principles, including repetition, emphasis, balance, and unity, to organize the art elements.

Objective A: Critique printmaking.

- Analyze prints regarding the use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of printmaking.
- Interpret prints.

Objective B: Evaluate printmaking and prints.

- Analyze and compare prints using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate printmaking based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Objective A: Create content in printmaking.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in printmaking.
- Create prints that effectively communicate subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

Standard 1  MAKING
Students will assemble and create prints by manipulating printmaking media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of printmaking media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create prints using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive prints using art elements, including line, value, texture, space, shape, form, and depth.
- Create expressive prints using principles, including repetition, emphasis, balance, and unity, to organize the art elements.

Objective A: Critique printmaking.

- Analyze prints regarding the use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of printmaking.
- Interpret prints.

Objective B: Evaluate printmaking and prints.

- Analyze and compare prints using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate printmaking based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 2  PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating prints.

Objective A: Create content in printmaking.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in printmaking.
- Create prints that effectively communicate subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

Standard 3  EXPRESSING
Students will create meaning in prints.
- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of printmaking or art elements and principles that express content.

**Objective B: Curate prints ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

- Exhibit printmaking selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

**Objective A: Align prints according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on printmaking.

- Evaluate own relationship with prints from various periods in history.

**Objective B: Synthesize printmaking with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate printmaking with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how printmaking can be integrated across disciplines.

**Objective C: Evaluate the impact of printmaking on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to printmaking.

- Predict how printmaking can add to the quality of life and lifelong learning.

---

**PRINTMAKING LEGEND**

Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished 10
- Independent 9
- Fluent 8
- Developing 7
- Novice 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives:  
This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
**Visual Arts Achievement Portfolio**

**Sculpture**

*(VA 1230)*

*Practice Develops Confidence*

---

**Description of Sculpture**

This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. Sculpture is an overview of basic skills used to create three-dimensional works of art. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.*

**Explanation of Standards**

There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</th>
<th>3-D Design (VA 1110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film Making (VA 1240)</td>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sculpture Student Achievement Portfolio

Media explored: __________________________________________________________

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of sculpture media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of sculpture media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of art media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create sculpture using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive sculpture using art elements, including line, texture, form, negative space, and value.
- Create expressive sculptures using principles to organize the art elements, including unity, proportion, emphasis, and balance.

Objective A: Critique sculpture.

- Analyze sculptures according to use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of sculpture.
- Interpret sculptures.

Objective B: Evaluate sculpture.

- Analyze and compare sculptures using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate sculpture based on forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 1 MAKING
Students will assemble and create sculpture by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

Objective A: Create content in sculpture.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in sculpture.
- Create sculpture that effectively communicates subject matter,
metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

- Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of sculpture or art elements and principles that express content.

**Objective B: Curate sculpture ordered by medium and content.**

- Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or clear content.

- Exhibit sculpture selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

**Objective A: Align sculptures according to history, geography, and personal experience.**

- Use visual characteristics to group artworks into historical, social, and cultural contexts; e.g., cubist view of the Egyptians, tenebrism of the Baroque.

- Analyze the impact of time, place, and culture on sculpture.

- Evaluate own relationship with sculptures from various periods in history.

**Objective B: Synthesize sculpture with other educational subjects.**

- Integrate sculpture with dance, music, and theater.

- Explore how sculpture can be integrated across disciplines.

**Objective C: Evaluate the impact of sculpture on life outside of school.**

- Examine careers related to sculpture.

- Predict how sculpture can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

---

**SCULPTURE LEGEND**

Each box to the left of the objective contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished 10
- Independent 9
- Fluent 8
- Developing 7
- Novice 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the objectives:

This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
For resources to support progress through this document visit:
http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/FineArt

The space below is for written communication between student, teacher, and parent.
Description of 3-D Design
This course is for the High School Visual Arts Core Curriculum. 3-D Design provides an overview and introduction to fine crafts, their media, and the cultures they represent. With an emphasis on studio production, this course is designed to develop higher-level thinking, art-related technology skill, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. *The prerequisite for this course is Foundations I or II.*

Explanation of Standards
There are two basic goals in a visual arts education: one, creating meaning in works of art, and two, perceiving meaning in works of art. The Utah State Visual Arts Core divides each of these goals into two standards. The resulting four art standards are Making, Perceiving, Expressing, and Contextualizing. These four divisions or standards organize the curriculum into manageable and related units and guide the student toward a deep and holistic comprehension of the Visual Arts. Each standard is broken into objectives, each objective into indicators. A scoring box is placed to the left of each objective. The student scores his or her achievement within each objective using a number ranging from 0 to 10. A legend is provided wherein the student and teacher tally both the average score from the objective boxes and the total number of indicators the class has studied.

Technology requirements for this class include computers with art/graphics software, color printer, image projectors, and appropriate new technologies.

Listed below are all of the courses presented in the Visual Arts Core Curriculum. There are additional, elective courses such as AP Art History and Studio Art available in many schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History and Criticism (VA 1210)</th>
<th>Film Making (VA 1240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art and Electronic Media (VA 1250)</td>
<td>3-D Design (VA 1110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations I (VA 1100)</td>
<td>Foundations II (VA 1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking (VA 1130)</td>
<td>Drawing (VA 1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting (VA 1150)</td>
<td>Sculpture (VA 1230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography (VA 1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics (VA 1220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry (VA 1160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media explored: ________________________________

Objective A: Refine techniques and processes in a variety of media.

- Experience and control a variety of 3-D design media, including current arts-related technologies.
- Select and analyze the expressive potential of 3-D design media, techniques, and processes.
- Practice safe and responsible use of 3-D design media, equipment, and studio space.

Objective B: Create 3-D design using art elements and principles.

- Create expressive 3-D design using art elements, including line, shape, texture, form, contrast, and unity.
- Create expressive 3-D design using art principles to organize the art elements, including emphasis, repetition, and unity.

Objective A: Critique 3-D design.

- Analyze 3-D designs regarding use of art elements and principles.
- Examine the functions of 3-D designs.
- Interpret 3-D designs.

Objective B: Evaluate 3-D design.

- Analyze and compare 3-D designs using a variety of aesthetic approaches.
- Evaluate 3-D designs based on their forming techniques, effective use of art elements and principles, fulfillment of functions, impact of content, expressive qualities, and aesthetic significance.

Standard 1 MAKING
Students will assemble and create 3-D design by manipulating art media and by organizing images with the elements and principles.

Standard 2 PERCEIVING
Students will find meaning by analyzing, criticizing, and evaluating 3-D design.

Standard 3 EXPRESSING
Students will create meaning in 3-D.

Objective A: Create content in 3-D design.

- Identify subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, and content in 3-D designs.
• Create 3-D designs that effectively communicate subject matter, metaphor, themes, symbols, or individually conceived content.

• Create divergent, novel, or individually inspired applications of 3-D design media or art elements and principles that express content.

Objective B: Curate 3-D designs ordered by medium and content.

• Organize a portfolio that expresses a purpose such as mastery of a medium, objectives of this Core, or significant content.

• Exhibit 3-D designs selected by themes such as mastery of a medium, Core objectives, and significant content.

Objective A: Align works of 3-D design according to history, geography, and personal experience.

Objective B: Synthesize 3-D design with other educational subjects.

• Integrate the 3-D design with dance, music, and theater.

• Explore how 3-D design can be integrated across disciplines.

Objective C: Evaluate the impact of 3-D design on life outside of school.

• Examine careers related to 3-D design.

• Predict how 3-D design can add quality to life and lifelong learning.

Standard 4 CONTEXTUALIZING
Students will find meaning in 3-D design through settings and other modes of learning.

3-D DESIGN LEGEND
Each box to the left of the indicator contains a number that represents a level of achievement from this list:

- Distinguished: 10
- Independent: 9
- Fluent: 8
- Developing: 7
- Novice: 0-6

This is the average of the numbers recorded in the boxes to the left of the indicators: 
This is the percentage of indicators the class completed:
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I  RATIONALE

Visual Art is a powerful and pervasive means of communication. It is the means of personal expression by which students make visible ideas, thoughts, feelings and observations of their world through display and exhibition of made images and objects.

When exploring and applying perceptual and conceptual understandings of visual language (including visual elements, principles of composition, sign and symbolism), students define, communicate and discern meanings. In making, students’ individualised responses to their exploration of concepts and focuses communicate an evolving personal aesthetic (style and expression) and, in appraising, enhance their appreciation of artworks.

The teaching and learning processes of researching, developing and resolving in both making and appraising, focus on knowledge and understanding as being actively constructed by learners.

In making artworks, students define and solve visual problems by using visual language and contexts. Making processes involve selecting, exploring, manipulating and exploiting materials, techniques and processes in particular media areas to communicate meanings. Students resolve ideas by actively constructing meanings in imaginative, analytical and reflective ways, thus providing spiritual, intuitive, emotional and intellectual responses. These responses reveal idiosyncratic understandings and interpretations of sensory information and reflect students’ personal and cultural identities.

In appraising artworks, students constantly appraise images and objects through synthesising information, evaluating meanings and justifying positions. This enhances students’ understanding of the purpose and intent of visual artworks in various cultures and societies. It develops students’ capacity to critically reflect on and challenge representations of cultural values, beliefs and customs and to make informed judgments when ascribing aesthetic value to visual artworks.

In a world of proliferating communication technologies and of increasing published, Internet-transmitted, and digitised visual information, a knowledge and understanding of how meanings are constructed and ‘read’ is essential in becoming a critical consumer and/or producer of images and objects, whether for leisure or work.

The teaching and learning contexts of the subject also provide opportunities for the development of the seven key competencies1. In a course of study based on this syllabus, students are primarily involved in communicating ideas and information. In making, this involves planning and organising activities together with collecting, analysing and organising information to solve visual problems. Students, either as individuals or working collaboratively, use various technologies and, to a lesser extent, mathematical ideas and techniques when exploring media areas. In appraising, communication of ideas and information about artworks involves planning, collecting, organising and analysing information.

---

1 Refer to Integrating the Key Competencies into the Assessment and Reporting of Student Achievement in Senior Secondary Schools in Queensland, published by QBSSSS in 1997.

The key competencies are: KC1: collecting, analysing and organising information; KC2: communicating ideas and information; KC3: planning and organising activities; KC4: working with others and in teams; KC5: using mathematical ideas and techniques; KC6: solving problems; KC7: using technology.
2 GLOBAL AIMS

A course of study developed from this syllabus aims to promote critical, cultural and aesthetic understandings through participation in the processes involved in the whole visual art experience. Senior Visual Art encourages students to:

- make and appraise artworks, with confidence and individuality
- define and solve problems with the flexibility to negotiate and consider a variety of solutions and processes
- select, explore, manipulate and exploit the potential of materials, techniques, processes and technologies
- evolve a personal aesthetic
- develop personal perspectives relating to social, community, cultural, economic, political, environmental and vocational visual art contexts
- make informed judgments and justify positions when determining the aesthetic value of artworks
- value and develop an interest in diverse philosophies and methodologies
- understand the diverse role of artworkers in cultures past and present, including multicultural Australia’s
- develop social and personal skills that promote confidence, working together in teams, group cooperation, responsibility and an informed lifelong engagement and enjoyment of the visual arts.
The objectives of the syllabus are in three dimensions namely: making, appraising and affective.

These objectives relate to the creative thinking and problem-solving processes involved in producing and appreciating artworks, the knowledge to be acquired, and the attitudes, values and feelings the subject aims to foster. Achievement of affective objectives is not assessed for summative purposes.

The making and appraising objectives incorporate six of the key competencies mentioned in the section ‘Rationale’. Both objectives require that students communicate ideas and information involving planning and organising activities, together with collecting, analysing and organising information. Objective 1 also requires students to solve problems when exploring media areas. This may involve the use of technology, and mathematical ideas and techniques.

The interrelated processes of researching, developing and resolving are central to this syllabus and are used to structure teaching and learning in making and appraising. The three processes are viewed as non-hierarchical and non-sequential.

Figure 1: Relationships between developing, researching and resolving
1. Making

Making is the production of artworks that communicate thoughts, feelings, ideas, experiences and observations through sensory modes. The effects of past and present social and cultural contexts on the meanings and aesthetic values of artworks are considered. In visual art, the formulation of ideas, and the creating and thinking processes are at least as significant as the final product. By the conclusion of a course of study, students should be able to demonstrate this objective through visual literacy and application.

Visual literacy entails communicating meanings through:
- researching, developing and resolving artworks to reflect a personal aesthetic
- defining and solving problems relevant to concept(s)
- using visual language and contexts.

Application entails communicating meanings through applying knowledge and understanding when selecting, exploring and manipulating materials, techniques and processes through researching, developing and resolving.

2. Appraising

Appraising is the appreciation of artworks from past and present social and cultural contexts. Artworks are considered through a range of researching, developing and resolving experiences that encourage students to critically reflect on, and challenge, ideas about the various meanings, approaches and aesthetics of visual art. By the conclusion of a course of study, students should be able to demonstrate this objective.

Appraising entails determining and communicating meanings through:
- demonstrating knowledge and understanding of artworks in contexts relating to concept(s) and media
- analysing, evaluating, synthesising and justifying sensory information
- using suitable terminology, language and referencing conventions.

3. Affective

Affective objectives are concerned with attitudes, values and feelings. By the conclusion of a course of study, students should demonstrate a willingness to:
- value and be confident in their own creative ability
- demonstrate a critical and sensitive awareness of expressive, functional and aesthetic qualities of the visual environment
- value the contribution of visual art workers
- value the diversity of forms of visual art in different cultures and contexts.
4 COURSE ORGANISATION

4.1 Course structure

4.1.1 Time allocation

The minimum number of hours of timetabled school time, including assessment, that the Visual Art syllabus has been designed to cater for is 55 hours per semester.

4.1.2 Framework for a course of study

A two-year course of study is based on units of work that comprise concepts, focuses and media areas.

Students’ understanding of the general objectives of making and appraising is developed through these units of work and is supported by the essential teaching and learning processes of researching, developing and resolving.

Concepts are the unit organisers that direct student learning and integrate making and appraising. Teachers present a concept to engage students in learning experiences that allow them to develop their own focuses for artworks with an understanding of related artworks from a range of social, cultural and historical contexts. Concepts may be media-based or theme-based.

Focuses are individual student pathways that define interpretations and responses to concepts. Over the two-year course, the teacher will structure units of work and there is a progression from teacher-directed focus, through teacher–student negotiated focus, to the students’ selecting and interpreting their own focus to resolve work.

Media areas are overviews of knowledge, skills, techniques and processes. Each area should not be viewed as distinct or limited to preconceived understandings of the visual art discipline. Over the two-year course, students should have the opportunity to make and appraise images and objects growing from a range of media areas.

Media areas

- ceramics
- costume and stage design
- drawing
- electronic imaging
- environmental design
- fibre arts
- graphic design
- installation
- painting
- performance art
- photographic arts
- printmaking
- product design
- sculpture
- video and film

The main features of a course of study are summarised in table 1. The sequencing of units of work (and the underpinning concepts) across a course of study should provide students with opportunities to progress along a learning continuum that develops from diversification in Year 11 to specialisation in Year 12. Thus, students should be making increasingly independent selections of focuses and media areas.
Table 1: The features of a two-year course of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units of work comprise</th>
<th>Features of Year 11 (diversification)</th>
<th>Features of Year 12 (specialisation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Initially the work undertaken will tend to be teacher-directed allowing opportunities for student resolution, moving towards a greater student independence in the selection and use of materials and processes. Teachers lead the students through explorations of a diverse range of artworks, visual art styles and philosophies relating to the concepts.</td>
<td>Exploring new concepts and/or building on concepts, techniques, media and approaches from Year 11, students undertake units of work that encourage student-directed investigation and independence in the selection and use of materials and processes. Teachers and students explore a diverse range of artworks, visual art styles and philosophies relating to the concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focuses</strong></td>
<td>Initially based on specific interpretations of the concepts provided, the teacher could provide strict frameworks for student interpretation and exploration of selected focuses.</td>
<td>Students interpret the concepts through which their focus or focuses are researched, developed and resolved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Media areas**        | These explorations involve closed and open-ended making and appraising learning experiences that reflect the processes of researching, developing and resolving. The students should be led through a diverse range of media areas and approaches that allow them to resolve images and objects. | Teachers may nominate or students may select the media area(s) when researching, developing and resolving folios that explore the focus(es). Students specialise in one of the following:  
  • several media areas with one concept and one focus  
  • several media areas with several concepts and focuses  
  • one media area with several concepts and focuses  
  • one media area with one concept and several focuses. |

4.1.3 Sample course overviews

Appendix 1 provides two sample course overviews illustrating the features in table 1. These samples are to be used as guides only as they have been contextualised for two different hypothetical school situations. Schools need to ensure that, in developing their overviews, they take into account their own particular context, e.g. resources, student interests, teacher expertise.
4.2 Units of work

When planning and developing units of work for a course of study, teachers should consider the sequencing, content and interrelatedness of units. The units should build upon each other to present a depth and breadth of cohesive experiences. This is to ensure that students engage in, and reflect on, philosophies and approaches that will challenge, motivate, and lead to an increasing independence in the making and appraising of artworks. Teachers should:

- take into account:
  - school context
  - students’ aptitudes and interests
  - available facilities and resources
  - teacher expertise
- introduce concepts to students through a diverse range of:
  - artworks
  - art-making approaches
  - related philosophies
- provide opportunities for students to engage in:
  - learning experiences that interrelate making and appraising
  - perceptual and/or conceptual approaches
  - a variety of concepts that challenge understandings of what visual art is
  - making independent decisions based on their own research about media areas that link concept to focus
  - increasing depth of exploration of selected media and techniques
  - problem identification and solution
  - visual, spoken and written responses that develop critical awareness of their own and others’ artworks
  - exploration of multiple contexts, e.g. social, cultural, historical, environmental
  - a range of assessment instruments.
5 LEARNING EXPERIENCES

A learning experience is an activity designed to foster student learning and development. Not all learning experiences need to be formally assessed. The interrelated concepts of researching, developing and resolving underpin the learning experiences described in this section. They have been designed to help teachers develop a dynamic learning environment. Students should be encouraged to experiment, to be innovative, imaginative and original to develop confidence in visual art making and appraising.

Sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 provide possible ways to enhance students’ achievement of the general objectives. They also provide opportunities for students to develop the six key competencies noted earlier. For example: in tables 2 and 4, students are ‘collecting, analysing and organising information’ underpinned by ‘planning and organising activities’. In table 2, the production of artworks involves ‘solving problems’ and in 5.3, experiences in the media areas such as ‘using technology’ assist students in ‘communicating ideas and information’. Underpinning some of the media areas, e.g. costume and stage design, environmental design is the ‘use of mathematical ideas and techniques’.

5.1 Learning experiences in making

Table 2: Making learning experiences in which students could participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing, collecting, compiling and recording visual, verbal and sensory information and ideas from a variety of sources and contexts.</td>
<td>Continuing to observe, collect, compile and record visual, verbal and sensory information and ideas from specific sources and contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being exposed to personal, global and universal concerns as a basis for the development of ideas and artworks.</td>
<td>Using personal perceptions, feelings and expressions to explore such issues as personal, global and universal concerns as a basis for the development of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring and experimenting with two- and three-dimensional and ephemeral media to give form to ideas/images/symbols.</td>
<td>Continuing to explore, experiment and exploit with media to give form to ideas, images or symbols of special significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring such visual elements as colour, line, texture, mass, light etc. when transforming media.</td>
<td>Manipulating the visual elements when transforming media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating ideas through media manipulation.</td>
<td>Translating and interpreting ideas through media manipulation to invent images and objects, developing understandings of style that become increasingly personal and selective when composing images and objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using skills and techniques to explore and manipulate a diversity of materials.</td>
<td>Using skills and techniques to explore, manipulate and control selected materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with a variety of materials, media and technologies as well as experimenting to discover and explore their intrinsic qualities.</td>
<td>Working to the limitations of selected materials, media and technologies as well as experimenting to exploit their intrinsic qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using personal ideas to present artworks appropriate to a variety of contexts.</td>
<td>Using personal ideas, feelings and expressions to present artworks suitable for a variety of contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting working processes to record, analyse and evaluate the development and resolution of artworks.</td>
<td>Documenting working processes to record, analyse and justify the development and resolution of artworks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1 Quantitative concepts and skills

At times, learning experiences relating to visual art making and displaying may require students to develop and apply numerical and mathematical concepts and skills; these could include:

- comprehending basic concepts and terms underpinning number, space, volume, quantity, measurement
- calculating and applying basic mathematical procedures
- using computers
- using skills or applying quantitative concepts when presented with visual/structural/curatorial problems.

5.2 Learning experiences in appraising

Language is a means by which meaning is constructed, shared and communicated. All teachers have a responsibility for language education.

Visual art discourse is the language that is used when listening, speaking, reading and writing about visual art. Exploring and challenging representations and stereotypes embodied in other discourses, e.g. gender, race, religion and politics, are intrinsic to the appreciation of artworks.

Students should:

- use suitable and effective language (visual, written, oral) for different audiences
- select and sequence information
- use specialised vocabulary and terminology
- use the conventions of grammar, spelling, punctuation and layout
- use recognised referencing conventions, e.g. Harvard, Oxford
- be familiar with both the format and the language of assessment instruments.

Table 3: Suggested ways of developing students’ facility with language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing upon sources of information, such as:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>observations, demonstrations, experiments, discussions, lectures, interviews, galleries, exhibitions, books, catalogues, computer software, journal articles, magazines, newspapers, broadcast media, advertisements, videos or films, world wide web.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using language for the purposes of, for example:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developing an idea, expressing a personal aesthetic, devising symbolism, embellishing own and others’ images, designing a product, describing a process, interpreting and analysing images/objects, explaining a relationship, narrating a visual story, evaluating an argument, synthesising information, justifying a position, researching concepts/focuses, reporting results, formulating a hypothesis, giving instructions, arguing a proposition, proposing action, interpreting a theory, persuading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenting information in ways such as:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sketches, photographs, commentary on resolved images/objects, artist’s statement of intent, extended writing, short responses, letters, reviews, oral presentations, seminars, demonstrations, web pages, CD-ROM, interviews, visual journal notes, critiques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: *Appraising* learning experiences in which students could participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing, collecting, compiling and recording visual, verbal and sensory information and ideas from a variety of sources and contexts.</td>
<td>Observing, collecting, compiling and recording visual, verbal and sensory information and ideas from a variety of sources and contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting ideas, media, techniques and processes to assist in describing, analysing and interpreting visual artworks.</td>
<td>Reflecting on ideas, media and techniques, processes etc. When describing, analysing, interpreting and judging visual artworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in discourse about the arts and learning skills necessary for appraising the styles, subject matter, composition and purpose of artworks.</td>
<td>Participating in critical discourse about the arts when appraising the styles, subject matter, composition, context artists’ intentions and purposes of artworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgments and expressing personal opinions when ascribing value to visual art.</td>
<td>Making informed judgments and justifying personal opinions when ascribing value to the visual arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing appropriate language and terminology when responding to sensory information such as the visual, tactile, spatial, aesthetic and kinaesthetic qualities of artworks.</td>
<td>Use suitable language and terminology when responding to sensory information such as the visual, tactile, spatial, aesthetic, kinaesthetic qualities of artworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the meanings that can be communicated through visual symbols, objects and imagery.</td>
<td>Critically appraising the meanings that can be communicated through visual symbols, objects and imagery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating, analysing and interpreting the visual art of different cultures and societies.</td>
<td>Investigating, analysing, interpreting and evaluating visual art in relation to the personal, social, cultural and historical contexts of production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being exposed to the meanings and values of visual arts in different cultures and societies.</td>
<td>Understanding the meanings and values of visual art in different cultures and societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the roles of artists and critics and the purpose and intent of artworks in societies.</td>
<td>Considering the roles of artists and critics and the purpose and intent of artworks in societies and discuss reasons for values changing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding how artists can challenge or reinforce values through making and presenting artworks.</td>
<td>Understanding how artists can challenge, reinforce or invent values through making and presenting artworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the links between visual art, other art forms and other areas of the curriculum.</td>
<td>Conducting excursions and visits to galleries, artist-run spaces, studios, artist collectives, offices of visual art organisations, urban and rural environments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Learning experiences in the media areas

Each of the following media areas are overviews of knowledge, skills, techniques and processes and are not to be viewed as distinct visual art disciplines. Each area has flexible boundaries and therefore this syllabus fosters inter-media techniques, approaches and applications.

Students should *make* and *appraise* within, across and through media areas that will include and enrich their personal cultures and philosophies. Inclusion of past and present contexts and a diversity of cultures is essential.
Ceramics
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to ceramics. For example, students could consider the intrinsic qualities of clay, glazes/slips, firing cycles and construction techniques.

Approaches to ceramics could be individual or collaborative, utilitarian, expressive, sculptural, decorative or ephemeral and could include such techniques as modelling, casting, assembling, throwing, carving and such surface manipulation as glazing, carving, burnishing, sgraffito, slip etc.

Responses in ceramics could be as diverse as utilitarian ware, sculpture, murals, body-wearable visual art, visual art in public spaces, essays, critiques, reviews.

Costume and stage design
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to costume and stage design. Students could, for example, consider conventional and unconventional media such as pen, pencil, felt-tip markers, air brush, paint, ink, electronic imaging, photography, fabrics, timber, cardboard, plastic, found objects and ephemera (such as live flowers, soap bubbles, body paint).

Approaches to costume and stage design could be two-dimensional or three-dimensional, individual or collaborative, and could include understanding performance and performance spaces, sketches, drawings, designs, plans, image creation, construction, modification, assemblage, computer and photocopy images, multimedia explorations etc.

Responses in costume and stage design could include stage design plans, stage models, set construction, lighting design plans, costumes, props, marketing and promotional sketches, materials and posters for publication, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

Drawing
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to drawing. Students could consider the qualities of conventional and unconventional media such as graphite, pastel, felt-tip markers, air brush, collage, found objects, montage, charcoal, ink, watercolour, fibres, light, electronic imaging, paint, wax, wire and so on.

Approaches to drawing could be individual or collaborative, two-dimensional or three-dimensional, subjective, objective, non-objective, informational, schematic, pictorial etc.

Responses in drawing could be as diverse as sketches, cartoons, illustrations, designs, plans, maps, collage, montage, frottage, body decoration, installation, essays, critiques, or reviews.

Electronic imaging
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to electronic imaging. Students could consider the technical characteristics of electronic media such as computer imaging, lasers, telecommunications, photocopiers, facsimile, etc.
Approaches to electronic imaging could be individual or collaborative and include image enhancement, creation, modification, manipulation, animation, scanning, digitisation, photocopying, documenting, narrating, multimedia exploration, appropriation, virtual reality, interactive TV etc.

Responses in electronic imaging could be as diverse as drawings, product and graphic design plans, films and videos, photocopies, facsimiles, electronic mail, sound and light, desktop publishing, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

**Environmental design**

Learning experiences in environmental design should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to the natural and built environment. Students could consider their environment in emotional, sensory and qualitative terms as a means of developing a sense of concern for both private and public realms, natural and built environments, the relationships of humans to their surroundings etc.

Approaches to environmental design could be individual or collaborative and could include experiencing the perceptual, expressive, ecological, historical and cultural domains of the human environment; analysing, designing and modifying environments, architectural design, interior design, landscapes design, town planning etc.

Responses in environmental design could be as diverse as sketches, drawings, plans, mental or cognitive maps, analytical/evaluative/comparative drawings, slide/film/video programs, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

**Fibre art**

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to fibre art. Students could consider the surface and tactile qualities of conventional and unconventional media such as fibres, textiles and mixed media such as paper, cotton, silk, wool, metal, wood, wire, paint, dye, wax, plastic, synthetics etc.

Approaches to fibre art could be individual or collaborative and could include printing, dyeing, weaving, constructing, assembling, moulding, casting etc.

Responses in fibre art could be as diverse as utilitarian products, sculpture, body-wearable visual art, murals, visual art in public spaces, installations, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

**Graphic design**

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to graphic design. Students could consider conventional and unconventional media such as graphite, pastel, pen and ink, watercolour, gouache, felt-tip markers, collage, air brush, montage, photocopying, computer images, printmaking, vinyl, plastics etc.

Approaches to graphic design can be two-dimensional or three-dimensional, individual or collaborative and could include freehand drawing, rendering, pictorial, orthographic, appropriation, image transfer, photocopying, electronic imaging and image processing, construction, modelling etc.

Responses in graphic design could be as diverse as illustration, animation, film and video, information design, advertising design and layout, display and presentation, exhibition design, packaging, posters, billboards, magazines, signs, typography, essays, critiques, reviews etc.
Installation

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas. Students could consider the interdisciplinary potential of installation, selecting, constructing, assembling, combining conventional and unconventional media and visual art forms such as drawing, painting, video, film, sculpture, found objects, electronic media, sound, movement, light, and ephemera.

Approaches to installation could involve individual or collaborative construction or alteration of spaces or environments which may be site-specific, transient etc.

Responses in installation could be as diverse as working in private or public realms such as personal environments, conventional and unconventional ‘gallery’ spaces, interiors and exteriors of buildings, corporate foyers, shopping centres, parks, streets, suburbs, schools, classrooms, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

Painting

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to painting. Students could consider conventional and unconventional media such as water-based and oil-based paints, inks, substances of varying viscosity, fluidity and plasticity on grounds and supports such as canvas, paper, wood, masonite, metal, glass, plastic, leather, plaster, gesso, glue etc.

Approaches to painting could be individual or collaborative and could be two-dimensional and three-dimensional, subjective, objective, non-objective, informational, schematic, pictorial, conceptual etc.

Responses in painting could be as diverse as paintings, sketches, cartoons, illustrations, designs, murals, artists’ books, visual art in public spaces, collage, body decoration, installation, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

Performance art

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to performance art. Students could consider the interdisciplinary nature of performance in this context using the body and other data in participatory projects which involve the audience.

Approaches to performance art could be individual or collaborative and could include cross-disciplinary investigations which broaden interpretations, challenge boundaries and make links in the arts; visual, literary, dramatic, dance, movement, music, sound, ephemeral, electronic etc.

Responses in performance art may be site-specific or transient works such as body art, ritual, political, technological performances using the body and, for example, voice, words, sounds, smells, tastes, actions, movement, sets, props, costumes, essays, critiques, reviews etc.
Photographic art
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to photography as visual art. Students could consider, for example, the qualities of such light-sensitive materials as photographic paper, emulsion, film, orthofilm, to capture and manipulate photographic images on conventional and unconventional surfaces and objects.

Approaches to photography could be individual or collaborative and could be two-dimensional, three-dimensional and ephemeral, and could include photograms, photographs, developing, printing, manipulating, enhancing, colouring, fashion, journalistic, landscape, portraiture, still life, documentation, representation, symbolism etc.

Responses in photographic art could be as diverse as advertising and promotion, illustration, photographic essay, photographs for publication, performance, installation, sculpture, body-wearable visual art, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

Printmaking
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to printmaking. Students could consider the characteristics of image replication through conventional and unconventional media such as stone, wood, lino, masonite, metals, plastic, clay, inks, paints, air brush, emulsions, photocopying, electronic imaging etc.

Approaches to printmaking could be individual or collaborative, two-dimensional or three-dimensional, utilitarian, expressive, decorative, sculptural or ephemeral and could include mono printing, embossing, screen printing, relief, intaglio, lithograph, electronic imaging, and such techniques as paper, lacquer stencils, light-sensitive emulsions, woodcut, masonite cut, linocut, collograph, dry point, mezzotint, etching, aluminium, paper, stone, litho print etc.

Responses in printmaking could be as diverse as mono prints, print editions inked or embossed, fabric prints, clothing designs, sculptures, installations, corporate image design, posters, billboards, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

Product design
Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to product design. Students could consider product exploration from a complex thematic base rather than an object focus and the needs and desires for products through customer focus and the consumer in the marketplace.

Approaches to product design could be two-dimensional or three-dimensional, individual or collaborative, and could include a history of industrial design, human environment design, ergonomic studies, computer-aided industrial design, design construction, graphic presentation, product research, market research etc.

Responses in product design could be as diverse as computer design, studies of manufacturing technology, product evaluation, models, mockups, small-scale prototypes, essays, critiques, reviews etc.
**Sculpture**

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to sculpture. Students could consider conventional and unconventional media such as wood, glass, metal, stone, clay, fibre, wire, paper, found objects, plastics, water, concrete etc.

Approaches to sculpture could be individual or collaborative and could be static, kinetic or ephemeral, and could include modelling, casting, carving, construction, assemblage, installation, performance etc.

Responses in sculpture could be as diverse as freestanding, glyptic, relief sculptures, environmental sculptures (earthworks, interiors), murals, furniture, body-wearable visual art, artists’ books, visual art in public spaces, essays, critiques, reviews etc.

**Video and film**

Learning experiences should involve students in research, development and resolution of ideas related to video and film as visual art. Students could consider the construction and manipulation of filmic images in an experimental visual art context and such technologies as super-8, video, electronic imaging etc.

Approaches to video and film could be individual or collaborative and could include script development, filming, editing, soundtracks, documentation, representation, illusion, symbolism, animation, narration, dramatisation, designing titles, electronic image creation, enhancement processing etc.

Responses in video and film could be as diverse as photographic, performance art, computer-generated stills, film, video, installation, animated video etc.
6 ASSESSMENT

The purpose of assessment is to make judgments about how well students meet the general objectives of the course. In designing an assessment program, it is important that the assessment tasks, conditions and criteria are compatible with the general objectives and the learning experiences. Assessment then, both formative and summative, is an integral and continual aspect of a course of study. The distinction between formative and summative assessment lies in the purpose for which that assessment is used.

Formative assessment is used to provide feedback to students, parents, and teachers about achievement over the course of study. This enables students and teachers to identify the students’ strengths and weaknesses so that, by informing practices in teaching and learning, students may improve their achievement and better manage their own learning. The formative techniques used should be similar to summative assessment techniques, which students will meet later in the course. This provides students with experience in responding to particular types of tasks under appropriate conditions. It is advisable that each assessment technique be used formatively before it is used summatively.

Summative assessment, while also providing feedback to students, parents, and teachers, provides information on which levels of achievement are determined at exit from the course of study. It follows, therefore, that it is necessary to plan the range of assessment instruments to be used, when they will be administered, and how they contribute to the determination of exit levels of achievement. Students’ achievements are matched to the standards of exit criteria, which are derived from the general objectives of the course. Thus, summative assessment provides the information for certification at the end of the course.

6.1 Underlying principles of assessment

The Board’s policy on assessment requires consideration to be given to the following principles when devising an assessment program. These principles are to be considered together and not individually in the development of an assessment program.

- Exit achievement levels are devised from student achievement in all areas identified in the syllabus as being mandatory.
- Assessment of a student’s achievement is in the significant aspects of the course of study identified in the syllabus and the school’s work program.
- Information is gathered through a process of continuous assessment.
- Exit assessment is devised to provide the fullest and latest information on a student’s achievement in the course of study.
- Selective updating of a student’s profile of achievement is undertaken over the course of study.
- Balance of assessment is a balance over the course of study and not necessarily within a semester or between semesters.
Mandatory aspects of the syllabus

Judgment of student achievement at exit from a school course of study must be derived from information gathered about student achievement in those aspects identified in a syllabus as being mandatory. The assessment program, therefore, must include achievement of the general objectives of the syllabus.

For Visual Art, these aspects consist of the general objectives met through the chosen media area(s).

Significant aspects of the course of study

Significant aspects refer to those areas included in the course of study, determined by the choices permitted by the syllabus, and seen as being particular to the context of the school and to the needs of students at that school. These will be determined by the choice of learning experiences appropriate to the location of the school, the local environment and the resources selected.

The significant aspects of the course must reflect the objectives of the syllabus.

Achievement in both mandatory and significant aspects of the course must contribute to the determination of the student’s exit level of achievement.

The assessment of student achievement in the significant aspects of the school course of study must not preclude the assessment of the mandatory aspects of the syllabus.

The significant aspects of the course in Visual Art are areas in which the school has given special emphasis for reasons of school philosophy or availability of expertise or resources. These aspects are the *concepts* within units of work developed by the school and which *must* be assessed. They must reflect the objectives of the syllabus.

Continuous assessment

This is the means by which assessment instruments are administered at suitable intervals and by which information on student achievement is collected. It requires a continuous gathering of information and the making of judgments in terms of the stated criteria and standards throughout the two-year program of study.

Levels of achievement must be arrived at by gathering information through a process of continuous assessment at points in the course of study appropriate to the organisation of the learning experiences. They must not be based on students’ responses to a single assessment task at the end of a course or instruments set at arbitrary intervals that are unrelated to the developmental course of study.

For Visual Art, this requires judgments about student achievement in terms of stated criteria and standards to be undertaken periodically through the course and recorded on a student profile.

Fullest and latest

Judgments about student achievement made at exit from a school course of study must be based on the fullest and latest information available.

‘Fullest’ refers to information about student achievement gathered across the range of general objectives. ‘Latest’ refers to information about student achievement gathered from the latest period in which the general objectives are assessed.
Fullest and latest information consists of both the most recent data on developmental aspects together with any previous and not superseded data. Decisions about achievement require both to be considered in determining the student’s level of achievement.

As the assessment program in Visual Art is to be developmental in nature, information on student achievement of the assessable objectives, therefore, should be selectively updated throughout the course. ‘Fullest’ refers to achievement through the selected concepts and chosen media area(s) of the course of study. In terms of ‘latest’ it is expected that summative assessment instruments will come from Year 12.

**Selective updating**

Selective updating is related to the developmental nature of the two-year course of study. It is the process of using later information to supersede earlier information.

As the criteria are treated at increasing levels of complexity, assessment information gathered at earlier stages of the course may no longer be typical of student achievement. The information should therefore be selectively updated to reflect student achievement more accurately. Selective updating operates within the context of continuous assessment.

The principle of selective updating is linked to the developmental nature of the course. As student skills in visual literacy, application and appraising develop towards increasing levels of complexity, assessment information gathered at earlier stages of the course may no longer be typical of student achievement at later stages. The information should, therefore, be selectively and continually updated (not averaged) to accurately reflect student achievement.

Selective updating must not involve students reworking and resubmitting previously graded assessment tasks. Opportunities may be provided for particular students to complete and submit additional tasks. This may provide information for making judgments if achievement on an earlier task was unrepresentative or atypical, or there was insufficient information upon which to base a judgment.

In *making*, students may use aspects of previously assessed developmental or formative tasks to provide a foundation for other tasks including those selected as being summative.

**Balance**

Balance of assessment is a balance over the course of study and not necessarily a balance within a semester or between semesters. The assessment program must ensure an appropriate balance over the course of study as a whole.

Within the two-year course for Visual Art it is necessary to establish a suitable balance in the objectives, assessment tasks, conditions and criteria. The criteria are to have equal emphasis across the range of assessment. The balance is over the course of study and not necessarily within a semester or between semesters.

### 6.2 Planning an assessment program

At the end of Year 12, judgments are made about how students have achieved in relation to the standards stated in the syllabus for *making* and *appraising*. These summative judgments are based on achievement in each of the general objectives.
When planning an assessment program, schools must consider:

- general objectives (refer to section 3)
- the learning experiences (refer to section 5)
- the underlying principles of assessment (refer to section 6.1)
- a variety of assessment techniques and instruments over the two-year course (refer to section 6.3)
- conditions under which the assessment is implemented
- the exit criteria and standards (refer to section 6.5)
- verification folio requirements especially the number and the nature of student responses to assessment tasks to be included (refer to section 6.6)
- minimum assessment necessary to reach a valid judgment of the student’s standard of achievement.

Students should be conversant with the assessment techniques and have knowledge of the criteria to be used in assessment instruments. Refer to appendix 1 for a sample assessment overview.

**6.2.1 Special consideration**

Guidance about the nature and appropriateness of special consideration and special arrangements for particular students may be found in the Board’s policy statement on special consideration, *Special Consideration: Exemption and special arrangements in senior secondary school-based assessment* (30 May 1994). This statement also provides guidance on responsibilities, principles and strategies that schools may need to consider in their school settings.

To enable special consideration to be effective for students so identified, it is important that schools plan and implement strategies in the early stages of an assessment program and not at the point of deciding levels of achievement. The special consideration might involve alternative teaching approaches, assessment plans and learning experiences.

**6.3  Assessment in making and appraising**

**6.3.1 Techniques, instruments and tasks**

Many making and appraising learning experiences are informal and serve to develop student expertise. Particular learning experiences may be formally assessed through the application of techniques within instruments to create tasks.

**Techniques**

A *technique* is a strategy for assessing student work and forms part of an assessment instrument. Techniques include: teacher observation, focused analysis, peer assessment and self-assessment, student–teacher consultation, dialogue with artists, short and extended writing.
Instruments

An *instrument* is a tool developed by the school for assessing students in a subject at a specific time within a course of study, and used to frame an assessment task. Instruments include: folios, visual journals, reports, essays, tests, catalogues, reviews, critiques, orals, interviews.

Tasks

A *task* is work undertaken by a student in response to an assessment instrument and outlined in a task sheet. The standard of the response is assessed in relation to specific criteria.

Teachers have an ethical responsibility to ensure that, in responding to *making* or *appraising* tasks, students avoid uninformed and insensitive treatment of subject matter and issues.

In describing assessment tasks to students, teachers need to ensure that they:

- provide a clear description of the task, written in a manner that is logically sequenced and easily understood by students
- provide scaffolding or guidelines that clearly explain the processes of task completion for the student
- include statements of relevant criteria reflecting aspects of the exit criteria
- identify conditions involved.

6.3.2 Making tasks

Descriptions of *making* tasks could include:

- opportunities for explorations of media, ideas and processes
- suggestions for ways of interpreting concepts and possible focuses
- examples of related artists
- stimulus material, such as literary/film/music references, quotes, definitions, prompting questions
- possible strategies to assist the student when responding.

Resolved work in making

Resolved work is the completion of the work as required by the task. It is an individualised response demonstrating a synthesis of ideas as a result of researching and developing.

Table 5: Characteristics of resolved work in making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of resolved work in making include:</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evidence of research and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emerging personal aesthetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis is not on ‘finish’ but on developing knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some end-point is reached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts, focuses and media areas used to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence of depth of research and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own personal aesthetic is communicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a degree of finish showing knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end-points are reached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts, focuses and media areas used to solve complex problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appropriation of images

Appropriation is the borrowing of an idea or image and recontextualising it to give it another meaning. When teachers are determining the validity of appropriated images in student artwork, they are advised to consider the context in which the image is being used. Borrowed images are acceptable when they are:

- placed in a new context, whether altered or not
- not culturally sensitive (refer to the section ‘Educational equity’).

Copying images is a valid approach when developing particular media processes and techniques.

6.3.3 Appraising tasks

Descriptions of appraising tasks could include:

- links/references to relevant making activities
- opportunities for students to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the concepts and media areas they have studied
- relevant information such as definitions of terms, suggested artists or artworks
- a requirement for students to interpret, evaluate and justify information, e.g. slides, print or video material, original artworks, websites, prose extract, artistic statement, critique, journal article, review, in response to a question, statement or hypothesis
- prompting questions requiring students to reconsider their stance on the issue to be discussed.

Appraising techniques and instruments from which tasks are devised include:

- extended writing (800–1000 words), e.g. essay, critique, article, review, dialogue with the artist
- orals, e.g. seminar presentation, interviews, dramatic enactments, debates
- objective tests, e.g. multiple-choice questions, matching/classification, sentence completion, definition of terms.

6.3.4 Examples of technique, instrument and task

Table 6 provides brief descriptions of possible tasks in making and appraising, and shows how they are linked to techniques and instruments. The table is a guide only and is not to be considered as definitive or exhaustive.
### Table 6: Examples of technique, instrument and task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Brief task description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making</td>
<td>Teacher observation, student–teacher consultation</td>
<td>Painting/drawing folio</td>
<td>Resolve representations of the figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self assessment, student–teacher consultation</td>
<td>Visual journal (as part of the painting/drawing folio)</td>
<td>Document ideas and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td>Extended writing</td>
<td>Essay of 800–1000 words</td>
<td>Critically analyse the statement: 'Drawing and painting have evolved into the same visual art form'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended writing</td>
<td>Critique of 800 words</td>
<td>Critique an exhibition of figurative work, examining use of metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short written response</td>
<td>Objective test</td>
<td>Recall historical, theoretical and technical aspects of artworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Exit criteria

In Visual Art, judgments made about student achievement in the general objectives of **making** and **appraising** contribute to the exit level of achievement. The exit criteria are derived from the general objectives of the course.

The criteria for the **making** objective are **visual literacy** and **application**.

- **Visual literacy** entails communicating meanings through:
  - researching, developing and resolving artworks to reflect a personal aesthetic
  - defining and solving problems relevant to concept(s)
  - using visual language and contexts.

- **Application** entails communicating meanings through:
  - applying knowledge and understanding when selecting, exploring and manipulating materials, techniques and processes through researching, developing and resolving.

The criterion for the **appraising** objective is **appraising**:

- **Appraising** entails determining and communicating meanings through:
  - demonstrating knowledge and understanding of artworks in contexts relating to concept(s) and media
  - analysing, evaluating, synthesising and justifying sensory information
  - using suitable terminology, language and referencing conventions.

Thus, derived from the general objectives of **making** and **appraising**, there are three criteria:

- visual literacy
- application
- appraising.
6.5 Determining exit levels of achievement

On completion of the course of study, the school is required to award each student an exit level of achievement from one of the five categories:

Very High Achievement
High Achievement
Sound Achievement
Limited Achievement.
Very Limited Achievement.

The school must award an exit standard for each of the three criteria (visual literacy, application, and appraising), based on the principles of assessment described in this syllabus. The criteria are derived from the general objectives and are described in section 6.4. The minimum standards associated with the three exit criteria are described in section 6.5.1. When teachers are determining a standard for each criterion, it is not always necessary for the student to have met each descriptor for a particular standard; the standard awarded should be informed by how the qualities of the work match the descriptors overall.

When assessing formative tasks, particular standards descriptors may be selected from the matrix and/or adapted to suit the task. These standards are used to inform the teaching and learning process. For Year 12 tasks, students should be provided with opportunities to understand and become familiar with the expectations for exit. The exit standards are applied to the summative body of work selected for exit.

Of the seven key competencies, the six that are relevant to assessment in this subject are embedded in the descriptors in the standards matrix. The descriptors refer mainly to elements of knowledge, problem solving, communication and analysis and artmaking skills involving concepts and chosen media.

After standards have been determined in each of the three criteria in making and appraising, the minimum requirements for awarding an exit level of achievement are indicated in table 7, in which A represents the highest standard and E the lowest.

Table 7: Minimum requirements for exit levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VHA</td>
<td>Standard A in any two exit criteria and no less than a B in the remaining criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Standard B in any two exit criteria and no less than a C in the remaining criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard C in any two exit criteria and no less than a D in the remaining criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Standard D in any two exit criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLA</td>
<td>Does not meet the requirements for Limited Achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 KC1: collecting, analysing and organising information; KC2: communicating ideas and information; KC3: planning and organising activities; KC5: using mathematical ideas and techniques; KC6: solving problems; KC7: using technology
### 6.5.1 (Table 8) Minimum standards associated with exit criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>standard A</th>
<th>standard B</th>
<th>standard C</th>
<th>standard D</th>
<th>standard E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making: visual literacy</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• researches, develops and resolves individualised artworks, reflecting an evolved personal aesthetic</td>
<td>• researches, develops and resolves individualised artworks, reflecting a personal aesthetic</td>
<td>• researches and develops artworks</td>
<td>• researches and develops artworks</td>
<td>• copies ideas and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• defines and solves complex problems relevant to concept(s)</td>
<td>• defines and solves problems relevant to concept(s)</td>
<td>• solves problems relevant to concept(s)</td>
<td>• solves some problems with relevance to the concept(s)</td>
<td>• explores simple problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• uses visual language and contexts to construct and effectively communicate intended meanings</td>
<td>• uses visual language and contexts to construct and communicate intended meanings</td>
<td>• uses visual language and contexts to reproduce meanings</td>
<td>• uses images and/or objects and contexts</td>
<td>• uses images and/or objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making: application</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• applies knowledge and understanding when selecting, exploring, manipulating and exploiting materials, techniques and processes</td>
<td>• applies knowledge and understanding when selecting, exploring and manipulating materials, techniques and processes</td>
<td>• applies knowledge when selecting and using materials, techniques and processes</td>
<td>• selects materials and uses techniques and processes</td>
<td>• uses materials and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising: appraising</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
<td>The student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of artworks in contexts, related to concepts and chosen media area(s)</td>
<td>• demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of artworks in contexts, related to concepts and chosen media area(s)</td>
<td>• demonstrates relevant knowledge and some understanding of artworks related to chosen media area(s)</td>
<td>• can identify artworks related to chosen media area(s)</td>
<td>• can identify artworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effectively syntheses information through analysis and interpretation to evaluate meanings when justifying positions</td>
<td>• synthesises information through analysis and interpretation to evaluate meanings when justifying positions</td>
<td>• describes and interprets meaning and gives an opinion</td>
<td>• describes and classifies artworks</td>
<td>• describes artworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistently and accurately uses and applies relevant terminology, and language and referencing conventions</td>
<td>• consistently uses and applies relevant terminology, and language and referencing conventions</td>
<td>• uses relevant terminology, and language and referencing conventions</td>
<td>• occasionally uses relevant terminology and language conventions</td>
<td>• uses some language conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Requirements for verification folios

In the verification folio requirements for the subject, the minimum and maximum numbers of assessment instruments are stipulated. Schools must ensure that the verification folios presented in October contain all summative assessment instruments and corresponding student responses upon which judgments about interim levels of achievement have been made to that point.

Each student verification folio must provide sufficient material to validate judgments made regarding the interim level of achievement. ‘Sufficient material’ includes:

- evidence that visual literacy, application and appraising have been summatively assessed at least twice from Year 12 only
- between two and four resolved artworks/folios in making that:
  - are supported with evidence of relevant research and development in relation to the concept(s) and media area(s) explored, e.g. extracts or sections of originals, and/or photocopies/scans of information, ideas and working processes
  - reflect a depth of study
  - demonstrate the defining and solving of problems
  - consolidate ideas and processes
  - show significant difference, development or progression in terms of either concept(s) or focus(es) or media area(s)
- between two and four appraising responses to tasks including two written responses, one of which is to be extended writing of 800–1000 words
- task sheets for each submitted student response that set out criteria used for assessment and the standard awarded
- photographs of non-portable or fragile artworks in place of the originals (with a scale indicator placed beside the image/object to indicate size—where relevant, include at least one close-up or detail of each artwork)
- selected hard copies of electronic images, not disks
- oral presentations (if submitted) are to be accompanied by a 200–300 word summary outlining the key aspects of the presentation, student’s preparatory materials such as scripts and OHTs
- a completed student profile (see 6.6.1).

6.6.1 Sample student profile

The sample student profile in appendix 2 illustrates one way of recording student achievement. The profile shows the key elements:

- titles of units of work and/or concepts
- tasks in each semester
- the standards achieved in each criterion for each task
- those summative tasks included in the verification folio, indicated with an asterisk, highlighter pen or designated area of the profile sheet
- the interim level of achievement for verification.

Schools may use the profile template in appendix 2, or design their own, as long as the key elements are shown.
The work program is the school’s interpretation of the syllabus. It explains how the school intends to implement the syllabus. It contains more detail than the syllabus does, and it caters for the special characteristics of the individual school and its students.

The work program must meet all syllabus requirements and show the overall plan for the subject within the school. It should be a stand-alone document that does not require reference to other documents to be understood.

7.1 Components of a work program

The work program must contain the following components:
- Table of contents
- Rationale
- Global aims
- General objectives
- Course organisation
- Learning experiences
- Assessment section
- Educational equity
- Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of contents</th>
<th>This increases the readability of the document. Pages must be numbered.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>This provides the justification for including Visual Art in the school curriculum. The school program may copy the syllabus rationale and incorporate additions that take into account the particular circumstances of the school and its student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global aims</td>
<td>These are statements of long-term achievements, attitudes and values to be developed by the students in studying Visual Art but which are not directly assessed by the school. They are to be copied from the syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General objectives</td>
<td>General objectives are detailed statements of what students are expected to learn to realise the global aims. These objectives are to be pursued directly by the school and student achievement of them is to be assessed by the school. They are to be copied from the syllabus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Course organisation**

The course overview, in tabular format, sets out the school’s proposed course indicating how suggested units of work are organised and sequenced. Two sample overviews are provided as guides in appendix 1 and a blank course overview template is provided in appendix 2. Schools may design their own course overview layout as long as the elements in the template are present.

A course overview:
- demonstrates an integrated balance of making and appraising experiences
- is based on the framework of concepts, focuses and media areas (refer to section 4.1.2)
- should indicate possible student responses within each unit
- comprises units of work that:
  - show a gradation from teacher-directed focuses in Year 11, through teacher–student negotiated focuses, to the students’ selecting and interpreting their own focus(es) in Year 12
  - provide increasing complexity and greater student independence
  - encourage diversification in Year 11 and specialisation in Year 12
  - are sequenced in Year 12 to build upon and extend the learning done in Year 11.

To accompany the course overview, schools must provide:

1. **two sample units of work**: one from Year 11 and one from Year 12
2. **two sample assessment tasks**: one making task and one appraising task—these are selected so that one is from the Year 11 sample unit and one is from the Year 12 sample unit.

The two sample units of work:
- state the approximate time allocated and position in the two-year course, e.g. 6 weeks, semester 1
- have titles that reflect the underpinning concepts
- outline details of the unit including the concepts studied and related stimuli such as suggested artists, movements
- have teacher-directed focuses in Year 11 and student-interpreted focuses in Year 12
- include making and appraising experiences
- show an increase in complexity and greater student independence between Year 11 and Year 12
- illustrate diversification of learning experiences in Year 11 and specialisation in Year 12
- list possible media areas covered
- list possible tasks the students will undertake.

A sample unit overview is provided in appendix 1 as a guide to the level of detail required. Schools may use the blank unit overview template in appendix 2 or devise their own.

---

**[This table continues on the next page]**
Learning experiences are summarised in the course overview and expanded in the units of work. Section 5, ‘Learning experiences’ provides guidelines for devising learning experiences.

The requirements of the *Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995* should be considered when developing learning experiences and practical assessment tasks (see section 7.1.1).

**Assessment section**

(a) Assessment overview

The work program should contain a comprehensive assessment overview that:

- conforms to the principles outlined in section 6.1
- shows assessment planned for each unit of work
- lists a variety of assessment instruments
- indicates extended writing tasks in Year 11 in preparation for Year 12
- indicates the duration and nature of the assessment tasks in length (time/words) as well as the conditions that apply, e.g. classwork/supervised exam.

A sample assessment overview is provided as a guide in appendix 1. Schools may use the template in appendix 2 or devise their own.

In addition to the assessment overview, schools must also include in the ‘Assessment’ section of the work program:

(b) Student profile

The student profile indicates the student’s progress over the two-year course and provides information for the determination of the student’s exit level of achievement. Schools are to provide a sample worked profile to illustrate how they determine an exit level of achievement by applying the standards matrix (see section 6.5). A sample profile is provided in appendix 2.

(c) Determination of exit levels of achievement

Table 7 (minimum requirements for exit levels, see p. 22) is to be included.

**Educational equity**

The requirements of educational equity should be considered when developing the work program. The statement has implications for course organisation (including the selection of media areas and learning experiences) and assessment (techniques and instruments). School may wish to use the syllabus statement or develop their own (refer to section 8 ‘Educational equity’) as long as it reflects the intent of the syllabus statement.

**Resources**

These should be indicated under the heading ‘details of unit’ within the unit overviews, e.g. artists, artworks, texts, websites (see sample unit overview in appendix 1).
7.1.1 Workplace Health and Safety

Schools must ensure that when they offer this subject they comply with the requirements of the *Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995*. Teachers must evaluate all risks inherent in any student activities so that the health and safety of students, teachers and any others involved in such activities are not jeopardised. Teachers should refer to the risk management documents in their school and check activities with the school Workplace Health and Safety Officer. Risk management involves identifying any potential hazards, assessing the likelihood of injury, devising procedures to control or minimise the risk and evaluating the effectiveness of these procedures.

In Visual Art, there is the potential for physical injury for both teachers and students. Teachers need to assess the risk of such things as: the use of toxic and hazardous materials, ventilation, storage, equipment, kilns, the nature of floor surfaces and learning experiences in the natural and built environment outside the classroom. Teachers should ensure that students understand safety procedures.

For further information consult the resources section and the following publications:


Education Queensland’s website—http://www.education.qld.gov.au

From the Catholic Education Centre: *Workplace Health and Safety Resource Folder.*
Equity means fair treatment of all. In developing work programs from this syllabus, schools are urged to consider the most appropriate means of incorporating the following notions of equity.

Schools need to provide opportunities for all students to demonstrate what they know and what they can do. All students, therefore, should have equitable access to educational programs and human and material resources. Teachers should ensure that the particular needs of the following groups of students are met: female students; male students; Aboriginal students; Torres Strait Islander students; students from non-English-speaking backgrounds; students with disabilities; students with gifts and talents; geographically isolated students; and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

The subject matter chosen should include, where appropriate, the contributions and experiences of all groups of people. Learning contexts and community needs and aspirations should also be considered when selecting subject matter. In choosing appropriate learning experiences teachers can introduce and reinforce non-racist, non-sexist, culturally sensitive and unprejudiced attitudes and behaviour. Learning experiences should encourage the participation of students with disabilities and accommodate different learning styles.

It is desirable that the resource materials chosen recognise and value the contributions of both females and males to society and include the social experiences of both sexes. Resource materials should also reflect the cultural diversity within the community and draw from the experiences of the range of cultural groups in the community.

Efforts should be made to identify, investigate and remove barriers to equal opportunity to demonstrate achievement. This may involve being proactive in finding out about the best ways to meet the special needs, in terms of learning and assessment, of particular students. The variety of assessment techniques in the work program should allow students of all backgrounds to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a subject in relation to the criteria and standards stated in this syllabus. The syllabus criteria and standards should be applied in the same way to all students.

Teachers may find the following resources useful for devising an inclusive work program:


Department of Training and Industrial Relations 1998, Access and Equity Policy for the Vocational Education and Training System, DTIR, Brisbane.


9 RESOURCES

9.1 Teaching and learning resources


*Writing About Art*, Hirsh, E. 1996, Addison Wesley Longman Australia Pty Ltd. ISBN 0582804132

9.2 General text resources


*Aesthetics and Art Criticism: The role of emotion in art*, Hoffert, B. 1997, Addison Wesley Longman Australia Pty Ltd. ISBN 0582807875


*Angels, Archangels, and All the Company of Heaven*, Knapp, G. 2000, Prestel from Peribo Pty Ltd, Mount Kuring-Gai, NSW. ISBN 3791322311


**VISUAL ART SENIOR SYLLABUS**


*The Art of Modernism: Art, culture and society from Goya to the present day*, Bocola, S. 2000, Prestel from Peribo Pty Ltd, Mount Kuring-Gai, NSW. ISBN 3791321463


*The Australian Scapegoat: Towards an antipodean aesthetic*, Fuller, P. 1986, University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands.


History of Indian and Indonesian Art, Coomaraswamy, A. 1985, Dover, New York.


HSC Artexpress a selection of outstanding works from the HSC Examination in Visual Arts, Board of Studies, New South Wales, PO Box 460, North Sydney.


An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols, Cooper, J. 1978, Thames and Hudson, Ltd. Hampshire. ISBN 0500271259

**VISUAL ART SENIOR SYLLABUS**


Islands: Contemporary installations, National Gallery of Australia 1996, Thomas and Hudson (Australia) Pty Ltd, Port Melbourne. ISBN 0642130558


### 9.3 Journals

**Australian Art Education**, Journal of the Australian Institute of Art Education (AIAE), University of Wollongong. ISSN 10321942, published three times per year.

**Art Asia Pacific**, issued quarterly, G+B Arts International, Fine Arts Press, Tower A, level 1, 112 Talavera Road, North Ryde, NSW 2113. ISSN 10393625

**Art Monthly Australia**, Canberra School of Art, GPO Box 804, Canberra, ACT 2601

**Contemporary Visual Arts**, bimonthly from the UK, G+B Arts International, Fine Arts Press, Tower A, level 1, 112 Talavera Road, North Ryde, NSW 2113. ISSN 09686711

**Isabout**, Journal of the professional art educator, Queensland Art Teachers’ Association (QATA), PO Box 5172 West End Qld 4101

**Mythosphere: A journal for image, myth and symbol**, four issues per volume edited by W. Doty, Craftsman House, G+B Arts International, Fine Arts Press, Tower A, level 1, 112 Talavera Road, North Ryde, NSW 2113. ISSN (issue 3) 9057005670; (issue 4) 9057005689

**Visual Arts and Culture: An international journal of contemporary art**, biannual, G+B Arts International, Fine Arts Press, Tower A, level 1, 112 Talavera Road, North Ryde, NSW 2113. ISSN 10266402

**YAQ Papers**, a collection of essays investigating youth arts and cultural development, Youth Arts Queensland, GPO Box 2855, Brisbane, Qld 4001
9.4 Videos

*The Art of Place: An Asian–Australian art exchange*, 26 minutes, Video Classroom, 572a St Kilda Road, Melbourne, 3004.

**From VEA, 111 Mitchell Street, Bendigo Victoria 3550**
**Telephone 1800 034 282**

*A Matter of Identity* (34 minutes) 1994. Four Aboriginal artists talk about their work as artists.

*Aboriginal Art: yesterday and today* (27 minutes) 1996. Examines the work of four artists against the backdrop of their heritage and beliefs.


*Women’s Art and Feminism 1970–1994* (30 minutes) 1994. Traces the recent history of women’s art; considers the various attitudes towards feminism and the role of gender in art; features ten women artists.

*Women Artists series* (108 minutes) 1982. Fifty artists—their lives, ideas and work plus a catalogue of their artwork are provided in this series.

*Workbooks, Diaries and All That* (20 minutes) 1996. Profiles three high achieving student artists, each of whom keeps a journal and works with different media; illustrates how students use their journals to develop ideas from concept to completed work, explore alternatives, monitor progress and critique works.

**From VC Media Pty Ltd, 572a St Kilda Road Melbourne 3004,**
**Telephone (03) 9510 3600**

*Ghosts, Angels and Suburbia: four contemporary Australian Artists* (25 minutes). The artists speak about their methods, motivations and influences and their exhibitions and studios are shown.


*Creating an Australian Icon: The Rip Curl logo— A graphic communication case study* (20 minutes). Traces the evolution of the company’s marketing imagery.

*Logos and Labels: Australian textiles and design* (20 minutes). Explores the growing demand for the design and wearing of ‘branded’ clothing and the reasons young people wear them.

*Master Photographers Series*, six 35-minute programs from the BBC.

9.5 Software

*Art Gallery* 1998, VEA, 111 Mitchell Street, Bendigo, Victoria, 3550. Telephone 1800 034 282. Presents the art collection of the National Gallery in London and allows the user to witness techniques of the great artists.

*Moorditj: Australian Indigenous Cultural Expressions* 1998, (CD-ROM), VEA, 111 Mitchell Street, Bendigo, Victoria, 3550. Telephone 1800 034 282. Celebrates the work of 110 artists from around Australia, with their biographies and the issues that motivate them; includes more than 300 artworks.

9.6 Websites

At the time of publication, these URLs (website addresses) were checked for accuracy and suitability of content. However, due to the transient nature of material placed on the web, their continuing accuracy cannot be verified. These sites are likely to be more long lasting than most, and are regularly updated. They were last accessed in late 2000.

Alphabetical listing of artists—
  http://www.artincontext.org/listings/artist/alpha/menu.htm

Animation Tutorials—
  http://graphicssoft.about.com/compute/software/graphicssoft/msubanitut.htm

Art History Resources on the Web—http://witcombe.sbc.edu/


Art on the Net—http://www.art.net/

Arts Education Online—http://www.ucop.edu/tcap/aeo1.html


ArtsEdNet—http://www.artsednet.getty.edu/

ArtsInfo—http://www.artsinfo.net.au/


Australian National Affiliation of Art Educators—

Copyright and Art—

CorelDRAW Tutorials—
  http://graphicssoft.about.com/compute/software/graphicssoft/msubcoreldraw.htm


Digital Photography Links—
  http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Visual_Arts/Photography/Digital/

Fine Arts Forum—http://www.msstate.edu/Fineart_Online/home.html

Glossary of Words for Art—http://www.arts.ouc.bc.ca/fiar/glossary/gloshome.html

Incredible Art Department—http://www.artswire.org/kenroar/

Metropolitan Museum of Art—http://www.metmuseum.org/


Online Visual Literacy Project—http://pete.pomona.edu/visual-lit/intro/intro.html

PaintShop Pro Tutorials—
  http://graphicssoft.about.com/compute/software/graphicssoft/msubmenu2.htm

Photography, History—http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Visual_Arts/Photography/History/

Photography Resources—Yahoo Directory—
  http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Visual_Arts/Photography/


Queensland Art Teacher’s Association—http://www.qata.qld.edu.au/

Queensland Arts Council—http://www.qac.org.au

Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies—http://www.qbssss.edu.au

Visual Literacy—

Web Museum, Artists Index—http://metalab.unc.edu/wm/paint/auth/

Web Museum—http://metalab.unc.edu/wm/

World Wide Art Resources—http://wwar.com/


9.7 Bookshops

American Book Store, 173 Elizabeth Street, Brisbane, 4000.
Telephone (07) 3229 4677. Fax 3221 2171

Folio Books, 80 Albert Street, Brisbane, 4000.
Telephone (07) 3221 1368. Fax 3220 0098

McGills’ Technical Books, 161–163 Elizabeth Street, Brisbane, 4000.
Telephone (07) 3221 9939. Fax 3236 2446

Queensland Art Gallery Bookshop, PO Box 3686 South Brisbane 4101.
Telephone (07) 3840 7290. Fax 3844 8865.
APPENDIX 1: 
SAMPLE OVERVIEWS

The two sample overviews should be read in conjunction with table 1, section 4.1.2 (the features of a two-year course of study).

Sample course overview 1

Sample 1 comprises ten units with titles that refer to the underpinning sample concepts. Under ‘perceiving images and objects’ students undertake visual art making approaches based on observation to allow for media investigation that does not require students to conceptualise the imagery. Under ‘conceiving images and objects’, students begin to conceptualise imagery informed by their knowledge of media and techniques. Initially in these units they begin to explore the use of symbolism and metaphor within a variety of traditional and non-traditional visual art making approaches. In Year 12, in ‘generating images and objects’, students select and work in visual art making approaches to resolve images and/or objects that relate to the concepts.

The focuses are nominated by the teacher for units 1–4, negotiated between teacher and student for unit 5, then student-determined for the remaining units. To lead the students through specific approaches in media and technique, the media areas are chosen by the teacher for units 1–5. For the remaining units, the students should choose their own, building on previous experiences. Accompanying this overview is an example of one of the units developed in some detail plus an assessment overview.
**Sample course overview 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceiving images and objects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conceiving images and objects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Generating images and/or objects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diversification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Media area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using marks</td>
<td>Students explore the concept of the mark to explore in an integrated way the elements and principles of design.</td>
<td><strong>Surface</strong></td>
<td>Drawing, printmaking, painting experimental folio &amp; critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Using layers</td>
<td>Through the concept of wrappings students investigate the notion of creating multiple layers of media for effect in artworks.</td>
<td><strong>Symbol</strong></td>
<td>Drawing painting experimental folio &amp; critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Using objects</td>
<td>Through the concept of meanings students explore the intrinsic qualities of objects to convey personal messages.</td>
<td><strong>Earth, fire, water, air</strong></td>
<td>Sculpture, ceramics folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using repetition</td>
<td>Through the concept of spirituality students individually and collaboratively explore ritual and performance to develop individualised artworks.</td>
<td>Teacher–student negotiated focus</td>
<td>Photographic arts, drawing Folio &amp; essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Levels of meaning</td>
<td>Building on previous approaches and using the concept of words students decide on a focus to explore the notion of text in artworks in an individualised way.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Installation, performance art, photographic arts folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Challenge the viewer</td>
<td>Examining a range of artists whose work reflects excess in concept and/or media approach-students explore the concept of gluttony to resolve individualised artwork(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student media area choice folio &amp; oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excess</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restraint</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Excess</td>
<td>Examining a range of artists whose work reflects restraint in concept and/or media approach-students explore the concept of virtue to resolve individualised artwork(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Examining a range of artists whose work is reflective in concept and/or media approach-students explore the concept of introspection to resolve individualised artwork(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Restraint</td>
<td>Students resolve work that either replaces or builds on previous work in making or appraising, e.g. another making folio that develops further earlier concepts or media approaches and another appraising task</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students resolve work that either replaces or builds on previous work in making or appraising, e.g. another making folio that develops further earlier concepts or media approaches and another appraising task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample unit overview Year 11 Semester 2: Conceiving images and objects (accompanies sample course overview 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Unit title</th>
<th>Details of unit</th>
<th>Possible learning experiences</th>
<th>Media areas</th>
<th>Possible assessment tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>Unit 4. Using repetition</td>
<td>Concept: The elements</td>
<td>• As a starting point, students explore, examine, and discuss how repetition has been used in artworks across a variety of media areas.</td>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>Making Folio of ideas, investigations, and evidence of some resolution of ideas and approaches experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• initially this unit will be teacher-directed examining artworks and visual art styles that may involve collaboration between individuals</td>
<td>• Students follow initial teacher-directed exercises, using repetition to explore and experiment with 3-dimensional and ephemeral media, including the interdisciplinary potential of installation (the group may decide to collectively use natural objects as a stimulus for further exploration, e.g. stones/pebbles, leaves, ice, sand, clay).</td>
<td>Environmental design</td>
<td>Appraising Essay 800 words: evaluating how a range of artists have interpreted the idea of the elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the various focuses for this unit will be nominated by the teacher and resolved by the students:</td>
<td>• Students may select, construct, and assemble, conventional and unconventional media with reference to the elements, (perhaps some collaborative environmental pieces).</td>
<td>Performance art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- earth</td>
<td>• As further stimulus, students examine and discuss how the elements have been reflected/treated in artworks.</td>
<td>Photographic arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- air</td>
<td>• Students document working processes to record the development of their focus derived from the elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- fire</td>
<td>• Student approaches to resolving artworks could involve individual or collaborative construction or alteration of spaces or environments which may be site-specific, transient etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- water</td>
<td>• Students should make and appraise forms of installation, environmental design, and/or performance art that includes references to the concept of the elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• related artists’ works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rosalie Gascoigne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Anneke Silver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Christo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tom Risley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Andy Goldsworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Emily (Kame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Elizabeth Gower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sebastian Dimauro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- artists represented at the 1999 Asia Pacific Triennial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible excursion to a natural setting to allow for collaborative experiments using either photography or film as starting points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample assessment overview (accompanies the sample course overview 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Formative/summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Experimental folio</td>
<td>Teacher-directed</td>
<td>Visual literacy, Application</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 (6 weeks)</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Experimental folio</td>
<td>Teacher-directed</td>
<td>Visual literacy, Application</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>600 words</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Teacher initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 (6 weeks)</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Teacher initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>800 words</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Teacher initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 (6 weeks)</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Student initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>2–3 minutes</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 (10 weeks)</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Student initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td>Summative work selected from making and appraising and indicated on the relevant section of the profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Exhibition critique</td>
<td>800 words</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (10 weeks)</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Student initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>800–1000 words</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 (10 weeks)</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Student initiated, student resolved</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>4–6 minutes</td>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Folio or essay</td>
<td>teacher-student negotiated</td>
<td>Visual Literacy, Application or Appraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making and appraising tasks are undertaken concurrently.
Sample course overview 2

Sample 2 comprises units with titles that refer to the underpinning sample concepts. The focuses are initially nominated by the teacher for units 1 and 2, then negotiated between teacher and student for unit 3, then student-determined for the remaining units. The primary media areas are nominated by the teacher in all units, however student work may develop into other media areas in addition to these.
Sample course overview 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diversification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specialisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Observing reality</td>
<td>Using the <strong>still life</strong> as an initial stimulus, students explore a range of wet and dry media to make images. Representations of <strong>still-life</strong> will be explored when making and appraising visual art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Translation and interpretation</td>
<td>Using the <strong>scape</strong> as the stimulus, students explore representations of urban and rural landscapes (including their local environments) as a basis for media experimentation and image manipulation. Representations of the <strong>scape</strong> will be explored when making and appraising visual art.</td>
<td>Building on previous media approaches, students explore representations of the figure as a basis for student extensions in selected media approaches.</td>
<td>Examining further representations of the human form in visual art, students resolve individualised artwork(s) reflecting the concept of the <strong>figure</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reacting and expressing</td>
<td>Using the <strong>self</strong> as the stimulus for both teacher- and student-directed media explorations. Representations of the <strong>self</strong> will be explored when making and appraising visual art including portraiture and narrative and symbolic elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Examining the concept of <strong>love</strong> in visual art (both overt and covert representations/interpretations) — students resolve individualised artworks reflecting the concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Redesigning reality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using the artist in residence as a basis, making and appraising artworks that relate in both concept and/or media approach. The concept for this unit will be negotiated between the artist and teacher(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focus/es**
- texture
- layers
- form
- shapes

Each of these focuses will be used as the basis for teacher-directed activities with different media

- representation
- distortion
- teacher–student negotiated focus

Each of these focuses will frame experiments.

- teacher–student negotiated focus

Students respond to the nominated concepts and interpret their own focuses to resolve folios of work

**Media area responses**
- drawing, painting, printmaking folio
- assignment

- drawing, installation, performance art, sculpture folio
- assignment/oral

- drawing, painting, photographic art, with either ceramics, performance, sculpture folio
- test

- a folio that revisits any previously explored media areas and, where relevant, incorporates any 3-dimensional related media area
- assignment

- painting and/or drawing folio
- assignment

- painting and/or drawing folio
- oral

- photographic art folio
- assignment

- photographic art folio
- test

**Formative folios**

Verification folio selected from above
## Course overview template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specialisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit title**

**Concept**

**Focus**

**Media area response**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment overview template</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Formative/summative</th>
<th>Summative work selected from making and appraising and indicated on the relevant section of the profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Unit title</th>
<th>Details of unit</th>
<th>Possible learning experiences</th>
<th>Media areas</th>
<th>Possible assessment tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Visual Art Senior Syllabus**
### Student profile template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student name:</th>
<th>school name:</th>
<th>year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unit title</th>
<th>visual literacy</th>
<th>application</th>
<th>appraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>making instrument</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unit title</th>
<th>visual literacy</th>
<th>application</th>
<th>appraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>making instrument</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standard at monitoring

#### Summative work selected from Year 12

#### Verification interim level of achievement

#### Exit level of achievement
Appendix C

The Moderation Handbook
January 1999

The Moderation Handbook

Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies
# Table of Contents

Table of Contents .......................................................................................................................... iii
Table of Figures ............................................................................................................................... vi

Section 1 – overview ....................................................................................................................... 1

1. Introduction................................................................................................................................. 1

1.1 The partnership......................................................................................................................... 1

1.2 The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies............................................. 2

1.2.1 Membership of the Board ................................................................................................. 2

1.2.2 Functions of the Board and relevant committees ............................................................. 3

1.2.3 The Office of the Board .................................................................................................... 3

The Moderation Section.................................................................................................................. 4

Review officers................................................................................................................................. 4

Board agents................................................................................................................................. 4

Administration officers................................................................................................................ 4

1.2.4 District board centres........................................................................................................ 4

1.3 Assessment............................................................................................................................... 5

1.3.1 Principles of moderated school-based assessment ......................................................... 5

1.3.2 Guidelines for assessment quality and equity ................................................................. 5

1.3.3 Special consideration ....................................................................................................... 5

Exemption.................................................................................................................................. 6

Special arrangements................................................................................................................... 6

Students with special needs......................................................................................................... 6

Principles of decision making in special consideration cases .................................................... 6

1.4 Moderation............................................................................................................................. 7

1.4.1 Accreditation of work programs and study plans ......................................................... 7

1.4.2 Review ............................................................................................................................... 8

Monitoring.................................................................................................................................. 8

Verification.................................................................................................................................. 8

Approvals................................................................................................................................... 8

1.4.3 Random sampling ........................................................................................................... 8

1.5 Senior Certificates .................................................................................................................. 8

1.5.1 Subjects on Senior Certificates ...................................................................................... 9

Board subjects.............................................................................................................................. 9

Board subjects – extension senior subjects .............................................................................. 9

Board-registered subjects............................................................................................................ 9

Recorded subjects....................................................................................................................... 9

1.5.2 Awarding Senior Certificates ...................................................................................... 10

Students completing Year 12 in full-time schooling ................................................................. 10

Students who complete Year 12 other than in full-time schooling ......................................... 10

Students completing external senior examinations ................................................................. 10

1.6 Exit Statements....................................................................................................................... 10

1.7 Review panels......................................................................................................................... 11

1.7.1 District review panels ..................................................................................................... 11

1.7.2 State review panels ......................................................................................................... 11

SECTION 2 – teacher involvement in moderated school-based assessment.............................. 12

2.1 Introduction............................................................................................................................. 12

2.2 Role of review panels ........................................................................................................... 12

2.2.1 State review panels ....................................................................................................... 12

2.2.2 District review panels ..................................................................................................... 12

2.3 Responsibilities and duties of review panel members ....................................................... 13

2.3.1 Responsibilities of review panel members ...................................................................... 13

2.3.2 Duties of review panel members ................................................................................... 13

2.4 Staffing review panels ......................................................................................................... 13

2.4.1 Applications .................................................................................................................... 13

State review panels .................................................................................................................. 13

District review panels .............................................................................................................. 13
2.4.2 Selection and appointments .................................................................................................................. 14
State review panels ........................................................................................................................................ 14
State review panels—composition and appointments .................................................................................... 14
District review panels—selection and appointments ...................................................................................... 15
2.4.3 Casual vacancies ...................................................................................................................................... 15
State review panels ........................................................................................................................................ 15
District review panels .................................................................................................................................. 15
2.5 Procedures for review panel rollover ........................................................................................................ 15
2.6 Credentialling of review panel members .................................................................................................... 16
2.6.1 The process of credentialling .................................................................................................................. 16
2.7 Professional development of review panel members .................................................................................... 16
2.7.1 Review panel training ............................................................................................................................... 17
2.7.2 Assessment and moderation meetings ..................................................................................................... 17
2.7.3 Incidental review panel maintenance ..................................................................................................... 17

SECTION 3—moderation .................................................................................................................................. 18
3.1 The agreement between schools and the Office of the Board ........................................................................ 18
3.2 Procedures associated with board subjects ................................................................................................. 18
3.2.1 Accreditation of work programs in board subjects .................................................................................. 18
   The procedures of work program accreditation for board subjects ................................................................. 18
   Timelines for accreditation of work programs in board subjects ................................................................. 21
   Developing and preparing a work program in a board subject ...................................................................... 21
   Developing and preparing a work program in a board subject—information sheet for teachers .................. 22
   Submitting a work program in a board subject ............................................................................................. 22
   Amending an accredited work program in a board subject ......................................................................... 23
   Amending an accredited work program in a board subject—information sheet for teachers ..................... 23
   Provisional accreditation ................................................................................................................................ 24
3.2.2 Monitoring .............................................................................................................................................. 24
   The procedures of monitoring ....................................................................................................................... 24
   Observers at monitoring meetings ................................................................................................................ 26
   Timelines for monitoring ............................................................................................................................... 26
   Preparing a monitoring submission—information sheet for teachers ......................................................... 26
   Dispatching the submission ............................................................................................................................ 28
   Responsibility for secure transport of submissions ...................................................................................... 28
3.2.3 Verification ............................................................................................................................................. 28
   The procedures of verification .................................................................................................................... 29
   Timelines for verification ............................................................................................................................. 31
   Preparing a verification submission—information sheet for teachers ....................................................... 31
   Preparing a verification submission—information sheet for teachers ....................................................... 32
   Dispatching the submission ........................................................................................................................... 33
   Reaching agreement—consultation and negotiation ..................................................................................... 33
   Procedures following consultation and negotiation .................................................................................... 34
   Preparing a verification submission for state review panel consideration ................................................ 34
   Preparing a verification submission for state review panel consideration—information sheet for teachers .... 35
3.2.4 Approvals ............................................................................................................................................... 35
   Determining the exit levels of achievement ................................................................................................. 35
   Checking procedures—Office of the Board .................................................................................................... 36
3.2.5 Random sampling .................................................................................................................................. 36
   Timelines for random sampling .................................................................................................................. 36
   Procedures of random sampling .................................................................................................................. 36
   Preparing a submission for random sampling—information sheet for teachers ........................................... 37
3.3 Procedures associated with board-registered subjects for which the Board develops and approves a study area specification.................................................................................................................... 37
3.3.1 Accreditation of study plans .................................................................................................................... 37
   The procedures of study plan (Form R9) accreditation ..................................................................................... 37
   Timelines for accreditation ............................................................................................................................. 40
   Developing and preparing a study plan .......................................................................................................... 40
   Developing, preparing and submitting a study plan (Form R9)—information sheet for teachers ............... 40
   Submitting a study plan ................................................................................................................................. 42
   Amending a study plan ................................................................................................................................. 42
3.4 Procedures associated with board-registered subjects for which schools develop, and the Board accredits, work programs .................................................................................................................... 43
3.4.1 Accreditation of work programs in board-registered subjects ........................................... 43
The procedures for work program accreditation in a board-registered subject .......................... 43
Timelines for accreditation of work programs in board-registered subjects .................................. 45
Developing and preparing a work program for a board-registered subject – information sheet for teachers ................................................................. 45
 Submitting a work program for a board-registered subject ..................................................... 45
Amending a work program in a board-registered subject ....................................................... 45
Amending a work program in a board-registered subject – information sheet for teachers ............. 46
3.5 Recorded subjects ........................................................................................................... 46

SECTION 4 – special administrative arrangements ............................................................. 47
4.1 Variable progression rates............................................................................................... 47
4.1.1 The principles of variable progression rates ............................................................ 47
4.1.2 Procedures of variable progression rates ................................................................. 48
4.1.3 Monitoring and verification for variable progression rate students ............................... 48
4.2 Shared campuses ........................................................................................................... 49
4.3 The Exit Statement ....................................................................................................... 49
4.3.1 Characteristics of the Exit Statement ........................................................................ 49

Glossary of terms .................................................................................................................. 51

Appendices .......................................................................................................................... 60
Appendix 1 ............................................................................................................................ 60
Description of forms mentioned in this handbook ...................................................................... 60

Appendix 2 ............................................................................................................................. 62
Sample of a Senior Certificate ............................................................................................... 62

Appendix 3 ............................................................................................................................. 64
Samples of administrative forms A1 and A12 ........................................................................ 64
 Form A1: ‘Application to Issue Senior Certificates’ ................................................................. 64
 Form A12: ‘Application for Issue of Certificates’ .................................................................. 64

Appendix 4 ............................................................................................................................. 66
Samples of review procedures forms .................................................................................... 66
 Form R1 ‘Title Page of Work Program – Application for Accreditation’ ................................. 66
 Form R2 (white) ‘Work program Advice to Schools – Board Subject’ .................................. 66
 Form R2 (blue) ‘Work Program Advice to Schools – Board-Registered Subject’ .................. 66
 Form R3 ‘Year 11 monitoring’ ............................................................................................. 66
 Form R6 ‘Year 12 Levels of Achievement – School Proposal’ ............................................... 66
 Form R9 ‘Study Plan – Application for Accreditation’ ......................................................... 66
 Form R10 ‘Study Plan – Advice to Schools’ ......................................................................... 66

Appendix 5 ............................................................................................................................. 68
Address list – district board centres ....................................................................................... 68

Appendix 6 ............................................................................................................................. 70
Detailed flowchart – accreditation of a work program .............................................................. 70

Appendix 7 ............................................................................................................................. 72
Detailed instructions on completing a Form R6 ....................................................................... 72

Appendix 8 – Information sheets for teachers – copying masters ......................................... 74
 Developing and preparing a work program in a board subject ............................................... 74
 Amending an accredited work program in a board subject .................................................... 75
 Preparing a monitoring submission ...................................................................................... 76
 Preparing a verification submission ...................................................................................... 77
 Preparing a verification submission for state review panel consideration ............................ 78
 Preparing a submission for random sampling ..................................................................... 78
 Developing and preparing a work program for a board-registered subject ......................... 78
 Amending a work program in a board-registered subject .................................................... 79

Index ........................................................................................................................................ 80
**Table of Figures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>Accreditation of a work program for a board subject (A more detailed version can be found in appendix 6)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>Anticipated pathway of a submission through a monitoring meeting</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>Anticipated pathway of a submission through a verification meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>Accreditation of study plans</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Actions for the accreditation of work programs in school-developed board-registered subjects</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION 1—OVERVIEW**

**Introduction**

This *Moderation Handbook* provides guidance in the administration of moderated school-based assessment.

The Overview is designed specifically for the school moderator who is the school principal (or person delegated by the school principal) and who takes responsibility for the total assessment program in the school. In this section, the various aspects of the system are described in general terms.

The sections that follow contain details about the procedures to be followed at the various stages of moderation. These are for the attention of subject moderators, who are directly responsible for preparing work programs and review submissions.

Interspersed through the document are boxed instructions for teachers undertaking specific tasks such as preparing a work program in a board subject. These appear again in appendix 8 as copying masters for distribution to teachers.

Several forms are mentioned in this handbook. A summary of the forms, their number and functions, can be found in appendix 1. A sample of each form mentioned is provided in appendices 3 and 4.

**1.1 The partnership**

Moderation is a set of procedures designed to ensure that the levels of achievement in board subjects recorded on the Senior Certificate match the requirements of syllabuses. Moderation involves contextualised teacher judgments and a system of verification of school decision making.

The aim of moderation is to ensure comparability; students who take the same board subject in different schools and who attain the same standard through the assessment programs based on a common syllabus will be awarded the same level of achievement. This is not to suggest that two students who receive the same level of achievement have had the same collection of experiences or have achieved equally in any one aspect of the course of study. Rather, it means that they have, on balance, reached the same standard.

Moderation involves the processes of accreditation, review (monitoring, verification and approvals) and random sampling.

This system of moderated school-based assessment is characterised by a close partnership between the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (the Board) and senior secondary schools.

The Office of the Board is responsible for the certification of student achievement on completion of Year 12. It ensures that the certificates issued to students have integrity, coherence and credibility, and that they:

- are available only to students in those schools that accept the Board’s moderation procedures
- record accurately the courses undertaken by students
- record students’ achievements in these courses of study.
The school principal, in the role of school moderator, is responsible for the school’s total assessment program. The principal ensures that the implementation of assessment within the school is consistent with the procedures outlined in this document and that the student achievement information submitted to the Office of the Board is accurate.

Schools participate in the Board’s moderation procedures in two ways:
- by agreeing to adhere to Board policies and to follow Board procedures for:
  - the accreditation of work programs and study plans
  - the review of standards of achievement for board subjects
  - random sampling
- by making teachers available to serve on review panels.

### 1.2 The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies

The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies is a statutory authority, responsible to the Queensland Minister for Education, which serves state and non-state schools by developing courses of study and by certificating student achievement in those courses. The Board and Queensland senior secondary schools are in partnership to provide accountability in the education system and to meet the needs of students.

#### 1.2.1 Membership of the Board

The membership of the Board is determined in accordance with the following requirements of the *Education (Senior Secondary Schools Studies) Act 1988*:
- one person nominated by the Minister, who is to be appointed as chairperson
- one official member, the Director-General of Education
- two public service officers employed in the department and nominated by the chief executive
- one person nominated by the Queensland Schools Curriculum Council
- one member of the Vocational Education, Training and Employment Commission nominated by the Minister responsible for vocational education
- one person nominated by the Higher Education forum
- one person nominated by the Queensland Catholic Education Commission
- one person nominated by the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland Inc.
- two practising secondary education teachers with experience in senior secondary education, of whom:
  - one is to be nominated by the Queensland Teachers’ Union
  - one is to be nominated by the Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools
- three persons who, at the time of appointment, are parents of students currently attending Year 11 or 12 at a State educational institution or other school in Queensland, of whom:
  - one is to be nominated by the Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens’ Associations Inc.
  - one is to be nominated by the Parents and Friends Federation Queensland
  - one is to be nominated by the Independent Council of Parents and Citizens Associations, Queensland
- if the Minister considers it appropriate—another person nominated by the Minister.
1.2.2 Functions of the Board and relevant committees

The functions and powers of the Board are described in the Education (Senior Secondary Schools Studies) Act 1988. Those relevant to moderation are:

- to advise the Minister on senior secondary education
- to issue Senior Certificates and other such certificates for senior secondary education as the Minister may approve from time to time, in accordance with the regulations
- to approve syllabuses for those subjects developed by schools, school systems, authorities, other institutions or the Board itself that are designated, or are to be designated, board subjects on the Senior Certificate
- to approve work programs for those subjects which are designated, or are to be designated, board or board-registered subjects on the Senior Certificate
- to approve study area specifications for subjects that are designated, or are to be designated, board-registered subjects on the Senior Certificate
- to determine procedures and undertake such arrangements as are deemed necessary for:
  - the assessment of students in relation to board subjects for the award of Senior Certificates
  - the recording of results in board subjects, board-registered subjects and recorded subjects on Senior Certificates issued to students
- to appoint a Moderation Committee and subject advisory committees, and to appoint such other committees as it deems necessary
- to arrange with Education Queensland and with such schools, persons and authorities as it thinks fit for the services of suitable persons as moderators, or to carry out accreditation, recognition and registration functions for vocational education programs
- to confer and collaborate with Education Queensland, school systems, authorities, schools and other institutions, as it sees fit, in the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers.

The Moderation Committee carries out those functions of the Board that are necessary to give effect to the Board’s policies on moderation. This committee is responsible for keeping the Board informed about current assessment practices in Queensland schools, advises the Board of persons qualified to act in various moderation capacities, and advises the Board on such matters as are referred to it by the Board.

The Review Procedures Subcommittee of the Moderation Committee considers all aspects of review procedures, monitors review procedures adopted by district and state review panels, and reports findings and recommendations to the Moderation Committee.

(Membership and functions of the Moderation Committee and the Review Procedures Subcommittee are described in the Board’s annual report, which is available from the Office of the Board.)

1.2.3 The Office of the Board

The Board’s functions are carried out by the Office of the Board, of which the Director is the chief executive. The Office of the Director supports the Director and administers the operations of the Office of the Board. The Director and three deputy directors form the Executive Management Group. Each deputy director is responsible for a division, each of which consists of a number of sections. The divisions are Moderation & Curriculum, Testing & Publishing, and Analysis & Resources.
**The Moderation Section**

The Moderation Section, through the leadership of the Assistant Director (Moderation), provides support for schools in the implementation of board and board-registered subjects, and oversees the implementation of moderated school-based assessment in senior secondary schools across the state.

The Moderation Section is staffed by review officers, board agents and administration officers.

**Review officers**

Review officers are teachers with expertise in moderated school-based assessment who are available to assist with:

- writing work programs to meet syllabus requirements in board and board-registered subjects
- designing and implementing assessment instruments
- applying criteria and standards to student work
- decision-making processes and judgments about student achievement.

**Board agents**

Board agents work from the district board centres established in the eleven administrative districts across the state. They provide schools with support in the administration of moderated school-based assessment. (See district board centres, 1.2.4)

**Administration officers**

Administration officers are located in the Office of the Board and in district board centres. They include management personnel and administrative assistants who, with review officers and board agents, provide the support structure for the administration of moderated school-based assessment.

**1.2.4 District board centres**

In each of the Office of the Board’s administrative districts, centres have been established to provide support for schools and review panels. (A list of district board centres appears as appendix 5.)

District board agents and administrative assistants in these centres provide support in:

- communication between schools and the Board
- transport and recording of materials such as work programs and submissions of student work
- organisation and provision of review panel meetings
- provision of information to and liaising with schools about the system of moderated school-based assessment
- organisation of workshops and seminars.

Further support of this nature is provided within the Moderation Section of the Office of the Board.
1.3 Assessment

1.3.1 Principles of moderated school-based assessment

In a communication to schools and review panels in October 1984, the Board stated the principles of school-based assessment for adoption by schools:

- assessment of student achievement is in the significant aspects of the course of study identified in the syllabus and the school’s work program
- balance of assessments is a balance over the course of study and not necessarily a balance within a semester or between semesters
- information is gathered through a process of continuous assessment
- student profiles of achievement are selectively updated
- exit assessment is devised to provide the fullest and latest information on student achievement in the course of study
- exit achievement levels are devised from student achievement in all areas identified in the syllabus as being mandatory.

1.3.2 Guidelines for assessment quality and equity

Guidelines for quality and equity in assessment have been developed by the Australasian Curriculum, Assessment and Certification Authorities (ACACA) for adoption and implementation by its member authorities. The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, as a member of ACACA, has made a commitment to these guidelines:

- an assessment item should assess what the item writer intends it to assess and only what on face value it purports to assess
- students should not, unless there is a specific and justifiable reason for doing so, have to decode some hidden instructions or clues on how to answer an assessment item
- specialist language or jargon in an assessment item should only be used to aid clarity and accuracy and if that specialist language is an integral part of the teaching and learning in that subject
- the reproduction of gender, socioeconomic, ethnic or other cultural stereotypes should only be used in assessment items after careful consideration as to its necessity
- to allow students to demonstrate their command of what the item is supposed to assess, the item should be presented clearly through an appropriate choice of layout, cues, visual design, format and choice of words, and state its requirements explicitly and directly
- the use of background material and requirement of assumed knowledge in an assessment item should only be used when the item writer can reasonably presume all students have ready access to these
- assessment criteria should be explicit, clear, unambiguous and declared in advance
- the criteria should allow students to identify appropriate ways to demonstrate command of the required knowledge and skills
- the criteria should also allow the marker to recognise, where appropriate, different ways in which students may demonstrate command of the required knowledge and skills.

1.3.3 Special consideration

Special consideration is the granting of exemption to, or the provision of special arrangements for, students with special needs. Schools are responsible for the procedures of special consideration in awarding levels of achievement, and should consider the following information and the Policy Statement on Special Consideration available from the Office of the Board.
Exemption

Fairness to all students and the integrity of results reported on Senior Certificates require that no students be exempted from meeting any of the substantive requirements of the syllabus, for any reason. In special consideration cases, schools may decide to exempt students from non-substantive subject requirements.

Special arrangements

Special arrangements are those practical arrangements that vary the conditions under which assessment occurs so that students with special needs have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a subject.

Students with special needs

Students with special needs may include, but are not limited to:

- students with learning difficulties
- students from non-English-speaking backgrounds
- students who are Aboriginal
- students who are Torres Strait Islanders
- students who have a physical impairment
- students who have an emotional impairment.

From time to time schools will need to make fair and reasonable decisions about the assessment of students who, for example, do not submit an assignment on time or who do not attend an examination. In these cases, the principles of equity and fairness to all students outlined here also apply.

Principles of decision making in special consideration cases

The following principles for making decisions about special consideration are consistent with good practice:

- students with special needs should have equal opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skills
- special consideration should not constitute an unfair advantage or produce results that are inaccurate; that is, results that indicate students have knowledge or skills which they lack; fairness to all students requires accurate results
- special consideration should in no way affect standards; the syllabus criteria and standards should be applied in the same way to all students
- the marking of all students’ work should be done on the same basis; that is, the criteria and standards for student achievement in the syllabus should be applied in the same way to work done by all students, including students with special needs
- before accepting a given level of work from students with special needs, all efforts should be made to remove barriers to equal opportunity; this may involve being proactive in finding how best to meet the special needs, in terms of learning and assessment, of particular students
- if it is apparent that there are barriers that prevent students from demonstrating their knowledge and skills, every possible effort should be made to make special arrangements
- if an impairment means that students are less successful in what assessment items in a subject are designed to assess—for example not having the language skills to do well in a test of reading and writing—it is both reasonable and proper that their results should show the actual knowledge and skills displayed
• special arrangements for students with special needs should be made as soon as possible to ensure that, as far as practicable, the students have early access to the support required to complete subject requirements
• appropriate and effective consultation with students and their parent(s) or guardian(s) should be central to the decision-making process.

1.4 Moderation

For board subjects, students’ work is moderated by review panels appointed by the Board. Moderation is a process that involves checking the extent that schools’ programs of work take into account the aims and objectives of syllabuses, checking the quality of the assessment programs used in gathering information about student achievement, and checking the criteria and standards applied by teachers when assessing the work of students.

The aim of moderation is to ensure comparability. Students who take the same board subject in different schools and who attain the same standard through the assessment programs based on a common syllabus will be awarded the same level of achievement. This is not to suggest that two students who receive the same level of achievement have had the same collection of experiences or have achieved equally in any one aspect of the course of study. Rather, it means that they have, on balance, reached the same standard. Consistency in administration of moderated school-based assessment and application of standards is a precursor to comparability.

Moderation involves the processes of accreditation, review (monitoring, verification and approvals) and random sampling.

1.4.1 Accreditation of work programs and study plans

Accreditation is a process of periodic approval by the Board of a school’s work programs and study plans.

A work program for a board subject is a document that translates a syllabus into the context of a school. The relevant review panel checks the school’s work program against the corresponding syllabus to ensure that the requirements of the syllabus have been met.

A work program for a board-registered subject is a document developed by a school to meet a local need. Officers of the Board check that the school’s work program is a significant area of study, relevant to the needs of Australian society, with learning experiences that are appropriate to student development and outside those of the Board’s study area specifications.

A study plan (Form R9) for a board-registered subject is a document that translates the study area specification into the context of a school (see appendix 4 for a sample of a Form R9). Officers of the Board check the school’s study plan against the corresponding study area specification to ensure that its requirements have been met.

The accreditation period is the span of years during which the teaching and learning, based on a particular syllabus, leads to student achievement being recorded on the Senior Certificate. For work programs, this is usually a period of seven years (four years for subjects in some stage of trial, and for those with embedded vocational education modules, although the latter may be extended). For study plans the accreditation period is usually four years, and this also may be extended.
1.4.2 Review

Review is a subset of moderation, comprising monitoring of standards and the verification and approval of levels of achievement.

Monitoring

Towards the end of Year 11, for each board subject offered by a school, the work of a number of sample students is sent to the relevant review panel. The review panel considers the sample early in the next year, after which the school is given feedback on the quality of its decision making; that is, whether the school’s assessment and standards are consistent with the requirements of the syllabus.

Verification

Towards the end of Year 12 (usually in October), for each board subject offered by a school, the work of a number of sample students, together with the school’s judgments about the levels of achievement of the sample students, are sent to the relevant review panel.

The review panel compares student work with the level of achievement descriptors by matching standards in the work with the criteria and standards of the syllabus. If a review panel does not agree with the school’s decisions, consultation and negotiation between the school and review panel takes place.

Approvals

Immediately after the end of Year 12 (in November), the Office of the Board considers each school’s proposal for exit levels of achievement for each board subject. After consideration of the evidence and the outcomes of consultation and negotiation with the school about changes since October verification, the levels of achievement are approved for entry on the Senior Certificate. The period of time between receipt of schools’ proposals for exit levels of achievement and the printing of Senior Certificates is referred to as the approvals period.

1.4.3 Random sampling

Random sampling is designed to provide the Board with information about the effectiveness of moderation procedures. It is a post-hoc scrutiny of standards of student work.

At the beginning of the year following the issuing of Senior Certificates, the Office of the Board extracts random samples of student work. This student work is viewed by review panels in other board districts. The Office of the Board analyses the information from random sampling and prepares a report to the Board. Schools involved in random sampling are provided with feedback about the outcome.

1.5 Senior Certificates

The Board is responsible for ensuring that Senior Certificates correctly identify or describe the courses taken by students, that the achievements recorded on the certificates apply to these courses of study, and that schools, in turn, have assigned their students comparable levels of achievement for comparable standards within a board subject. (A sample senior certificate is included as appendix 2.)
1.5.1 Subjects on Senior Certificates

Senior Certificates display students’ results in three types of subject:

- board subjects
- board-registered subjects
- recorded subjects.

**Board subjects**

A board subject is a subject for which a syllabus has been approved by the Board. Schools develop work programs from syllabuses. (See *The Development and Approval of Syllabuses in Board Subjects*, which is available from the Office of the Board.)

The Board accredits the work programs, monitors standards and verifies and approves the levels of achievement. The Board includes results from these board subjects in the calculation of Overall Positions and Field Positions.

The Senior Certificate records the name of the subject, the number of semesters for which it was studied, the level of achievement attained and, where appropriate, vocational education certificates and competencies.

**Board subjects—extension senior subjects**

Extension senior subjects cater for students with specific aptitudes and abilities. They comprise two semester units of study, are studied in Year 12, and are more challenging than their parent subjects. The standards used to assess student achievement are therefore higher than those used in the parent subjects.

Schools offering extension subjects receive information each year detailing specific procedures for monitoring and verification.

**Board-registered subjects**

There are two types of board-registered subject:

(a) **Those for which the Board has developed and approved a study area specification**

For these, schools complete, and the Board accredits, study plans.

The Senior Certificate records the name of the study area specification, the strand studied, the number of semesters for which it was studied, the level of achievement attained and, where appropriate, vocational education certificates and competencies.

(b) **Those for which schools develop, and the Board accredits, work programs**

The Senior Certificate records the name of the subject, the number of semesters for which it was studied, and the level of achievement attained.

**Recorded subjects**

A recorded subject is a subject, other than a board subject or board-registered subject, offered by an educational institution approved by the Board.

The Senior Certificate records the name of the subject and the result attained.
1.5.2 Awarding Senior Certificates

Students completing Year 12 in full-time schooling
Students who complete Year 12 in full-time schooling at an assessing school receive Senior Certificates issued by the Board. An assessing school is a school approved by the Minister for Education at which the students are assessed for either board or board-registered subjects, or both.

Completion of Year 12 by full-time students means that the students attend school in Year 12 until the date stipulated by the Board, which is the Friday of the fourth or fifth last week before the Christmas vacation starts. Each year, in October, the Office of the Board sends a calendar of administrative arrangements for the forthcoming year to each assessing school. The calendar states the date for the end of Year 12.

Principals of schools newly approved by the Minister for Education that wish to be assessing schools so that their students will receive Senior Certificates, complete a Form A12. The Form A12 is available from the Office of the Board. (An example of a Form A12 is shown in appendix 3.)

Principals of all schools who wish to be assessing schools complete a Form A1 each year. The Office of the Board sends Forms A1 to assessing schools in January of each year. (An example of a Form A1 is shown in appendix 3.)

Students who complete Year 12 other than in full-time schooling
The Board may award a Senior Certificate to students who complete senior secondary education other than by full-time schooling.

Principals who wish to have Senior Certificates issued to students who complete Year 12 other than by full-time schooling must seek approval in writing from the Office of the Board.

Students completing external senior examinations
The Board may allow students undertaking senior secondary education by full-time schooling to sit for the appropriate external examination under these conditions:
- students have transferred from one school to another and are unable at the new school to complete previously commenced studies
- students for good and sufficient reason are unable to undertake the study of one or more subjects at that school

Principals who wish to have students sit external examinations must seek approval in writing from the Office of the Board. Timetable clashes are not generally considered to constitute a good and sufficient reason.

The *External Examinations Handbook*, updated annually, contains details of the procedures and is available from the Office of the Board.

1.6 Exit Statements
Schools are required to issue Exit Statements to school leavers who complete at least one semester of post-compulsory schooling and who do not intend to return to school to complete Year 12. The Exit Statement is based on school-moderated assessments and is issued under conditions and in a format determined by the Board.
1.7 Review panels

Review panels are groups of experienced practising educators and teachers who are appointed by the Board to give advice to schools about the appropriateness of work programs for board subjects and standards of student work in board subjects.

Schools work in partnership with the Board by providing teachers to serve on review panels to carry out moderation processes.

1.7.1 District review panels

Principals in a board district select the chair of each district review panel and the teachers to serve on these review panels. A district review panel is formed for each board subject where a sufficient number of schools in the district are assessing students in the subject. If there are not sufficient schools in a district to form a review panel, a combined review panel may be formed with an adjacent district, or other districts, or the state review panel may deal with schools for that subject.

1.7.2 State review panels

There is a state review panel for each board subject. Each state review panel comprises a chairperson, a person from a tertiary institution, a subject advisory committee or subcommittee member, a person from industry (if the subject has vocational education components), and six teachers from secondary schools.

State review panels ensure that the accreditation of work programs proceeds in a similar manner in each district and that comparable standards are being implemented in each district. They do this by viewing a sample of work programs that have been recommended by district review panels for accreditation and by sampling school submissions from each district at verification.

State review panels also offer advice to schools if a school is unable to agree with the advice of a district review panel.
SECTION 2—TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN MODERATED SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

2.1 Introduction

Moderated school-based assessment is implemented in a partnership between schools and the Board. The contribution of the Board to this partnership is outlined in section 1 of this handbook. Schools agree to carry out board procedures related to moderation and to make teachers available to serve on review panels.

Review panels are groups of experienced educators and practising teachers who are appointed to the review panel by the Board to give advice to schools, in subjects within their area of expertise, about the appropriateness of work programs and about standards of student work.

The Moderation Section of the Office of the Board provides support for schools and for review panels.

2.2 Role of review panels

2.2.1 State review panels

The Board appoints state review panels, usually one state review panel for each board subject. The role of state review panels is to:

• consider work programs recommended for accreditation by district review panels and either approve their accreditation or provide further advice to the school and district review panel
• oversee the work of district review panels, through sampling, to ensure that advice to schools from district review panels is consistent across the state
• maintain standards across the state leading to acceptably high levels of comparability
• resolve disagreements between schools and district review panels.

If there are insufficient schools or panellists to form a district review panel, the state review panel may operate as a district review panel.

2.2.2 District review panels

District review panels are established by the Office of the Board, usually when at least eight schools within a district teach the subject and sufficient experienced teachers are available.

District review panels provide advice to schools during the first three phases of moderation—accreditation, monitoring and verification—and provide advice to the Board during random sampling. The role of district review panels is to:

• consider work programs submitted by schools for accreditation and either recommend their accreditation to the state review panel or provide advice to the school, whichever is appropriate
• maintain standards across the district, and consult and negotiate with schools.
2.3 Responsibilities and duties of review panel members

2.3.1 Responsibilities of review panel members
A review panel member is a person who:
• promotes the principles of moderated school-based assessment
• implements a criteria and standards approach to assessment
• accepts a flexible approach to syllabus interpretation and work program presentation
• is open and flexible in dealing with school submissions, particularly where extenuating circumstances exist, and is able to develop reasonable compromises in committees
• is constructive and diplomatic when preparing for the review panel chair, comments that are used for feedback to schools
• supports and implements review panel decisions
• ensures review panel confidentiality with respect to materials viewed, discussions held and decisions made.

2.3.2 Duties of review panel members
A review panel member is required to:
• have current and extensive knowledge of the subject area and a clear understanding of current syllabuses
• meet the deadlines set by the Board for accreditation
• meet the timelines set by the Office of the Board when providing advice about work programs and review submissions
• be punctual and dependable in attendance for the duration of meetings
• maintain currency with:
  – the procedures of accreditation, monitoring and verification
  – forms and administrative procedures
• maintain necessary records
• participate in review panel training.

2.4 Staffing review panels

2.4.1 Applications

State review panels
At the beginning of each year the Office of the Board advertises by memorandum the positions vacant on review panels and invites applications from suitably qualified people. Application forms accompany the memorandum. All applicants are expected to have a current and extensive knowledge of the subject at senior level.

Applications for membership of state review panels are sent directly to the Office of the Board. The application must be endorsed and signed by the principal if the applicant is from a school.

District review panels
At the beginning of each year district board centres advertise the positions vacant on district review panels and invite applications from suitably qualified teachers. Application forms are
sent to schools. All applicants are expected to have a current and extensive knowledge of the subject at senior level.

Applications for membership of district review panels are sent directly to the district board centre. The application must be endorsed and signed by the principal of the applicant’s school.

2.4.2 Selection and appointments

The process of selection and appointment is implemented by the Moderation Section of the Office of the Board. Appointments to review panels are provisional until the review panellist is credentialled.

State review panels

The selection process takes into account the applicant’s:

- knowledge of the subject area
- willingness to accept a flexible approach to syllabus interpretation and work program development
- recent involvement in developing an accreditable work program in the subject
- knowledge of and ability to apply board policies and procedures related to accreditation, monitoring and verification
- willingness to accept, support and implement review panel decisions
- ability to maintain confidentiality
- organisational skills
- commitment to and support of the philosophy of moderated school-based assessment
- availability for contact at short notice
- availability for regular review panel meetings and review panel training.

State review panels—composition and appointments

State review panels consist of:

- a person from a tertiary institution who is involved in the area of study
- a subject advisory committee or subcommittee member who is a teacher currently employed in a secondary school
- six teachers of the subject
- in the case of subjects in which vocational education modules have been embedded, an additional member is required as an industry representative.

Appointments to state review panels are made as follows:

- applications are considered by the state review panel chair and officers of the Moderation Section
- a shortlist is prepared and provided for the consideration of senior officers of the Moderation & Curriculum Division
- recommended applicants are considered and approved by the Board
- appointees are notified in writing by the Office of the Board.


**District review panels—selection and appointments**

The selection process takes into account the applicant’s:

- current knowledge of the subject area
- recent involvement in developing an accreditable work program in the subject
- willingness to apply board policies and procedures related to accreditation, monitoring and verification
- willingness to accept, support and implement review panel decisions
- ability to maintain confidentiality
- organisational skills
- commitment to and support of the philosophy of moderated school-based assessment
- availability for contact at short notice
- availability for regular review panel meetings and review panel training.

Appointments to district review panels are made as follows:

- applications are considered by the district board agent and the review officer
- a list is provided for the consideration and recommendation of the subcommittee of principals
- recommendations for chairs of district review panels are considered and approved by the Board
- review panel appointees are advised by the Office of the Board through the principals of their respective schools.

**2.4.3 Casual vacancies**

The requirements for selection stated above also apply to casual vacancies.

**State review panels**

At the beginning of each year the Office of the Board issues a memorandum requesting applications from suitably qualified people interested in serving on state review panels.

Casual vacancies are filled from the list of applicants as vacancies arise. Appointments are approved by the Board.

**District review panels**

Appointments to casual vacancies on district review panels are made, after consultation with the district board agent and the review officer, from applications already received at the district board centre.

**2.5 Procedures for review panel rollover**

State and district review panels are formed for a period of six years, after which time a spill of all positions is declared and new members are appointed. No more than two thirds of the previous members are likely to be reappointed. The rollover of both state and district review panels generally occurs in the fourth year of the accreditation period of the subject.

The following broad guidelines apply to review panel rollover:

- the chair should be changed after two terms of six years
- about one third of the members should be changed
• no more than one review panellist per school should be appointed to a review panel (not including the review panel chair)
• review panellists should be either currently teaching the subject or have recently taught the subject and expect to teach the subject again
• a balance of appointees from state/private schools, local/remote schools, large/small schools, female/male members is sought
• each review panellist should be on one review panel only – a person may not, except under circumstances approved by the Office of the Board, hold simultaneous membership of more than one review panel.

2.6 Credentialling of review panel members

Credentialling is a means of strengthening the moderation process by maintaining experienced and expert-based review panels and a way of recognising the contribution and commitment of review panellists to the process. Appointments to review panels are provisional until the review panellist is credentialled. Credentials are awarded by the Office of the Board.

District board agents manage the record-keeping requirements of the credentialling process.

2.6.1 The process of credentialling

Credentialling is a year-long process in which review panellists have opportunities to demonstrate that they have:
• participated in review panel training
• written or been involved in the writing of an accredited work program
• provided quality advice to the review panel about work programs
• provided quality advice to the review panel about standards
• kept to moderation timelines
• attended review panel meetings regularly and punctually
• respected the confidential nature of review panel discussions and decisions.

Credentials remain current for the term of the review panel unless it becomes clear that a review panellist is not able to maintain or sustain the conditions of the credential. Credentials may be withdrawn after a process of review and consultation.

2.7 Professional development of review panels

From time to time the Board will provide training for review panels on assessment, administrative arrangements, work program accreditation, monitoring, verification and random sampling procedures.

The support provided to review panels varies according to the stage of the accreditation period applicable to the subject. The following outline applies to those subjects in general implementation. Other arrangements apply for review panels of subjects in a trial or pilot phase of implementation.
2.7.1 Review panel training

Panel training involves the review officer, all district review panellists and two reserves, and local state review panellists. Training sessions may be held either in school time or in the review panellists’ own time. Attendance at review panel training is part of the review panellist’s credentialling process.

The focus of review panel training varies according to the particular stage in the accreditation period:

- a one-day meeting in the sixth year of the previous accreditation period – this meeting identifies syllabus and accreditation matters for review panellists to consider when they write and submit their own work programs in the year before the new accreditation period
- one half-day meeting in the second year of the accreditation period – this meeting considers issues arising from the first Year 11 monitoring and leading up to the first Year 12 verification
- a half-day meeting in the fourth year of the accreditation period – this meeting concentrates on induction of newly appointed review panellists.

2.7.2 Assessment and moderation meetings

Assessment and moderation meetings are organised by review officers so that review panellists can discuss assessment issues arising from the moderation process. Teachers who are not panellists are invited to these meetings.

The focus of assessment and moderation meetings varies according to the year of the accreditation period:

- year 1 of the accreditation period focuses on work program writing for teachers of the subject; resources such as sample work programs written by state and district review panellists are provided
- year 3 of the accreditation period focuses on matters arising from the first Year 12 verification
- year 5 of the accreditation period focuses on the revision of the syllabus after four years of implementation.

2.7.3 Incidental review panel maintenance

Should specific matters arise that relate to the moderation process in a district, a meeting is organised. On such an occasion, the meeting involves the review officer and is obligatory for all district review panellists and reserves.
SECTION 3—Moderation

3.1 The agreement between schools and the Office of the Board

Each year principals of schools that seek to be assessing schools under the Education (Senior Secondary School Studies) Act 1988 sign an agreement (the Form A1) with the Board. In this agreement, school principals, in their role as school moderators, accept and participate in the Board’s moderation procedures and agree to follow instructions from the Board or its officers acting on its behalf in these matters.

The principal of each school advises the Board of additional subjects offered by the school to Year 11 or Year 12 students and makes application to issue Senior Certificates in that year.

3.2 Procedures associated with board subjects

3.2.1 Accreditation of work programs in board subjects

The procedures of work program accreditation for board subjects

Accreditation is a process of periodic approval by the Board of a school’s work program. The process of accreditation involves the relevant review panel checking the school’s work program against the particular syllabus to ensure that the requirements of the syllabus have been met. (For further information on syllabuses, refer to the handbook The Development and Approval of Syllabuses in Board Subjects, which is available from the Office of the Board.)

The accreditation period is the span of years during which the teaching and learning based on a particular syllabus leads to student achievement being recorded on the Senior Certificate. For work programs, this is usually a period of seven years (four years for subjects in some stage of trial and for those with embedded vocational education modules).

The sequence of actions leading to accreditation is as follows:
• the school develops and prepares a work program
• the school submits the work program via the district board centre
• the relevant review panel (district or state) considers the program for accreditation
• work programs recommended for accreditation by a district review panel may be sampled by the state review panel
• the school is advised either that the work program has been accredited by the state review panel or that resubmission after consultation is necessary.

Figure 1, ‘Accreditation of a work program for a board subject’, shows the major steps involved. (See appendix 6 for a more detailed flowchart of these procedures).
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After considering the work program the district review panel recommends either that the work program be accredited or that the school seek consultation with the review panel.

When accreditation is recommended by a district review panel—

After considering the work program the district review panel recommends either that the work program be accredited or that the school seek consultation with the review panel.

**When accreditation is recommended by a district review panel:**

- the school receives a form letter from the district board agent indicating that the work program has been recommended for accreditation by the district review panel and the copies have been retained at the district board centre awaiting the advice of the state review panel
- the state review panel may select the work program for review or advise the Office of the Board that the work program is accredited.

**When consultation is recommended by a district review panel:**

- the district board centre sends to the school both copies of the work program with Form R1 attached and a completed Form R2 signed by the district review panel chair providing advice on whether the school’s work program meets the requirements of the syllabus. (Copies of the Form R1: ‘Title Page of Work Program — Application for Accreditation’ and the Form R2 (actually two forms): a blue form ‘Work Program Advice to Schools — Board-Registered Subject’ and a white form ‘Work program Advice to Schools — Board Subject’) are shown in appendix 4.)

The school is then required to:

- consider the comments and arrange consultation with the district review panel chair or review officer
- take account of the advice of the review panel and rewrite those parts of the work program that could not be accredited
- resubmit two copies of the work program to the district board centre.

After sampling a work program the state review panel recommends either that the work program be accredited or that the school seek consultation with the state review panel chair or the review officer.

**When accreditation is recommended by a state review panel:**

- the school receives from the district board centre one copy of the accredited work program with the attached Form R1 signed and stamped, showing the period of accreditation, and a copy of a Form R2 signed by the state review panel chair
- the district board centre retains and stores the other copy of the accredited work program with the attached Form R1 signed and stamped, showing the period of accreditation.

**When consultation is recommended by a state review panel:**

- the school receives from the district board centre two copies of the work program with the Form R1 attached and a completed Form R2 signed by the state review panel chair providing advice on the quality of the school’s work program.

The school is then required to:

- consider the comments and arrange consultation with the state review panel chair or review officer
- take account of the advice of the review panel and rewrite those parts of the work program that could not be accredited
- resubmit two copies of the work program to the district board centre.
Timelines for accreditation of work programs in board subjects

In the year before a new accreditation period begins, schools are given notice that a new or revised syllabus is available for general implementation with Year 11 students. At that time, the Board sends to schools:

- copies of the syllabuses that apply to the new accreditation period
- memoranda drawing attention to the impending accreditation period and the syllabuses upon which work programs are to be based.

Schools are required to submit a work program in a new accreditation period by the last day of the first semester in the first year of teaching the subject.

Schools proposing on a Form A1 that students receive Senior Certificates which record achievement in a board subject are to have an accredited work program before the time that Senior Certificates are issued.

While the maximum period of accreditation is seven years, the accreditation of work programs submitted during the period of general implementation is restricted to the number of years until the next accreditation period.

Year 11 students who commence a board subject in the final year of an accreditation period and students in Year 12 who continue a board subject in the final year of an accreditation period will have their studies based on the same work program.

Year 11 students who commence a board subject in the first year of a new accreditation period will have their studies based on a program that has been developed to meet the requirements of the new syllabus. In this year, the programs of studies of the Year 11 subject group and the Year 12 subject group are based on different work programs.

A subject group of students begins and completes studies based on one syllabus. Their studies are not interrupted at times of transition between syllabuses.

Developing and preparing a work program in a board subject

A work program is the school’s interpretation of the syllabus, setting out how the school intends to implement the syllabus. The work program caters for the special characteristics of the school and its students.

The program must meet all syllabus requirements, showing the school’s overall plan for implementing the subject. The work program should be a stand-alone document that does not require reference to other documents in order to be read with understanding. The moderation processes are expedited when the writers of work programs use terminology that is consistent with the terminology used in the syllabus in describing the school’s program.

Subject-specific, detailed information on the requirements of a work program is found in each senior syllabus.

In preparing the work program the school staff should check that the requirements, as stated on the Form R2, have been met and that the work program:

- has sequential page numbering
- satisfies the minimum time requirements for study and assessment
- has a logical framework that corresponds to a table of contents
- includes a sample, completed profile showing student achievement
- has been edited by staff of the school other than the primary author to meet the standards of an important school document
- has been audited by staff of the school other than the primary author as meeting the requirements outlined in this handbook.
Assistance in developing a work program and in following the procedures to prepare and submit a work program is available from the district board agent, the review officer or the review panel chair. Direct procedural questions should be directed to the district board agent. Subject-specific questions should be directed to the review officer or review panel chair.

Developing and preparing a work program in a board subject—information sheet for teachers

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a work program for a board subject.

In developing a work program the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook should be collected and used as points of reference:
- subject syllabus
- Form R1 'Title Page of Work Program—Application for Accreditation'
- Form R2 (white): 'Work program Advice to Schools—Board Subject'
- subject-specific checklist for accreditation of a program.

Developing the work program involves thinking about and proposing ways to:
- cover all syllabus requirements
- maintain congruence between course objectives and syllabus objectives
- include subject matter that reflects a consistent interpretation of the syllabus
- include learning experiences that reflect the stated course objectives and are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course
- provide a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences
- provide clear information about the conditions under which assessment is planned to be implemented
- construct a profile of student achievement that clearly corresponds with the assessment instruments in the assessment program
- follow the principles of moderated school-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment and the principles of decision making in special consideration cases
- provide opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course.

Submitting a work program in a board subject

Proceed as follows:
- complete all sections of the Form R1
- identify the school code allocated by the Office of the Board (school codes are shown in the annual address list of Queensland senior schools)
- identify the review panel code of the review panel for the subject (schools are notified annually by memorandum of subject and review panel codes)
- have the Form R1 signed and dated by the principal
- attach the original of the signed and dated Form R1 to one copy of the work program and the duplicate Form R1 to another copy; attach the triplicate to another copy of the work program retained by the school
- place the two copies to be submitted in a suitably large envelope
- send both copies of the work program to the district board centre.

Amending an accredited work program in a board subject

From time to time, a school may need to make substantive changes to an accredited work program. Such amendment of an accredited work program must meet the requirements of the syllabus.
Substantive changes to a work program include changes to one or more of these:
- the range and balance of assessment instruments
- the coverage of general objectives
- the assessment program.

If the school considers that the proposed change can be communicated to the review panel by reference to the already accredited work program, then the proposal constitutes an amendment. If not, the school can submit a completely revised work program.

Amendments to accredited work programs are considered only by review panel chairs; amendments are not reviewed by review panel members.

Immediately an accredited amendment is returned to the school it is essential that:
- the accredited amended pages are inserted in all copies of the work program in the school
- the accredited amendment is adhered to for the next and subsequent groups of students to exit from the course.

Assistance is available from the district board agent, the review officer or the review panel chair. Direct procedural questions should be directed to the district board agent. Subject-specific questions should be directed to the review officer or review panel chair.

When submitting an amendment, there may be no need to submit the complete program. Schools submit the amended pages with a new Form R1 and a covering letter outlining the nature of the changes made.

**Amending an accredited work program in a board subject—information sheet for teachers**

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit an amendment to an accredited work program in a board subject.

When developing and preparing an amendment to an accredited work program ensure that the proposed amendment:
- is integrated into a single congruous whole work program
- makes reference to the purpose of the amendment and the location or locations (including page numbers) in the work program where change occurs
- is submitted in a timely way such that it may be accredited in the semester prior to implementation
- does not threaten coverage of all syllabus requirements
- includes only subject matter that reflects a consistent interpretation of the syllabus
- includes only learning experiences that reflect the stated course objectives and are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course
- maintains a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences
- maintains the provision of clear information about the conditions under which assessment is planned to be implemented
- adheres to the principles of moderated school-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment and the principles of decision making in special consideration cases
- does not threaten the provision of opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course.
Provisional accreditation

In exceptional circumstances a school work program may not be accredited before students exit from the course. In these circumstances, a school’s work program may be granted provisional accreditation. Schools with provisional accreditation may not advertise to prospective Year 11 students a provisionally accredited course as a board subject.

Results in a subject for which the work program is provisionally accredited may appear on the Senior Certificates of students of the school under the following conditions:

- the school includes in the submission to the verification meeting of the review panel:
  - a letter outlining the substance of the delay in accreditation
  - the action proposed by the school to commit resources to help ensure that the work program is accredited before the time that students exit
  - an undertaking to make available to the review panel, should it be required, the updated and complete exit folios of work of all students of the subject
- the school’s submission to a subsequent monitoring meeting is reviewed by members of the state review panel
- the school’s submission to a subsequent verification meeting is to contain the folios of all students in the Year 12 subject group and is reviewed by the state review panel
- the school accepts the advice of the state review panel in relation to students’ level of achievement.

3.2.2 Monitoring

Monitoring is the process by which review panels consider the decisions made by schools on standards of student achievement after Year 11 in senior board subjects. Review panels provide advice to schools on the standards in student work and the appropriateness of the decision making in the school.

To help review panels with this process, submissions include the range of the assessment materials used by schools to form interim judgments on student achievements.

In some subjects in some schools, the relevant assessment material may include summative results. Usually few, if any, assessment materials are summative at this stage and formative assessment materials used in making interim judgments are included in the submission.

The procedures of monitoring

Schools prepare submissions of student folios, accompanied by a Form R3 ‘Year 11 Monitoring’, for consideration by district or state review panels. (A copy of the Form R3 is shown in appendix 4.)

All submissions are sent to review panels via the local district board centre.

After the monitoring meetings submissions and originals of the Form R3 with comments and advice from review panels are returned to schools. These comments are used as the basis of discussion among teachers of the subject at the school.

Consultation between review panels and staff of schools may occur following the meeting. If the review panel suggests consultation or if the school wishes to have consultation, the school contacts the review panel chair or the appropriate review officer to discuss the review panel comments. The submission must be maintained intact for the consultation.

Figure 2, ‘Anticipated pathway of a submission through a monitoring meeting’, shows the way in which submissions are reviewed at a monitoring meeting.
School sends submission to district board centre.

Pre-reviewing by panellist 1—first independent review.

District review panel chair conducts monitoring meeting.

Submission to panellist 2—second independent review.

Pre-reviewing notes set to one side.

Conferencing No. 1 of panellists 1 and 2.

Consensus—preparation of draft R6 comments.

No consensus—submission goes to a third panellist for third review.

Conferencing No. 3—third panellist with district review panel chair.

District review panel chair finalises comments.

Form R6 completed.

Conferencing No. 2—panellists 1 and 2 with panellists 3 and 4 to filter the draft R6 comments.

District review panel chair finalises comments.

Form R6 completed.
Observers at monitoring meetings

A school may request that a teacher be allowed to attend the monitoring meeting as an observer. The request may be made to the district review panel chair through the district board agent. A limit may be placed on the number of observers attending any particular meeting.

Observers are not invited to verification meetings.

Timelines for monitoring

Submissions are due at district board centres in the final week of each school year. The Office of the Board advises schools by memorandum of the due date for and the contents of submissions to monitoring meetings.

Monitoring meetings are convened early in the following year, usually in February. Advice on schools’ submissions is provided to schools immediately after the meeting.

Preparing a monitoring submission—information sheet for teachers

(see next page)
Preparing a monitoring submission—information sheet for teachers

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to prepare a monitoring submission. In preparing a monitoring submission the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook are required:

- the Board memorandum outlining contents of a submission for monitoring
- Form R3: ‘Year 11 Monitoring’
- Form R5: ‘Conditions Relevant to an Assessment Instrument’ or equivalent
- the sample student folios (as described in the following paragraphs)
- a copy of the school’s accredited work program with Form R1 attached
- clean copies of assessment instruments with marking schemes or model responses where appropriate.

Folios of sample students:

- folios of sample students should demonstrate standards that are typical of student work of the standard at the particular level required. A minimum of five student folios must be included irrespective of the size of the Year 11 subject group, except where there are fewer than five students in the subject group.

Students who have received special consideration:

- the folios of students who have been given special consideration do not need to be submitted except where these students are part of small groups for which all folios are submitted
- schools may seek advice from review panels about students for whom special consideration has been made; in such cases, a supporting statement describing the difficulties faced by the student should be enclosed.

If there are more than five students in the subject group:

- the submission is to include the folio of the student whose achievement is closest to the middle of each level of achievement in which students have been placed (the mid-range sample).

If there are more than five students in the subject group but there are no students achieving one or more of the levels of achievement:

- the submission is to include the folio of the student who has been placed closest to the middle of the levels of achievement (mid-range samples) and the folio of the top student in the subject group—include folios of other students from the subject group until five folios have been included.

When compiling the monitoring submission complete the following steps:

- select the sample students
- gather and collate in a folio the work of each selected student
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio correspond with the assessment instruments described in the assessment section of the school’s accredited work program
- ensure that the student profile of each selected student is up to date and corresponds with the sample in the work program
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio match those listed on each student profile
- ensure that the criteria stated in the syllabus are evident in the student profile
- clearly identify each folio to be presented with a letter code (A ... E)
- write on a Form R3 the school name and code allocated by the Office of the Board (school codes are shown in the annual address list of Queensland senior schools); write the subject name and code allocated by the Board; write the name of the Board district for the school and the review panel code of the review panel for the subject (review panel codes are provided to schools annually by memorandum)
- indicate by writing the letter code (A ... E) on the interim relative achievement section on the left-hand side of Form R3 the standard reached in each interim level of achievement by the selected students
- write the number of students in the subject at the end of Year 11
- write in the School comments section brief comments that the school believes are necessary to convey to the review panel information relating to the context in which learning and assessment occurred in the subject in the school
- have the Form R3 signed and dated by the principal
- remove the quadruplicate of the Form R3 and retain for school records
- provide other information in any student folio that will assist the review panel in matching criteria and standards with student work
- where there are fewer than five students in the subject group, include all student folios in the submission.
Dispatching the submission

Ensure that the submission contains:

- the original, duplicate and triplicate of the Form R3, signed and dated by the principal, and ensure that the sections indicating interim relative achievement of sample students, and the number of students completing the subject at Year 11, have been completed
- sample student folios, each with a completed student profile
- a copy of the accredited work program with a signed Form R1 attached
- a clean set of all assessment instruments, including Forms R5 or equivalent, that were used to make judgments about interim levels of achievement
- information regarding marking schemes and, where appropriate, model responses
- any additional information and materials that the school believes are necessary to convey to the review panel information relating to the context in which learning and assessment occurred in the subject in the school.

Ensure that the submission is securely packaged and clearly identifies the school and the subject. Address the submission to: The District Board agent, QBSSSS, District Board centre, (here add the postal address of your school’s district board centre—the address list for district board centres is in appendix 5.)

It is the principal’s responsibility to ensure that the packaging and transport of all submissions from the school to verification is secure.

Responsibility for secure transport of submissions

It is the principal’s responsibility to ensure that all submissions from the school to monitoring meetings are packaged securely and dispatched to the district board centre in parcels that comply with the size and weight standards stated in the Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995.

The Board regards student work as invaluable. In every circumstance submissions are dispatched from district board centres and the Office of the Board by courier, registered post, a teacher of the school from which the submission came, a member or chair of a review panel, or the district board agent. In each case, a record is kept of the name of the carrier and date that the submission was dispatched. The cost of returning submissions to schools is borne by the Board.

It is expected that submissions will be dispatched from schools with the same levels of accountability for delivery. The cost of sending submissions to Board centres or the Office of the Board is borne by the school.

3.2.3 Verification

Verification is the process that occurs near the end of the course (usually in October) when each school sends a submission of samples of Year 12 student work in each board subject to review panels to confirm that the standards in the submission match the criteria and standards stated in the syllabus, and to verify the school’s proposed distribution of levels of achievement of students in the course.

A submission to a verification meeting contains review folios of student work, a copy of the school’s accredited work program and the complete set of summative assessment instruments implemented in the school, and may contain other documents that support the school’s proposal. Subject-specific requirements of review folios are stated in each syllabus.
The procedures of verification

Schools prepare submissions of student folios, accompanied by a Form R6: ‘Year 12 Levels of Achievement – School Proposal’, for consideration of district or state review panels. (A copy of the Form R6 is shown in appendix 4.)

All submissions are sent to the review panel via the local district board centre. After the verification meetings, submissions, accompanied by the originals and duplicates of the Form R6 with comments and advice from review panels, are returned to schools. Some materials might be retained for a short time for sampling by the state review panel. The school is notified if its submission is sent to the state review panel for sampling. In such a case, the Form R6 is returned to the school and a copy of the Form R6 accompanies the submission to the state review panel.

The Form R6 is considered the most important accountability document in the moderation process. The form is in quadruplicate so that the history of decisions, consultation and negotiations, and approvals are captured and retained for later reference. The original page of the quadruplicate form is retained by the Board as a record of the processes within moderation. (Detailed instructions on completing a Form R6 appear in appendix 7.)

If the review panel agrees with the school proposal, the school receives the original and duplicate of the Form R6 with the signature of the review panel chair on the line ‘Agreement Reached on School Proposal’. Schools need take no further action until the exit proposal is made.

If the review panel does not agree with the school proposal, the school receives the original, duplicate and triplicate of the Form R6, complete with the advice of the review panel. When the school receives the review panel advice with an indication of the recommended relative achievement of sample students in the ‘Panel’ column of the Form R6, the school is required to consult the review panel chair. Consultation should begin as soon as possible after review panel advice is received by the school. The principal, or staff member delegated by the principal, should initiate these consultations promptly but the review panel chair may make the initial contact.

Figure 3, ‘Anticipated pathway of a submission through a verification meeting’ shows the way in which submissions are reviewed at a verification meeting.
Figure 3: Anticipated pathway of a submission through a verification meeting

- School sends submission to district board centre.
- Pre-reviewing by panellist 1—first independent review.
- Verification meeting.
- Pre-reviewing notes set to one side.
- Submission to panellist 2—second independent review.
- Conferencing No. 1 of panellists 1 and 2.
- No consensus—submission to a third panellist—third review.
- Conferencing No. 3—third panellist and district review panel chair.
- District review panel chair finalises R6 comments.
- Form R6 completed.
- Consensus—reviewers prepare draft R6 comments.
- Conferencing No. 2—panellists 1 and 2 with panellists 3 and 4 to filter the draft R6 comments.
- District review panel chair finalises R6 comments.
- Form R6 completed.

No consensus—submission to a third panellist—third review.
**Timelines for verification**

Submissions are due at district board centres in the first week of the fourth school term. The Office of the Board advises schools in July by memorandum of the due date for and the contents of submissions.

Verification meetings are convened on the third Monday of the fourth school term. Advice on schools’ submissions is provided to schools immediately after the meeting.

After verification meetings, consultations and negotiations occur between review panels and schools. These consultations and negotiations occur within a very tight schedule. The Board advises schools by memorandum of the specified date for reaching agreements with district review panels.

In the same way, when schools are required to negotiate with state review panels, the Board advises schools by memorandum of the specified date for reaching agreement.

**Preparing a verification submission—information sheet for teachers**

(This information sheet is shown on the next page.)
Preparing a verification submission—information sheet for teachers

The information that follows is provided to assist teachers who are required to prepare verification submissions.

In preparing a verification submission the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook are required:
- the Board memorandum outlining contents of a submission for verification
- Form R6 ‘Year 12 Levels of Achievement—School Proposal’
- Forms R5 ‘Conditions Relevant to an Assessment Instrument’
- folios of sample students (as described below)
- a copy of the school’s accredited work program with Form R1 attached
- clean copies of assessment instruments with marking schemes or model responses where appropriate.

Folios of sample students:
- folios of sample students should demonstrate standards that are typical of student work of the standard at the particular level required. A minimum of nine student folios must be included irrespective of the size of the Year 11 subject group, except where there are fewer than nine students in the subject group.

When compiling the verification submission, complete the following steps:
- select the sample students
- gather and collate in a folio the work of the selected students
- ensure that the student profiles of selected students are up to date and complete
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio correspond with those stated in the assessment section of the school’s accredited work program
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio match those listed on each student profile
- ensure that the criteria stated in the school’s accredited work program can be matched with sample students’ work
- clearly identify each folio to be presented with a letter code (A ... I)
- write on a Form R6 the school name and code allocated by the Office of the Board (school codes are shown in the annual address list of Queensland senior schools); write the subject name and number, and name of the Board district for the school, and the review panel code of the review panel for the subject (schools are notified annually of subject and review panel codes)
- indicate by writing the letter code (A ... I) in the ‘October’ column of the relative achievement section of the Form R6 the appropriate placement of the selected students in each level of achievement
- complete the ‘October’ column of the relative achievement section of the Form R6 by indicating the appropriate placement of all students in each level of achievement in the subject group receiving a Senior Certificate at the end of the year regardless of whether the students have completed 1, 2, 3 or 4 semester units of study in the subject
- complete the ‘Initial School Proposal’ section on the Form R6
- consider providing other information for any student folio which will help the review panel in matching criteria with student work
- have the Form R6 signed and dated by the principal
- remove the quadruplicate of the Form R6 and retain it for school records.

If there are more than nine students in the subject group, the submission is to include the folios of:
- the top student in the subject group
- the student who is placed closest to the middle of each level of achievement (mid-range sample)
- the student who is placed closest to the lower threshold of all levels (threshold samples) except Very Limited Achievement
- complete all steps listed in the section above.

If there are more than nine students in the subject group but there are no students achieving one or more of the five levels of achievement, the submission is to include the folios of:
- the top student in the subject group
- the student who is placed closest to the middle of each level of achievement (mid-range sample)
- other students from the subject group until at least nine folios have been included; these other folios are to be selected, where possible, from those students who are placed in the Very High Achievement, High Achievement and Sound Achievement bands
- complete all other steps as outlined above.

If there are nine or fewer students in the subject group, include all student folios in the submission.

Check that the work of all students is labelled clearly so that the review panel is able to match assessment instruments in the folio with those listed in the school’s accredited work program, and with results recorded on the corresponding student profile.

Students who have received special consideration:
- the folios of students who have been given special consideration do not need to be submitted except where these students are part of small groups for which all folios are submitted.
- schools may seek advice through the review system about students for whom special consideration has been made; in such cases, a supporting statement describing the difficulties faced by students should be enclosed.
Dispatching the submission

Ensure that the school submission contains the following items:

- the original, duplicate and triplicate of the Form R6 with the ‘Relative Achievement of Students’ section completed, the initial school proposal entered and the form signed and dated by the school principal
- folios of sample students with attached student profiles clearly identifying the letter code of the sample
- a copy of the school’s accredited work program
- a set of all assessment instruments used in the school’s determination of exit levels of achievement, with Forms R5 (conditions sheets) or equivalent attached
- where appropriate, further information regarding criteria and standards schemas and marking schemes or model responses
- any additional information that the school wishes to provide to assist in the reviewing process.

Ensure that the submission clearly identifies the school and the subject – audio and video tapes should be placed in a sealed envelope, clearly marked and tied into the submission. Address all submissions to: The District Board Agent, QQSSSS, District Board centre (here add the postal address of your school’s district board centre – the address list for district board centres is in appendix 5.)

It is the principal’s responsibility to ensure that the packaging and transport of all submissions from the school to verification is secure. (See ‘Responsibility for secure transport of submissions’ in section 3.2.2 for details.)

Reaching agreement—consultation and negotiation

Review panels review student work according to the model presented in fig. 3. After the work from a school has been viewed, comments from the review panel are written on the Form R6 and it is returned to the school with the submission. The Form R6 shows clearly whether agreement has been reached between the review panel and the school.

Agreement for large groups is reached when:

- the distribution recommended by the review panel, incorporating the relative achievement of sample students, is agreed to by the school.

Agreement for small and intermediate groups is reached when:

- the placement of each student in the subject group within the relevant level of achievement is agreed to by the school.

When the panel agrees with the school proposal:

- the relative positions of the students, as advised by the review panel, are written in the ‘Panel’ column on the Form R6
- the line ‘Agreement reached on school proposal’ is signed and dated by the district review panel chair
- the advice of the review panel is written in the ‘Review Panel Chair Comments’ section of the Form R6.

When the review panel does not agree with the school’s proposal:

- the relative positions of the students, as advised by the review panel, are written in the ‘Panel’ column on the Form R6
- the line ‘Agreement reached on school proposal’ remains unsigned until such time as agreement is reached
• comments that clearly indicate the reasons the review panel has not been able to agree with the school’s proposal are written in the ‘Review Panel Chair Comments’ section of the Form R6, which is signed and dated by the district review panel chair
• on receipt of the Form R6 the school consults the district review panel chair and negotiates a subsequent agreement, if possible.

Schools are advised by memorandum each year of the dates pertaining to the consultation and negotiation process and the steps involved.

**Procedures following consultation and negotiation**

Consultation and negotiation with a district review panel have two possible outcomes: agreement is reached between the review panel and the school; agreement is not reached and the state review panel is required to arbitrate.

If agreement is reached, proceed in the following way:
• indicate the relative achievement of sample students in the ‘Agreed’ column of the Form R6
• complete and sign the ‘Subsequent school proposal’ section
• forward to the district board centre, for the attention of the district review panel chair, the original, duplicate and triplicate of the Form R6, marked ‘Resubmission after Consultation’.

The district review panel chair signs the ‘Agreement Reached on School Proposal’ section of the Form R6 and returns the original and duplicate to the school. If the signature of the district review panel chair has not been entered, the school should contact the district board centre to have this oversight corrected before the ‘Exit Proposal’ section is completed.

If agreement is not reached by the date specified in the Board memorandum, the complete verification submission is sent by the school to the district board centre for immediate dispatch to the Office of the Board for state review panel consideration and advice.

**Preparing a verification submission for state review panel consideration**

If agreement is not reached by the date specified in the Board memorandum, the school sends the submission direct to the Office of the Board by the date specified. The school may include any additional information and/or material that may assist the state review panel in its judgments. Any correspondence included with this material and in the submission should be signed by the principal of the school.

The district review panel chair provides, for the state review panel, details of the consultation and negotiation with the school. The state review panel in the first instance conducts an independent review of the school submission. Following the independent review, the state review panel considers all information made available by the school and the district review panel before making a final decision. The state review panel then negotiates with the school. These negotiations are to be finalised by a date specified in the Board memorandum.

It is the responsibility of the principal to ensure that the packaging and transport of all submissions from the school to verification is secure and adheres to the regulations pertaining to size and weight. Refer to the section ‘Responsibility for secure transport of submissions’ at the end of section 3.2.2 for details.
Preparation of a verification submission for state review panel consideration—information sheet for teachers

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to prepare a verification submission for state review panel consideration. A verification submission for state review panel consideration is required only where agreement has not been reached with the district review panel. The submission is to contain:

- the complete submission to the verification meeting
- any additional information or materials that the school believes would help the state review panel in its judgments
- the original, duplicate and triplicate of the Form R6
- an explanation of why it has not been possible to reach agreement with the district review panel.

3.2.4 Approvals

Immediately after the end of Year 12, after considering a school’s proposal for exit levels of achievement and the record of any discussions with the Office of the Board concerning changes since October verification, the state review panel recommends levels of achievement for certification.

Determining the exit levels of achievement

Proposed distributions of achievement at exit are recorded on the original sheet of the Form R6 for each Year 12 subject from each school. The proposals must reach the Office of the Board by the due date specified by memorandum each year.

It is possible that some changes will occur in the distribution of levels of achievement between the time of signing the agreed school proposal and awarding levels of achievement at the time of exit. The Board, however, cannot accept that, in a criteria and standards-based assessment system involving continuous assessment, changes of a significant nature will occur in such a short time.

The Education (Senior Secondary School Studies) Regulation 1989 designates a date of completion of Year 12. Each year the Office of the Board advises schools of the completion date. If the school has evidence to show that it is appropriate to propose a change immediately before the completion date, the school should contact the relevant review panel chair. If the evidence leading to the proposal for change does not become available until after the completion date, the school should make urgent contact with the Assistant Director (Moderation) who will determine the nature of any further action. In completing the Form R6, the school must attach a note of explanation on the nature of the changes it is seeking, and must record on the Form R6 the distribution on which the school and review panel reached agreement and not the proposed changes. In such cases, the Moderation Section will contact the school for discussion and a possible review of the evidence kept by the school. School submissions required at this time are to be forwarded by overnight courier services.

Until all requests from students for validation of results are finalised, schools should retain evidence for such changes in the form of assessment instruments, student scripts and complete student profiles, and should clearly indicate the additional information used to alter the school’s October decision in case a submission is required for review by the state review panel.
Schools must:
- ensure that the date and principal’s signature are entered on the Form R6 beside the ‘Exit Proposal’ section
- attend to all senior data capture system (SDCS) requirements
- ensure that the distribution of exit levels of achievement agreed to on the Form R6 matches exactly the distributions of levels of achievement provided in SDCS—these distributions of levels of achievement are summarised at the end of each Class List
- submit the original of the Form R6, together with all other materials required to accompany the SDCS exchange disks direct to the Office of the Board in Brisbane so that it arrives by the due dates.

Checking procedures—Office of the Board

Should officers of the Board identify significant changes in the school’s exit proposal following agreement on the October proposal, reviews of the work of such schools may take place. These will occur up to and including a date set annually by the Office of the Board (usually the Wednesday of the second last week of the school year for government schools).

3.2.5 Random sampling

Random sampling is a procedure for providing information to the Board and schools about the standards in final and complete exit folios of student work which are not usually seen by review panels. In this way, random sampling is a post-hoc look at standards in student work.

A submission to a random sampling meeting contains exit folios of student work, a copy of the school’s accredited work program and the complete set of summative assessment instruments implemented in the school.

Timelines for random sampling

Principals of schools selected at random to be involved in random sampling are advised in October of the subjects that have been selected by the Office of the Board.

Following the receipt of SDCS exchange disk #5 from schools in November, the Office of the Board advises schools of the names of the students, selected at random, whose work is to be included in the random sampling submission. Schools send the student work to the district board centre with the Year 11 monitoring submission in early December.

The student work is returned to schools as soon as practicable after the end of term two.

Procedures of random sampling

Schools prepare submissions containing the work of the students selected by the Office of the Board and send them to the district board centre at the same time as the submission for Year 11 monitoring. The Form R6 for the subject group is not included with the submission.

District Board agents arrange for the submissions to be sent to a review panel in another district and the student work is reviewed at the same time as February monitoring of Year 11 work.
Preparing a submission for random sampling—information sheet for teachers

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a random sampling submission.

In submitting work for random sampling, ensure that the following are included:

- copy of the accredited work program for the subject
- a set of the summative assessment instruments used in the school’s determination of exit levels of achievement, with details of conditions of assessment attached
- information regarding marking schemes
- exit folios of student work for the students requested, with completed student profile attached, but with the level of achievement masked.

Do not include the Form R6 with the submission.

Forward the submission to the district board centre.

3.3 Procedures associated with board-registered subjects for which the Board develops and approves a study area specification

This category of subject is one in which:

- there is a Board study area specification
- study plans are required for accreditation by the Board
- the responsibility of assuring that the assessments made are consistent with the study area specification rests with the school
- student scripts are not required for review
- timetabled school time devoted to the study and assessment of the subject is a minimum of 55 hours per semester.

The list of study area specifications and strands (each strand of a study area specification is a board-registered subject) approved by the Board is updated annually and issued to schools.

(These subjects sometimes contain vocational education components. Reference should be made to the Vocational Education Kit published by the Office of the Board for information about registration procedures for vocational education components.)

3.3.1 Accreditation of study plans

Accreditation is a process of periodic approval by the Board of a school’s study plan. Schools provide to the Board details of the course of study on a study plan (Form R9). Forms R9 are available from the Office of the Board for each of the study area specifications. A sample of just one of these forms is shown in appendix 4.

The procedures of study plan (Form R9) accreditation

The process of accreditation involves officers of the Board checking the school’s study plan (Form R9) against the particular study area specification to ensure that its requirements have been met by the school.

(Refer to the Vocational Education Registration Kit issued by the Office of the Board for information about registration procedures for vocational education components.)
The accreditation period is the span of years during which the teaching and learning based on a particular syllabus leads to student achievement being recorded on the Senior Certificate. For study plans this is usually a period of four years, but may be extended.

In brief, the sequence of actions leading to accreditation is:

- the school submits two copies of the study plan (Form R9) to the Office of the Board
- officers of the Board consider the study plan (Form R9) for accreditation and complete a Form R10 ‘Study Plan – Advice to Schools’ recommending accreditation or further consultation with the school (a copy of the Form R10 is shown in appendix 4)
- the school receives advice from the Board that accreditation has been granted or that resubmission after consultation is necessary
- one copy of the school’s study plan (Form R9) is returned to the school, and the other is retained at the district board centre.

Figure 4, ‘Accreditation of study plans’ shows the broad steps involved.
Figure 4: Accreditation of study plans

School submits two copies of study plan (Form R9) to district board centre. 

District board agent forwards two copies of study plan (Form R9) to the Office of the Board.

School resubmits two copies of study plan (Form R9) to district board centre.

School modifies study plan (Form R9) according to advice received from Office of the Board.

Officers of the Board recommend accreditation?

no

yes

Office of the Board sends study plans (Forms R9) to district board centre with Form R10.

District board centre sends one copy of accredited study plan (Form R9) back to school, together with a Form R10.
**Timelines for accreditation**

In the year before the commencement of a new accreditation period, schools are given notice that a new or revised study area specification is available for general implementation. At that time, the Board sends to schools:

- copies of the study area specifications that apply to the new accreditation period
- memoranda drawing attention to the impending accreditation period and the study area specifications upon which study plans are to be based.

Schools are required to submit a study plan (Form R9) by the end of the first term in the first year of teaching the subject. Although the usual period of accreditation is four years, it may, in some circumstances, be extended to seven years.

Students begin and complete a course based on one study area specification. A subject group of students does not have studies interrupted in the change from one accreditation period to the next.

Schools proposing on a Form A1 that students receive Senior Certificates which record achievement in a board-registered subject based on a study area specification are to have an accredited study plan before the time that Senior Certificates are issued.

**Developing and preparing a study plan**

A study plan (Form R9) sets out the school’s proposal for implementing the study area specification.

The study plan must meet all study area specification requirements, showing the school’s overall plan for implementing the subject, including course sequence and organisation, assessment overview, conditions of assessment and completed student profiles for sample students exiting the course at the end of four semesters.

Assistance in developing a study plan (Form R9) and in following the procedures to prepare and submit that study plan is available from officers of the Board.

**Developing, preparing and submitting a study plan (Form R9)—information sheet for teachers**

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a study plan.

In developing a study plan, the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook should be collected and used as points of reference:

- study area specification
- information statement 08/98 issued on 28/05/98
- Form R9.

Developing the study plan (Form R9) involves thinking about and proposing ways to:

- cover all study area specification requirements
- include learning experiences that are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course
- provide a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences
- provide clear information about the conditions under which assessment is to be implemented
- construct and complete a student profile of student achievement that clearly corresponds with the instruments and techniques stated in the assessment outline
- follow the principles of school-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment, and the principles for decision making in special consideration cases
- provide opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course
- check that the study plan has been audited by staff of the school other than the primary author as meeting the requirements outlined in the study area specification and in this handbook.
In preparing the study plan (Form R9) check that staff of the school have looked at a blank Form R10 and have made sure that the requirements stated on the Form R10 have been met and that the study plan:

- satisfies the time requirements of the study area specification
- follows an appropriate course sequence
- includes a sample profile demonstrating student results and final level of achievement at exit from the course after four semesters of study.

**Submitting a study plan**

Proceed as follows:

- complete all sections of the Form R9 (Study Plan)
- identify the school code allocated by the Office of the Board
- identify the strand of the study area specification being undertaken (where appropriate)
- indicate whether the study plan (Form R9) is a new submission or an amendment
- have the study plan Form R9 signed and dated by the principal, noting the contractual obligations implicit in the statement being signed
- make two copies of the original
- place the original and one copy in an envelope
- send both copies of the study plan (Form R9) to the local district board centre.

**Amending a study plan**

From time to time, a school may need to make substantive changes to an accredited study plan. Such amendment to an accredited study plan (Form R9) must meet the requirements of the study area specification. Amendments should be submitted direct to the Office of the Board for consideration.

When submitting an amendment, the school must:

- complete all sections of the study plan (Form R9)
- identify the school code allocated by the Office of the Board
- identify the strand of the study area specification being undertaken (where appropriate)
- indicate that the study plan (Form R9) is an amendment
- have the study plan (Form R9) signed and dated by the principal, noting the contractual obligations implicit in the statement being signed
- make two copies of the original of the Form R9
- place the original of the Form R9 and one copy in an envelope
- send to the district board centre, for forwarding to the Office of the Board
- retain a copy within the school.
3.4 Procedures associated with board-registered subjects for which schools develop, and the Board accredits, work programs

This category of subject is one in which:

- there is no Board syllabus or study area specification
- work programs are subject to Board accreditation procedures
- the school has the responsibility of ensuring that the assessments actually made are consistent with the accredited work program
- student scripts are not required for review
- timetabled school time devoted to the study and assessment of the subject is a minimum of 55 hours per semester.

This category of subject enables schools to offer a variety of board-registered subjects not already covered by study area specifications while at the same time enabling results in those subjects to be recorded on the Senior Certificate.

3.4.1 Accreditation of work programs in board-registered subjects

The procedures for work program accreditation in a board-registered subject

Accreditation is a process of periodic approval by the Board of a school’s work programs and study plans.

The accreditation period for a board-registered subject is the span of years during which the teaching and learning based on a particular work program leads to student achievement being recorded on the Senior Certificate. This is usually a period of seven years.

In brief, the sequence of actions leading to accreditation is:

- the school develops and prepares a work program
- the school submits the work program via the district board centre
- work programs are recommended for accreditation by officers of the Board
- the school receives advice either that the work program has been accredited or that consultation is required.

When accreditation is recommended:

- the school receives a form letter from the district board agent indicating that the work program has been recommended for accreditation and that the copies have been retained at the district board centre.

When consultation is recommended:

- the district board centre sends to the school both copies of the work program with the Form R1 attached and a completed blue Form R2. (A copy of the blue Form R2 is shown in appendix 4.)

The school is required to:

- consider the comments and arrange consultation with the review officer
- take account of the advice and the discussion in consultation and rewrite those parts of the work program that are unsuitable for accreditation
- resubmit two copies of the work program to the district board centre for further consideration by officers of the Board.

The process is summarised in fig. 5.
Figure 5—Actions for the accreditation of work programs in school-developed board-registered subjects

School submits two copies of work program to district board centre.

District board agent forwards two copies of program to the Office of the Board.

School resubmits two copies of work program to district board centre.

School modifies program according to advice received from Office of the Board.

Officers of the Board recommend accreditation?

Office of the Board sends work program to district board centre.

District board centre sends one copy of accredited work program back to school.

no

yes
Timelines for accreditation of work programs in board-registered subjects

In the year before a new accreditation period begins, schools are required to submit a work program. The usual period of accreditation is seven years.

The final date for submitting a work program is the last day of semester one in the first year of the new accreditation period.

Students begin and complete studies based on one work program. A subject group of students does not have studies interrupted in the change from one accreditation period to the next.

Developing and preparing a work program for a board-registered subject—information sheet for teachers

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a work program in a board-registered subject.

In preparing the work program, check that staff of the school consider that the requirements as stated on the Form R2 (blue) have been met, that the work program is relevant to student needs and that it:

- is not in an area covered by a study area specification
- has sequential page numbering
- satisfies minimum time requirements for study and assessment
- has a logical framework that can be seen in a contents page
- has a statement of relevant objectives written in terms of student achievement
- includes a sample, completed profile of student achievement
- deals with the principles of criteria- and standards-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment, and the principles for decision making in special consideration cases
- provides opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course
- has been edited by staff of the school other than the primary author as meeting the standards of an important school document
- has been audited by staff of the school other than the primary author as meeting the requirements outlined in this section of the handbook.

Submitting a work program for a board-registered subject

Proceed as follows:

- complete all sections of the Form R1 ‘Title Page of School Work Program — Application for Accreditation’
- identify the school code allocated by the Office of the Board
- attach the original of the signed and dated Form R1 to one copy of the work program and the duplicate Form R1 to another copy; attach the triplicate to another copy of the work program retained by the school
- place the two copies to be submitted in a suitably large envelope
- send both copies of the work program to the district board centre.

The district board agent will forward the work program to the Office of the Board.

Amending a work program in a board-registered subject

Periodically a school may need to make substantive changes to an accredited work program. Substantive changes may involve changes to the following aspects:

- the criteria and standards descriptors
- the range and balance of assessment instruments
- the coverage of general objectives
- the assessment program.
If the school considers that the proposed change can be communicated by reference to the accredited work program then the proposal constitutes an amendment. If not the school may submit a completely revised work program. Amendments to accredited work programs are considered by officers of the Board.

Immediately an accredited amendment is returned to the school it is essential that:
- the accredited amended pages are inserted in all copies of the work program in the school
- the accredited amendment is adhered to for the next and subsequent subject groups of students to exit from the course.

Assistance is available from the district board agent or the review officer. Direct procedural questions should be directed to the district board agent. Subject-specific questions should be directed to the review officer.

When submitting an amendment there is no need to submit the complete program. Schools submit the amended pages with a new Form R1 and a covering letter outlining the nature of the changes made.

Amending a work program in a board-registered subject—information sheet for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit an amendment to an accredited work program in a board-registered subject.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When developing and preparing an amendment to an accredited work program in a board-registered subject, ensure that the proposed amendment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is integrated into a single congruous whole work program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is explained; that is, reference is made to the purpose of the amendment and the precise location or locations of text changes in the work program (include page numbers etc.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is submitted in a timely way such that it may be accredited in the semester prior to implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- includes only learning experiences that reflect the stated course objectives and are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- maintains a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides clear information about the conditions under which assessment is planned to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Recorded subjects

A recorded subject is a subject other than a board subject or board-registered subject that is offered by an educational institution approved by the Board, the results of which are recorded on the Senior Certificate.

The Board has a process for approving which organisations may have student results appearing on the Senior Certificate in this category, and for approving which results from the approved organisations may appear on the certificate. The Office of the Board does not conduct a moderation process for recorded subjects. (Lists of recorded subjects are included in the annual Subject Lists publication, available from the Office of the Board.)

It is the school’s responsibility to seek information from students about the recorded subjects that they may be studying. It is the principal’s responsibility to sight the relevant certification from the approved organisation.
SECTION 4—SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

4.1 Variable progression rates

The Board’s moderation procedures are founded on the understanding that most students of a subject study one semester unit of that subject in each of four consecutive semesters over a two-year period.

For schools implementing variable progression rates for a significant proportion of students of a subject group, and for students undertaking variable progression rates, the usual flexibility and quality assurance procedures of moderated school-based assessment may not be applicable.

Syllabuses are two-year courses of study and assessment that develop knowledge, skills and higher-order thinking. Students who study and are assessed in a whole subject in fewer than four semesters would not have the opportunity to develop knowledge, skills and thinking processes as well as other students. Such students would have reduced opportunities for, and feedback from, formative assessment before summative judgments are made.

If schools were to offer certain subjects only every alternate year, students would not have the chance to repeat those subjects at that school.

Arrangements have been put in place for schools to manage variable progression rates for students so that the Senior Certificate can be awarded after a three-year program of study, and can record the study of more than one semester unit of a subject in a single semester.

The greater the variability between schools in the implementation of variable progression rates for subject groups of students, the greater is the likelihood that transferring students will encounter difficulties in continuing their studies.

The likelihood that a school will fully implement a revised syllabus before the work program is accredited is increased. Should the work program not lead to appropriate standards of student achievement, the ramifications for students are serious.

4.1.1 The principles of variable progression rates

A Senior Certificate will be issued to students who have completed Year 12 no earlier than two years after having (ordinarily) completed Year 10.

A Senior Certificate will record a maximum of four semester units of any board or board-registered subject. More than one semester unit of a board or board-registered subject may be recorded in a semester.

At least half a student’s total program of study in board subjects at Year 12 level is to be completed in the final year.

For moderation purposes, the subject group to which students belong is the one whose levels of achievement will appear on the Senior Certificate in the year the students receive their certificates. For the allocation of subject achievement indicators (SAIs), overall positions (OPs) and field positions (FPs), the student is part of the cohort with whom the he or she receives the Senior Certificate.
4.1.2 Procedures of variable progression rates

Schools must use the Board’s senior data capture system (SDCS) to indicate:

- that particular students are undertaking a variable progression rate
- the semester of commencement of the variable progression rate
- the year in which it is expected that these students will receive a Senior Certificate
- the subjects studied, by semester, between the semesters of commencement and certification.

4.1.3 Monitoring and verification for variable progression rate students

No matter what the rate of progression of students, the following moderation procedures apply:

- Year 11 monitoring takes place in February
- Year 12 verification takes place in October
- Year 12 random sampling takes place in February.

If more than fifty per cent of the subject group and more than seven students in the subject group are undertaking variable progression rates, the following special procedures apply:

- for monitoring in February the school submits the standard five representative folios of student work plus up to five additional folios from students undertaking variable progression rates
- for verification in October, the school submits the standard nine representative folios and up to five additional folios of work from students undertaking courses at variable progression rates.

If no folios are available for February monitoring because a school is offering a subject only every second year, the school submits verification folios that meet the requirements of the syllabus.

If the Board’s moderation procedures have indicated that a school has experienced difficulties in applying appropriate standards to student work, the school may choose one of the following special moderation procedures:

- inform the Office of the Board that they consent to the state review panel’s determining the distribution of levels of achievement, after taking into account the advice of the district review panel and the school’s proposal (this arrangement will continue until the state review panel endorses the decisions of the school)

or

- consult with staff of the Office of the Board and members of the relevant review panel by telephone and in writing, and arrange a special visit to the school by the review officer for the subject. (This arrangement can only be provided at the school’s expense—details on costs involved are available from the Office of the Board.)

then:

- having chosen one of the two options above, advise students and their parents of the choice and its implications.
4.2 Shared campuses

Occasionally a school may wish to provide the opportunity for students to study a subject that is not offered in the school but which is offered in another school (referred to as a host school). These circumstances sometimes arise when students transfer from one school to another, or when two (or more) schools that are geographically close agree to such an arrangement. This is referred to as a shared campus arrangement.

In either case the school seeking to provide that opportunity must:

- make written application to the Office of the Board
- include in the application the written permission of the principal of the host school.

There is no need for the school at which students are enrolled to submit a work program in the subject. The course of study followed by the students is that course in the accredited work program of the host school.

In rare circumstances, two schools in close proximity may agree that groups of students of either school are able to study a number of subjects in the other school. In this case, both schools are required to submit, for each subject appearing on the Senior Certificates of students of the school, a copy of the (joint) work program.

4.3 The Exit Statement

The Exit Statement is issued by schools to school-leavers who complete at least one semester of post-compulsory schooling and who do not intend to return to school to complete Year 12. The Exit Statement is based on school assessments and is issued in accordance with the conditions and format laid down by the Board.

4.3.1 Characteristics of the Exit Statement

The Exit Statement:

- is issued by schools and carries the school’s name with an option to print the school’s logo within the space provided
- carries the Board’s logo and, where applicable, the ‘Nationally Recognised Training’ logo in the space provided for the reporting of the vocational education components of Board and board-registered subjects
- is issued only upon receipt by the relevant school (i.e. the school last attended by the applicant) of a written application, preferably on the form approved by the Board
- carries the principal’s signature and shows the date of the student’s exit from school
- is not intended to replace the school’s reference
- records, where applicable, any vocational education competencies, modules and certificates attained
- does not report the QCS Test grade (students may apply direct to the Office of the Board for a Statement of Achievement if they sat for all four papers of the test)
- does not use the same nomenclature as that used to describe student achievements on the Senior Certificate
- reports a result and the period of study for each board or board-registered subject studied for at least one semester.

The result is described using one of the following statements:
**Highly successful** — In this subject, the student has been very successful at nearly all of the assessment instruments set during the time the subject has been studied.

**Successful** — In this subject the student has attempted nearly all of the assessment instruments set during the time the subject has been studied, and has usually recorded at least moderate success.

**Unsuccessful** — In this subject the student has not recorded at least moderate success in the assessment instruments set during the time the subject has been studied. A substantial proportion of the assessment instruments may not have been attempted.

**Not assessed** — In this subject the student has attempted few, if any, assessment instruments.

The senior data capture system (SDCS) provides schools with a facility to print the Exit Statement. Schools should contact the Office of the Board for further information.
### Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accreditation</td>
<td>the process of approval by the Board, for a fixed period of time, of schools’ work programs and study plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accreditation period</td>
<td>the accreditation period is the span of years during which the teaching and learning based on a particular syllabus leads to student achievement being recorded on the Senior Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendment</td>
<td>an alteration to the work program or study plan (Form R9) which makes substantive changes to the coverage of general objectives, mandatory and/or core subject matter, learning experiences, and the assessment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approvals (period – post-verfication)</td>
<td>the process in which levels of achievement are recommended for certification by the state review panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessing school</td>
<td>a school, approved by the Minister for Education, at which senior secondary education is offered and students are assessed for board subjects and/or board-registered subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment instrument</td>
<td>see instrument (assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment item</td>
<td>see item (assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment task</td>
<td>see task (assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment technique</td>
<td>see technique (assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance (and range)</td>
<td>one of the principles of moderated school-based assessment; refers to the spread of aspects of assessment over a two-year course of study and to the range of conditions and difficulty of assessment instruments in the assessment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board district</td>
<td>the geographical areas into which Queensland has been divided for the administrative purposes of the Office of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board subject</td>
<td>a subject in which a syllabus has been approved and issued by the Board, a school’s work program is accredited, student achievements are moderated and student results may contribute to overall positions and field positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board-registered subject</td>
<td>a subject devised from a Board-developed study area specification or developed by a school, for which a school’s study plan (Form R9) or work program is accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certification (Senior Certificate)</td>
<td>the process involved in collecting data and recording results on an official document; results in approved studies in Years 11 and 12 are recorded on the Senior Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>codes – school, subject, review panel</td>
<td>for administrative purposes, all schools, subjects and review panels are identified with alphabetical or numerical or alphanumeric codes; schools are notified by memorandum each year of subject and review panel codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohort of students</td>
<td>a group of students within a single school at a particular year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous assessment</td>
<td>one of the principles of moderated school-based assessment; a process of gathering information about student achievement against the stated criteria for the subject throughout the two-year course of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course organisation</td>
<td>the scope and sequencing of subject matter for a course of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credentiaulling of review panellists</td>
<td>a process of awarding trained review panellists a certificate of currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria-based assessment</td>
<td>judgment of student achievement by a process of matching standards in student work with previously identified criteria and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criterion (plural – criteria)</td>
<td>a property, dimension or characteristic by which something is judged or appraised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution</td>
<td>the relative positions of and number of students within each level of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district board centre</td>
<td>an administrative centre in each Board district to which schools address materials for accreditation and certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
district review panel a group of experienced practising teachers from schools within the district who are appointed by the Board to give advice to schools about the appropriateness of work programs and standards of student work

exemption (in special consideration cases) fairness to all students and the integrity of results reported on Senior Certificates require that no students be exempted from meeting any of the substantive requirements of the syllabus, for any reason; in special consideration cases, schools may decide to exempt students from non-substantive subject requirements

Exit Statement a statement of results issued by a school to students who have completed at least one semester of study in a board or board-registered subject and who leave school before receiving a Senior Certificate

extension senior subject an extension senior subject caters for students with specific aptitudes and abilities and may be studied in Year 12 only

external senior examination a public examination administered by the Board to cater for candidates who study Year 12 subjects outside the school-based system

field position (FP) students rank-order positions based on overall achievements in board subjects in up to five fields (dimensions of study that emphasise particular knowledge and skills)

folio (of student work) the compilation of a student’s responses to assessment instruments, accompanied by a completed student profile

formative assessment formal or informal assessment in a subject; primarily intended to help students improve the standard of their work

fullest and latest information one of the principles of moderated school-based assessment; the most up-to-date and complete information on student achievement in a subject

general objective objectives that the school is intending to pursue directly and in which student achievement is assessed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>global aim (in a syllabus or work program)</td>
<td>syllabus statements of the long-term abilities, attitudes and values that are developed by students in studying the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial school proposal</td>
<td>the school’s proposal for levels of achievement in a subject and submitted to review panel for verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument (assessment)</td>
<td>a tool developed by the school for assessing students in a subject at a specific time; often employing a range of assessment techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interim level of achievement</td>
<td>a decision about student achievement made at any time other than at the end of the course of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermediate group</td>
<td>an intermediate subject group consists of ten to thirteen OP-eligible students who have studied the subject for at least one semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item (assessment)</td>
<td>a subset or part of an assessment instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large group</td>
<td>a large subject group consists of fourteen or more OP-eligible students who have studied the subject for at least one semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning experience</td>
<td>activity designed to foster student learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of achievement</td>
<td>the standard reached by students at exit judged by matching standards in student work with the exit criteria and standards stated in a syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marking scheme</td>
<td>information about the contribution of parts of a response to decisions about standards of the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-range sample</td>
<td>the folio of student work, selected by the school, which is typical of the standards at the middle of a level of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model response</td>
<td>a suitable response to an assessment instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderated school-based assessment</td>
<td>a process of assessment whereby schools manage and plan their own assessment of student achievement supported by the moderation procedures of the Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
moderation  the set of procedures designed to ensure that results recorded on Senior Certificates match the requirements of syllabuses

monitoring  the process by which review panels provide advice to schools on standards of student achievement in board subjects for Year 11 work

overall position (OP)  an OP indicates students’ rank-order position in the state, reported in bands from 1 (highest) to 25

pilot (restricted use)  the process of refining the assessment procedures and developing the moderation processes for a syllabus with a select group of schools

profile  a document or form with concise information recording the standards reached by students in specified subject criteria

random sampling  a quality assurance process for providing the Board with advice about the effectiveness of moderation procedures

range and balance  one of the principles of moderated school-based assessment; refers to the spread of aspects of assessment over a two-year course of study and to the range of conditions and difficulty of assessment instruments in the assessment program

rationale  a statement in a syllabus and in a work program defining the subject by stating its salient characteristics or properties, and explaining how these characteristics contribute to the criteria for senior secondary education

recorded subject  a subject, other than a board subject or board-registered subject, offered by an educational institution approved by the Board, the results of which are recorded on the Senior Certificate

review  the process of considering standards of student work at the times of monitoring, verification, and approvals

review officer  a teacher seconded to or contracted by the Board to provide support to review panels and schools in the processes of moderated school-based assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>review panel training</td>
<td>training held periodically for district review panels to ensure that all review panellists are aware of required Board procedures and of the requirements of their own subject area with regard to accreditation and review, and that the best possible advice is given to principals of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school moderator</td>
<td>the school principal or delegate who takes responsibility for the total assessment program of the school, and who ensures that this program is implemented within the school in such a way that the achievement information submitted to the Office of the Board is in keeping with the Board’s moderation procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selective updating</td>
<td>one of the principles of moderated school-based assessment; process of replacing or supplementing earlier judgments about student achievement on given criteria with later judgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Certificate</td>
<td>a formal record of student achievements in senior secondary school study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant aspects (of a work program and syllabus)</td>
<td>components of the course of study designed by the school which contribute to exit levels of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared campus</td>
<td>the term used to describe the arrangement a school has with the Board to offer a subject to students from other schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small group</td>
<td>a small subject group consists of up to nine OP-eligible students who have studied the subject for at least one semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special arrangements (in special consideration cases)</td>
<td>practical arrangements that vary the conditions under which assessment occurs in order to enable students with special needs to have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>description of a level of student work or a benchmark in a continuum from highest to lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state review panel</td>
<td>a group of people with expertise in the subject area who are appointed by the Board to give advice to schools about the appropriateness of work programs and standards of student work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student folio  the compilation of a student’s responses to assessment instruments, accompanied by the completed student profile

student script  student response to a particular assessment instrument

study plan  an outline of the scope and sequence of subject matter and the assessment for a board-registered subject which is based on a study area specification

study area specification (SAS)  a document that provides details of courses of study in board-registered subjects

subject matter  the content component of a syllabus and a work program

submission  a compilation of materials sent by a school to be reviewed by a review panel

subsequent school proposal (on the Form R6)  the proposal for exit levels of achievement submitted by a school following verification advice from and negotiation with the review panel chair

summative assessment  assessment instruments that are used in determining exit levels of achievement

syllabus  a document that provides the curriculum framework that a school must use in its preparation of a work program for a board subject

task (assessment)  work undertaken by a student in response to an assessment instrument

technique (assessment)  strategy for assessing student work; may form part of an assessment instrument

tertiary entrance statement  this document contains statewide rank order information for students who meet OP eligibility requirements and is issued at the same time as the Senior Certificate

trial (restricted use)  the process of field testing a syllabus with a small group of schools involving an independent evaluation of the syllabus document
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trial-pilot (restricted use)</td>
<td>an accelerated process of trial and pilot of a syllabus that has undergone a major revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verification</td>
<td>the process near the end of Year 12 when district and state review panels advise schools on the validity of proposed exit levels of achievement based on school submissions of assessment instruments and student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verification folio (see folio of student work)</td>
<td>the compilation of a student’s responses to assessment instruments, accompanied by a completed student profile, from which an interim level of achievement may be derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work program (board subject)</td>
<td>a document that details how the school intends to implement a syllabus; it follows the guidelines set out in the syllabus and must meet the requirements of the Form R2 for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work program (for a school-developed, board-registered subject)</td>
<td>a document that outlines a subject developed by an individual school to meet student needs, and which meets the accreditation requirements of the Form R2 (blue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1**

**Description of forms mentioned in this handbook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form number</th>
<th>Form name</th>
<th>Form purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Application to Issue Senior Certificates</td>
<td>Used by all schools to apply annually to issue Senior Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Application for Issue of Certificates</td>
<td>Used by schools to apply to issue Senior Certificates for the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Title Page of Work program—Application for accreditation</td>
<td>Attached to copies of a work program for board or board-registered subjects when applying for accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>blue: ‘Work Program Advice to Schools—Board-Registered Subject’ white: ‘Work program Advice to Schools—Board Subject’</td>
<td>Used by review panels to advise schools whether their work programs have been accredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Year 11 Monitoring</td>
<td>Used by schools to indicate relative achievement of sample students at the end of Year 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Conditions Relevant to an Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>Accompanies a clean copy of each assessment instrument included in a submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Year 12 Levels of Achievement—School Proposal</td>
<td>Used by schools to indicate relative achievement of students at the time of verification in Year 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Study Plan—Application for Accreditation</td>
<td>Used by schools to apply to the Board to accredit a study plan (written for a board-registered subject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Study Plan—Advice to Schools</td>
<td>Used by the Board to give a response to the school’s Form R9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Sample of a Senior Certificate
Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies

1998 SENIOR CERTIFICATE
1998

This is to certify that

AMANDA JAMESON
of
SUNSHINE COLLEGE

having completed Year 12 in 1998 has been awarded the results reported on this Senior Certificate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board subject</th>
<th>Semester units studied</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>01 02 03 04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very High Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History</td>
<td>01 02 03 04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very High Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics A</td>
<td>01 02 03 04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very High Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>01 02 03 04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very High Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Communication &amp; Technologies</td>
<td>01 02 03 04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very High Achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total units 20  
Total subjects 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core skills</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QCS Test</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board-registered subject</th>
<th>Semester units studied</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Practices (Intro. to Hospitality)</td>
<td>01 02 03 04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very High Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total units</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total subjects       1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While undertaking subject(s) shown above, the student successfully completed vocational education competencies or modules and met the requirements for Certificate II in Clerical-Administration (Private Sector) (CNBA2)
(for details see Statement 1)

This Senior Certificate is recognised within the Australian Qualifications Framework.

Issued 18 December 1998 without alteration or erasure
Student No: 97-0206-1484-5
EXPLANATORY NOTES

This is an Australian certificate of senior secondary education. It has been issued on completion of Year 12 in full-time schooling by the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, one of the Australasian Curriculum, Assessment and Certification Authorities. Australian certificates of senior secondary education are official and authentic records of student achievement. They are accepted nationally and internationally.

The certificate can report student achievement in Board subjects studied during Year 11 and/or Year 12, and in the Queensland Core Skills Test. The certificate and results in Board subjects are accepted by universities across Australia and around the world. The certificate may record achievement in Board-registered subjects, in accredited vocational education, and in Recorded subjects. The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies is responsible for setting and maintaining the standards reported on its certificates as described below.

BOARD SUBJECTS
A Board subject is one for which a syllabus and a school’s work program have been approved by the Board and the standards of assessment are moderated.

The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board subject is 55 hours per semester.

There are Board-developed syllabuses for over 50 senior secondary subjects. A list of Board subjects is available from the Board’s office.

Semester unit
A semester unit is a portion of the syllabus usually completed in one semester and is represented by a code number such as 01, 03, 08, ... or 01, 02, 03, 04.

BOARD-REGISTERED SUBJECTS
A Board-registered subject is any subject, other than a Board subject, for which a study area specification or work program has been approved by the Board.

The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board-registered subject is 40 hours per semester.

Semester unit
A semester unit is a portion of the work program for a Board-registered subject usually studied in one semester.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT
A level of achievement indicates the standard attained in relation to the criteria stated in the accredited work program.

The levels are:
• Very High Achievement
• High Achievement
• Sound Achievement
• Limited Achievement
• Very Limited Achievement.

Levels of achievement in Board subjects are reported only for students in those schools that accept Board conditions and follow Board procedures for the moderation of standards.

Levels of achievement recorded in Board-registered subjects are based on school assessments that are not subject to the Board’s procedures for the moderation of standards.

The criteria used in making the final judgment of the level of achievement include:
• the student’s knowledge and understanding of the concepts and principles of the subject
• the student’s cognitive and practical skills in a wide range of situations.

QUEENSLAND CORE SKILLS
All Year 12 students are offered the opportunity to sit for the Queensland Core Skills (QCS) Test.

The QCS Test:
• tests the common elements of the senior curriculum employing three modes of response—extended writing, short response, and multiple choice—and involves seven hours of testing over two consecutive days
• is a standardised test requiring reading and writing in Australian English
• being cross-curriculum, provides information supplementary to the subject results.

Results are reported as grades from A to E (A indicating highest achievement).

QUEENSLAND CORE SKILLS
This is an Australian certificate of senior secondary education. It has been issued on completion of Year 12 in full-time schooling by the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, one of the Australasian Curriculum, Assessment and Certification Authorities. Australian certificates of senior secondary education are official and authentic records of student achievement. They are accepted nationally and internationally.

The certificate can report student achievement in Board subjects studied during Year 11 and/or Year 12, and in the Queensland Core Skills Test. The certificate and results in Board subjects are accepted by universities across Australia and around the world. The certificate may record achievement in Board-registered subjects, in accredited vocational education, and in Recorded subjects. The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies is responsible for setting and maintaining the standards reported on its certificates as described below.

BOARD SUBJECTS
A Board subject is one for which a syllabus and a school’s work program have been approved by the Board and the standards of assessment are moderated.

The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board subject is 55 hours per semester.

There are Board-developed syllabuses for over 50 senior secondary subjects. A list of Board subjects is available from the Board’s office.

Semester unit
A semester unit is a portion of the syllabus usually completed in one semester and is represented by a code number such as 01, 03, 08, ... or 01, 02, 03, 04.

BOARD-REGISTERED SUBJECTS
A Board-registered subject is any subject, other than a Board subject, for which a study area specification or work program has been approved by the Board.

The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board-registered subject is 40 hours per semester.

Semester unit
A semester unit is a portion of the work program for a Board-registered subject usually studied in one semester.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT
A level of achievement indicates the standard attained in relation to the criteria stated in the accredited work program.

The levels are:
• Very High Achievement
• High Achievement
• Sound Achievement
• Limited Achievement
• Very Limited Achievement.

Levels of achievement in Board subjects are reported only for students in those schools that accept Board conditions and follow Board procedures for the moderation of standards.

Levels of achievement recorded in Board-registered subjects are based on school assessments that are not subject to the Board’s procedures for the moderation of standards.

The criteria used in making the final judgment of the level of achievement include:
• the student’s knowledge and understanding of the concepts and principles of the subject
• the student’s cognitive and practical skills in a wide range of situations.

QUEENSLAND CORE SKILLS
All Year 12 students are offered the opportunity to sit for the Queensland Core Skills (QCS) Test.

The QCS Test:
• tests the common elements of the senior curriculum employing three modes of response—extended writing, short response, and multiple choice—and involves seven hours of testing over two consecutive days
• is a standardised test requiring reading and writing in Australian English
• being cross-curriculum, provides information supplementary to the subject results.

Results are reported as grades from A to E (A indicating highest achievement).

QUEENSLAND CORE SKILLS
This is an Australian certificate of senior secondary education. It has been issued on completion of Year 12 in full-time schooling by the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, one of the Australasian Curriculum, Assessment and Certification Authorities. Australian certificates of senior secondary education are official and authentic records of student achievement. They are accepted nationally and internationally.

The certificate can report student achievement in Board subjects studied during Year 11 and/or Year 12, and in the Queensland Core Skills Test. The certificate and results in Board subjects are accepted by universities across Australia and around the world. The certificate may record achievement in Board-registered subjects, in accredited vocational education, and in Recorded subjects. The Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies is responsible for setting and maintaining the standards reported on its certificates as described below.

BOARD SUBJECTS
A Board subject is one for which a syllabus and a school’s work program have been approved by the Board and the standards of assessment are moderated.

The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board subject is 55 hours per semester.

There are Board-developed syllabuses for over 50 senior secondary subjects. A list of Board subjects is available from the Board’s office.

Semester unit
A semester unit is a portion of the syllabus usually completed in one semester and is represented by a code number such as 01, 03, 08, ... or 01, 02, 03, 04.

BOARD-REGISTERED SUBJECTS
A Board-registered subject is any subject, other than a Board subject, for which a study area specification or work program has been approved by the Board.

The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board-registered subject is 40 hours per semester.

Semester unit
A semester unit is a portion of the work program for a Board-registered subject usually studied in one semester.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT
A level of achievement indicates the standard attained in relation to the criteria stated in the accredited work program.

The levels are:
• Very High Achievement
• High Achievement
• Sound Achievement
• Limited Achievement
• Very Limited Achievement.

Levels of achievement in Board subjects are reported only for students in those schools that accept Board conditions and follow Board procedures for the moderation of standards.

Levels of achievement recorded in Board-registered subjects are based on school assessments that are not subject to the Board’s procedures for the moderation of standards.

The criteria used in making the final judgment of the level of achievement include:
• the student’s knowledge and understanding of the concepts and principles of the subject
• the student’s cognitive and practical skills in a wide range of situations.

QUEENSLAND CORE SKILLS
All Year 12 students are offered the opportunity to sit for the Queensland Core Skills (QCS) Test.

The QCS Test:
• tests the common elements of the senior curriculum employing three modes of response—extended writing, short response, and multiple choice—and involves seven hours of testing over two consecutive days
• is a standardised test requiring reading and writing in Australian English
• being cross-curriculum, provides information supplementary to the subject results.

Results are reported as grades from A to E (A indicating highest achievement).
Appendix 3

Samples of administrative forms A1 and A12

Form A1: ‘Application to Issue Senior Certificates’

Form A12: ‘Application for Issue of Certificates’
I WISH TO MAKE APPLICATION FOR TO ISSUE SENIOR CERTIFICATES IN 1998.

The application is made with the understanding:

i. that the school accepts and participates in the Board’s moderation procedures and agrees to follow instructions from the Board or its officers acting on its behalf in these matters.

ii. that to be eligible to receive a Senior Certificate a student must complete Year 12 by remaining in attendance at school until 20 November 1998.

Provided that one or more of the students in the school are eligible for an Overall Position (OP), it is agreed that a condition of participation in the Student Education Profile system is the disclosure of Subject Achievement Indicators (SAIs) to students in a suitable form by 25 November 1998. This form is to consist of a listing for each Board subject such that students will be able to see their placement in each subject relative to each of the other students in the subject.

The school will retain a copy of the communicated SAIs in the form in which they were displayed and will make such a copy available to the Office of the Board on request.

Principal's Signature: ___________________________  Date: _______________

New Board Subjects

To assist with certification this year, would you please indicate if any new Board subjects (not Board-registered) are to be offered at your school this year in Year 11 or Year 12.

☐ YES  ☐ NO  If yes, please complete details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subject Name</th>
<th>Year Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If insufficient space, please attach a separate sheet. Please complete the reverse side of this form.
1. Please check (and amend where incorrect) these administrative details about your school.
2. File a copy of the form to be sent to the Board if your details change during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Our Records Show</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Name:</td>
<td>Sunshine College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Abbreviation:</td>
<td>SUNSHINE COLLEGE</td>
<td>002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>12 Beach Drv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noosa 3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address:</td>
<td>12 Beach Drv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noosa 3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(076) 23 4444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>(076) 84 8827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Phone:</td>
<td>(076) 56 5540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex(Co-ed/Female/Male):</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Year Level:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Names:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/School:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electronic Mail addresses are optional.

Principal's Signature: _______________________________ Date: ________________

To be forwarded to: Board of Senior Secondary School Studies
                    PO Box 307
                    SPRING HILL 4004

The Board's email address is office@bsssq.edu.au, our website is http://www.bsssq.edu.au
FORM A12 - Application for Issue of Certificates

To be completed by the Principal

To: The Director
   Board of Senior Secondary School Studies
   PO Box 307
   SPRING HILL QLD 4004

Sir

I hereby make application to issue Senior Certificates to eligible students of

| Name of school: |

the aforesaid being a school approved by the Minister for Education.

This application is made on the understanding that the school undertakes to adhere to the policies of the Board in general, and, in particular, to follow Board procedures for:

(i) the approval/accreditation of school work programs for Board subjects and/or Board-registered subjects and

(ii) the certification of standards appropriate to the levels of achievement for each subject for which certification is sought.

Signature of Principal: .................................................................

Date: .... / ... / ....

Please complete the details on reverse.
School Details

To be completed by the Principal

School details

Name of school: ........................................................................................................................................
Postal address: ........................................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................................... Postcode: .................
Street address: ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
Telephone(s): ( ) .................
( ) .................
Fax: ( ) .................

School Principal: ...................... Title: .......... Initials: ...............

Given names: ...............................................................
Surname: ........................................................................

Year level/s details

Current year level/s and proposed introduction of subsequent year levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOARD OFFICE USE ONLY

School Short Name:

Unit type: Boys ☐ Girls ☐ Coed ☐

Area ID: Established: ....../....../......

Students: Action: Create ☐ Modify ☐

Authorised by: ........................................ Entered by: ........................................
Date: ........................................ Date: ........................................
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Samples of review procedures forms

Form R1 ‘Title Page of Work Program—Application for Accreditation’
Form R2 (white) ‘Work program Advice to Schools—Board Subject’
Form R2 (blue) ‘Work Program Advice to Schools—Board-Registered Subject’
Form R3 ‘Year 11 monitoring’
Form R6 ‘Year 12 Levels of Achievement—School Proposal’
Form R9 ‘Study Plan—Application for Accreditation’
Form R10 ‘Study Plan—Advice to Schools’
Application for Accreditation

The school has the resources necessary to implement the attached work program and agrees to abide by the procedures and conditions laid down by the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies for accreditation of the work program and for certification of student achievement.

The timetabled school time devoted to the study and assessment of this subject is a minimum of 55 hours per semester.

Signed: ................................................................. Date: .... / .... / ..... 
Principal

NOTE: The minimum amount of timetabled school time to be devoted to the study and assessment of each Board and Board-registered subject is 55 hours per semester

| SCHOOL: | SCHOOL CODE: |
| SUBJECT: | SUBJECT CODE: |
| DISTRICT: | PANEL CODE: |
| CATEGORY: SENIOR BOARD/BOARD-REGISTERED* | Syllabus year: ......................... (for Board subjects only) |

* Strike out whichever is inapplicable.

| SENIOR (Board and Board-registered) | Tick (√) whichever is applicable. |
| SYLLABUS UNIT NUMBERS IN WORK PROGRAM: (if applicable) | New work program ☐ Resubmission ☐ |
| | Amendment to an accredited work program ☐ |
| TIME ALLOCATION ......................... TOTAL HOURS | If an amendment, which cohort? Yr 11 ☐ Yr 12 ☐ |

The original and duplicate of this title page should accompany the two copies of the work program submitted — one title page attached firmly to the first page of each work program. The triplicate should remain in the school attached to another copy of the work program. (After accreditation one copy of the work program will be returned to the school.)

Accreditation Approval (Office use only)

The attached work program for the subject and units of study as entered for the school above has been reviewed according to the procedures established by the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies and is hereby accredited for the period: 

......... to ........ inclusive.

Signed: ................................................................. Date: .... / .... / ..... 

(John A Pitman, Director, Board of Senior Secondary School Studies)
Board subject

1. The details of the title page are correct.
2. The stated objectives are consistent with syllabus objectives.
3. These objectives indicate appropriate scope and depth of student learning.
4. The learning experiences selected are consistent with the stated objectives.
5. The organisation of the course reflects the intent of the syllabus.
6. There is a clear assessment plan indicating:
   (a) technique used
   (b) criteria associated with each technique
   (c) conditions of implementation.
7. There is a balance in the assessment plan with respect to:
   (a) the techniques used
   (b) the scope and depth of the subject matter.
8. Sufficient information is provided relating the awarding of exit levels of achievement to summative assessment.
9. The work program satisfies syllabus requirements.

Comments

Note: If the school’s work program is not recommended for accreditation, the school should reconsider its proposal and consult with the district/state review panel chair or review officer if necessary. The two copies of the work program are then resubmitted with a clear indication of action taken in response to the panel’s comments.

Consultation recommended: Yes/No* ........................................... Signed: .................................................. Chair
Accreditation recommended: Yes/No* ........................................... Date: ........ / ........ / ......... for the state/district review panel*

*Strike out whichever is inapplicable.

Original: Returned to school with work program  Duplicate: Retained by S/DRPC  Triplicate: Retained by Board agent.
### SCHOOL: | SCHOOL CODE: 
---|---

### SUBJECT: | SUBJECT CODE: 
---|---

### DISTRICT: | PANEL CODE: 
---|---

This report provides the school with advice on the quality of the school’s proposed work program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Are the details of the title page complete?  

2. Does the rationale of the work program indicate:  
   (a) the relevance of the study to students’ needs?  
   (b) a challenge appropriate to the student group for whom it is intended?  
   (c) a significant area of study?  
   (d) relevance to the needs of Australian society?  

3. Are the global aims consistent with the intentions of the work program as expressed in the rationale?  

4. Do the objectives relate to the course content?  

5. Are the objectives written in terms of student achievement?  

6. Are the learning experiences selected consistent with the stated objectives?  

7. Has a course overview been provided?  

8. Does an appropriate range of assessment techniques provide balance in the assessment program?  

9. Are the assessment techniques relevant to the stated objectives?  

10. Has a course assessment plan been provided?  

11. Is sufficient information provided relating the awarding of Levels of Achievement to summative assessments?  

### Comments

### Action to be taken

Note: Where ‘No’ columns are indicated above, the work program will not be recommended for accreditation. Schools should reconsider their proposals and consult with the District/State Review Panel Chair if necessary. Two copies of the work program are then resubmitted with a clear indication of action taken in response to the panel’s comments.

Consultation recommended: Yes/No*  
Signed:  
Chair

Accreditation recommended: Yes/No*  
Date:  
for the State/District Review Panel*  
*Strike out whichever is inapplicable.
### Relative Achievement of Sample Students Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SCHOOL CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>SUBJECT CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PANEL CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student work in Board Subjects is monitored by District Panels after Year 11 so that advice can be given to schools to assist and reassure them on their judgments about student progress at this stage of the course.

Number of students completing subject at Year 11:

1. Each student folio presented should be as near as possible to the **middle** of each Level of Achievement.
2. Each of the five folios should be identified by code letter A, B, C, D, E on the scale to indicate the relative position within the proposed Level of Achievement.
3. The school submission should include:
   (a) student folios
   (b) school work program
   (c) assessment instruments
   (d) conditions sheet for each assessment instrument
   (e) detailed marking schemes with suggested responses
   (f) details of any other method of collecting data on achievement

School comments:

Signed: ................................................................. (Principal) Date: ... / ... / ....

### Panel advice re school submission

(Circle the number/s below on which advice is offered.)
1. Has the school supplied all materials listed in 3 above?
2. Has the school adhered to the work program?
3. Is the quality of the assessment instruments of a suitable standard?
4. Are the marking schemes with suggested responses of an appropriate standard?
5. Are the stated criteria being measured by the test instruments?
6. Are the samples submitted appropriately positioned at this stage of the course?

Review Panel comments:

Signed: ................................................................. (Chair for State/District Review Panel) Date: ... / ... / ....

---

Copies: Before meeting:
Original, duplicate and triplicate forwarded with samples to be reviewed.
Quadruplicate retained by school when making initial submission.

After meeting:
Original returned to school.
Duplicate retained by chair and returned to district Board agent.
Triplicate retained by chair.

Printed August 1995
### Technique:
Use syllabus terminology (e.g. written assignment, practical work, written report, oral report, essay, seminar, etc.)

### Additional information:
(Reference in work program, topics covered, criterion assessed, etc.)

### Conditions:
(Complete as many conditions as are appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length / Time allowed</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(include perusal if applicable)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task seen / unseen</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual / pair / group work</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised examination</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation time – class</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- own</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open book</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes allowed</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to library resources</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to electronic technology</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher input (e.g. drafts) (Extensive ........ None)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Levels of Achievement School Proposal**

**Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies**

**Form R6 Year 12**

### Relative Achievement of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct.</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Exit</th>
<th>LOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Enter the initial school proposal for distribution of Levels of Achievement for all students in the Year 12 cohort who have completed study of at least one semester of an accredited school work program.
2. Complete the October column. Indicate the relative achievement of every student by writing the number of students on the appropriate rung. Indicate the sample students by a letter code (A, B, C ...) on the appropriate rung, e.g. 6 + 6 (7 students).
3. Complete the Agreed column if negotiation took place between the school and the panel.
4. Complete the Exit column as explained in (ii) above.
5. At exit, indicate by circle all OP-ineligible students (including all visa students) e.g. `1` or `2 + 4 + 3 + C`.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in each level of achievement</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>WAP</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Principal to sign and date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial school proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent school proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement reached on school proposal</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit proposal recommended for certification</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For panel use:** Please tick if the following material has been adequately presented for reviewing.

- Student Folios and profiles
- School work program (R1)
- Assessment instruments
- Conditions sheets
- Detailed marking schemes with suggested responses
- Relative achievement of students
- Additional material to assist Review

Review Panel Chair Comments (complete, sign and date)

- Consultation with school is required
- Additional notes are attached

Note: Any additional notes must remain attached to the original Form R6.

Signed: D/SRPC _____________________________ Date: ___________ / __________ / _______

**Copy**
- October verification: Forward original, duplicate and triPLICATE with initial and any subsequent proposal. Retain quadruplicate in school.
- After agreement on proposal: Original and duplicate returned to school; triPLICATE retained by chair.
- Exit proposal: Original forwarded to Board; duplicate retained by school.

D/SRPC

Initials
Use this form to provide information in relation to the school's plan for teaching and assessing this Board-registered subject.

**SECTION 1: School and Subject Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand and School code</th>
<th>Subject (Strand) code:</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Use a different form for each strand of the specification.

**Module Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Nominal hours</th>
<th>Strand A (150 hrs min)</th>
<th>Strand B (50 hrs min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABF511</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCS001</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABF513</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA854</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABF512</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABF521</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABF522</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCO001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCO002</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR002</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR003</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF002*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF003*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF006*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF008*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF009*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF016*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNK001</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC046</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC047*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC048</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC049*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strand C 40 hrs min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine, coastal, estuarine &amp; riparian animals &amp; plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine &amp; aquatic pests and threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of the sea and inland waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather &amp; tides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and/or seawater properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans, coastlines and inland water systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waves and currents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strand C 40 hrs min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, assembly &amp; service of marine &amp; aquatic equip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquariums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating—power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating—sail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strand C 40 hrs min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping through the centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strand C 20 hrs min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School-developed electives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal (only Strands B &amp; C 30 hrs max)</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Application for accreditation**

The school has the resources necessary to implement this course and agrees to apply the Principles of assessment as outlined in the Study Area Specification and to follow the procedures and conditions set by the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies for accreditation of the study plan and certification of student achievement.

___________ School Principal _____________ Date
SECTION 2: Sequence/organisation of program of study

Provide an outline of the sequence in which the program of study will be taught. Refer to the advice on the relevant strand specified in the study area specification.

### Semesters I & II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics/Units/Themes</th>
<th>Time (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (weeks)

### Semesters III & IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics/Units/Themes</th>
<th>Time (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (weeks)
**SECTION 3: Assessment outline**

Indicate each planned assessment task by completing the tables below. Complete a student profile (section 3 part (iii)) to provide an assessment schedule showing the techniques employed, the criteria addressed, and how various assessment tasks contribute to the summative assessment plan.

(i) **Assessment overview**

**Semesters I & II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Identification Code (e.g. T1)</th>
<th>Formative/Summative (Indicate F/S)</th>
<th>Assessment Technique/s Employed (Test, Project, Oral response, Teacher observation etc.)</th>
<th>Criteria Assessed (K&amp;U, PS, WRP)</th>
<th>Length and/or Time Allocated (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semesters III & IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Identification Code (e.g. T1)</th>
<th>Formative/Summative (Indicate F/S)</th>
<th>Assessment Technique/s Employed (Test, Project, Oral response, Teacher observation etc.)</th>
<th>Criteria Assessed (K&amp;U, PS, WRP)</th>
<th>Length and/or Time Allocated (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) **Conditions of assessment**

List the conditions under which summative assessment tasks are to be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Technique</th>
<th>Conditions of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) **Student profile**

Attach an A4-sized copy of a worked student profile showing by example how assessment data are to be recorded for an individual student. The profile should reflect and encompass information provided in section 2 and section 3 of this form. You may, but are not compelled to, use the following generic student profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Assessment Instrument (Use ID Code)</th>
<th>Topics/Units/Themes</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>LoA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>K &amp; U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of Year 11</td>
<td>Overall Standard and Interim LoA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Year 12</td>
<td>Overall Standard and Interim LoA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Overall Standard and Exit LoA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board-registered subject

SCHOOL: 
DISTRICT: 
NAME OF STUDY AREA SPECIFICATION: 
NAME OF STRAND: 

Please tick ✓ the appropriate box. INITIAL SUBMISSION ☐ RESUBMISSION ☐ AMENDMENT ☐

This report provides the school with advice on the quality of the school’s proposed study plan.  Yes ✓ No ☐

1. The school is registered to teach the vocational modules within this Study Area Specification.
2. The study plan is signed by the principal.
3. Where required, the strand to be studied is indicated.
4. Selection and sequence of vocational modules are appropriate.
5. The course organisation and sequence meet the requirements of the Study Area Specification.
6. Themes/topics/units/vocational modules have been indicated for each semester.
7. Time allocations are appropriate.
8. Assessment
   (a) Assessment instruments have been identified.
   (b) There is an appropriate range and balance of assessment techniques.
   (c) There is evidence of integration of competencies with criteria-based assessment, where required.
   (d) Conditions of assessment have been indicated.
9. The completed student profile provides sufficient information for determining exit levels of achievement.

Name and signature of reviewer .................................................................................................................. Date ....... / ....... / ........

Comments and/or action for accreditation

Note: If the school’s study plan is not recommended for accreditation, the school should reconsider the plan and consult with the reviewer if necessary. The two copies of the study plan are then resubmitted with a clear indication of the action taken in response to the advice provided.

Consultation recommended: Yes/No Signed: ................................................................. Assistant Director (Moderation)
Accreditation recommended: Yes/No Date: ........ / ........ / ........

Original: Returned to school.
Duplicate: Retained by Board Agent.
Triplicate: Retained by office.
# Appendix 5

## Address list—district board centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone &amp; fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane South</td>
<td>Mt Gravatt State High School, Loreburn Street, Mt Gravatt Q 4122</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 3349 5264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 122, Mt Gravatt Q 4122</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 3343 8878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>Southport State High School, Brook Street Entrance, Brookfield Q 4215</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 5591 4255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 2005, Southport Q 4215</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 5591 4255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Ipswich</td>
<td>36 Boscombe Road, Brookfield Q 4069</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 3374 0602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1153, Kenmore DC Q 4069</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 3374 0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane North</td>
<td>Everton Park State High School, Stafford Road, Everton Park Q 4053</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 3855 1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 33, Everton Park Q 4053</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 3855 1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>Kawana Waters State High School (General Studies Block), Sportsmans Parade, Kawana Waters Q 4575 Post Office, Wurtulla Q 4575</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 5493 9452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: (07) 5493 9451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toowoomba</td>
<td>Toowoomba North State School, Mort &amp; Taylor Streets, Toowoomba Q 4350</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 4638 3699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: (07) 4638 5390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Bay</td>
<td>Sussex Street, Maryborough Q 4650</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 4123 1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 452, Maryborough Q 4650</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 4121 6811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhampton</td>
<td>The Cathedral College, Residential Block, The Range, 265 Agnes Street, Rockhampton Q 4700</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 4927 7279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: (07) 4922 6574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>Pioneer State High School, Room R1, Bedford Road, Andergrove Q 4740</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 4927 7279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 8163, Mt Pleasant Q 4740</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 4955 7314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>Aitkenvale Special School, Cnr Charles &amp; Nathan Streets, Aitkenvale Q 4814</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 4728 8485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 207, Aitkenvale Q 4814</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 4728 8486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>Cairns State High School, Sheridan Street, Cairns Q 4870</td>
<td>Phone: (07) 4051 3248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 5643, Cairns Q 4870</td>
<td>Fax: (07) 4051 3390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Detailed flowchart—accreditation of a work program

Key

DBC District Board centre
DRPC District review panel chair
DRP District review panel
SRP State review panel
SRPC State review panel chair
Appendix 7

Detailed instructions on completing a Form R6
Memorandum

Date: 6 August 1998  QBSSSS Ref.: M15  Ref. No.: 067/98

Distribution
Principals (Senior Schools)

Subject
Use of the Form R6 for 1998 Year 12 Subject-Groups

1. Purpose
This memorandum provides advice about the Form R6 and its use by schools and review panels.

2. Use of new Form R6
Completion of the Form R6 is initiated by the school at the time of preparing a submission for October verification.

Instructions (i) – (v) near the top of the form are directed to staff in schools. These instructions are provided here in more detail.

The sequence of actions in completing a Form R6 is described below.

- Staff of the school complete the (October) column to indicate the relative achievement of each and every student in the Year 12 cohort who has completed (or is in the process of completing) at least one semester of an accredited school work program in a Board subject and is expected to receive a Senior Certificate at the end of the year. The relative achievements are indicated by writing, on the appropriate rung, the number of students who have achieved at that particular level. The relative achievement of sample students whose work is sent to the verification meeting is indicated by a letter code (A, B, C, …). For example, where there are four students whose relative achievement is shown in the same rung and where one of these is sample student B the Form R6 shows 3 + B on that rung.

- Staff of the school complete the Initial Proposal showing the distribution of levels of achievement for these students. The principal signs and dates the initial school proposal.

- At the verification meeting the review panel indicates which materials from the list on the Form R6 have been included in the school’s submissions. Note that detailed marking schemes are not required in all subjects. If staff in a school are in doubt about which materials to include, contact may be made with the review panel chair or staff of the Board for advice. At the meeting, in the case where there is a difference between the review panel’s recommendation and the school’s placement of a sample student’s achievement, the review panel chair may indicate the difference in the Panel column. In this case the review panel chair initials the Panel column.
If the panel agrees with the initial school proposal, the review panel chair signs the Agreement reached on school proposal at the meeting.

If negotiations take place between the school and the panel following the verification meeting, staff of the school complete the Subsequent school proposal, and indicate in the Agreed column the placement after consultation of sample students’ achievements. The principal signs and dates the subsequent school proposal.

The school forwards the Form R6 directly to the district Board centre for the attention of the review panel chair. The review panel chair initials the Agreed column and signs the Agreement reached on school proposal section. The review panel chair retains the triplicate and returns the original and duplicate copies to the school.

At the end of the Year 12 school year staff of the school complete the Exit column (once again, the relative achievements are indicated by writing, on the appropriate rung, the number of students who have achieved at that particular level) and the Exit proposal. The principal signs and dates the exit proposal. At exit the school is to indicate on the Form R6 the relative achievement of each student (including each visa student) who is not eligible for an Overall Position by circling the number representing the placement of the student’s achievement on the Form R6, for example ① or ② + 2.

It is possible that minor changes in the relative positions of the students in a subject may occur between the time of agreement on the school proposal (October) and awarding exit Levels of Achievement (November). However, the Board does not accept that in a criteria-based system involving continuous assessment, changes of a significant nature would occur in such a short period of time. If such changes do occur, a further submission may be required from the school for consideration by the relevant review panel.

Changes in the agreed distribution of levels of achievement, between October and exit, must be agreed by the review panel chair.

If negotiations between the school and the review panel result in a change to the agreed distribution, documentation (such as fax form) is to be attached by the school to the original Form R6. The original Form R6 is forwarded to the Board, the duplicate copy is retained by the school.

The following is an example of part of a completed Form R6 showing examples of ways to complete the information in the columns
3. **Action**

- Please bring this memorandum to the attention of all staff involved in completing the Form R6 for 1998 verification.

4. **Enquiries**

Any questions regarding the contents of this memorandum may be addressed to John O’Brien, Assistant Director (Moderation), telephone (07) 3864 0284.

John A Pitman

*Director*
Appendix 8—Information sheets for teachers—copying masters

Developing and preparing a work program in a board subject

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a work program for a board subject.

In developing a work program the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook should be collected and used as points of reference:

- subject syllabus
- Form R1 ‘Title Page of Work Program—Application for Accreditation’
- Form R2 (white): ‘Work program Advice to Schools—Board Subject’
- subject-specific checklist for accreditation of a program.

Developing the work program involves thinking about and proposing ways to:

- cover all syllabus requirements
- maintain congruence between course objectives and syllabus objectives
- include subject matter that reflects a consistent interpretation of the syllabus
- include learning experiences that reflect the stated course objectives and are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course
- provide a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences
- provide clear information about the conditions under which assessment is planned to be implemented
- construct a profile of student achievement that clearly corresponds with the assessment instruments in the assessment program
- follow the principles of moderated school-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment and the principles of decision making in special consideration cases
- provide opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course.
Amending an accredited work program in a board subject

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit an amendment to an accredited work program in a board subject.

When developing and preparing an amendment to an accredited work program ensure that the proposed amendment:

- is integrated into a single congruous whole work program
- makes reference to the purpose of the amendment and the location or locations (including page numbers) in the work program where change occurs
- is submitted in a timely way such that it may be accredited in the semester prior to implementation
- does not threaten coverage of all syllabus requirements
- includes only subject matter that reflects a consistent interpretation of the syllabus
- includes only learning experiences that reflect the stated course objectives and are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course
- maintains a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences
- maintains the provision of clear information about the conditions under which assessment is planned to be implemented
- adheres to the principles of moderated school-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment and the principles of decision making in special consideration cases
- does not threaten the provision of opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course.
Preparing a monitoring submission

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to prepare a monitoring submission. In preparing a monitoring submission the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook are required:

- the Board memorandum outlining contents of a submission for monitoring
- Form R3: ‘Year 11 Monitoring’
- Form R5: ‘Conditions Relevant to an Assessment Instrument’ or equivalent
- the sample student folios (as described in the following paragraphs)
- a copy of the school's accredited work program with Form R1 attached
- clean copies of assessment instruments with marking schemes or model responses where appropriate.

Folios of sample students:
- folios of sample students should demonstrate standards that are typical of student work of the standard at the particular level required. A minimum of five student folios must be included irrespective of the size of the Year 11 subject group, except where there are fewer than five students in the subject group.

Students who have received special consideration:
- the folios of students who have been given special consideration do not need to be submitted except where these students are part of small groups for which all folios are submitted
- schools may seek advice from review panels about students for whom special consideration has been made; in such cases, a supporting statement describing the difficulties faced by the student should be enclosed.

If there are more than five students in the subject group:
- the submission is to include the folio of the student whose achievement is closest to the middle of each level of achievement in which students have been placed (the mid-range sample).

If there are more than five students in the subject group but there are no students achieving one or more of the levels of achievement:
- the submission is to include the folio of the student who has been placed closest to the middle of the levels of achievement (mid-range samples) and the folio of the top student in the subject group—include folios of other students from the subject group until five folios have been included.

When compiling the monitoring submission complete the following steps:
- select the sample students
- gather and collate in a folio the work of each selected student
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio correspond with the assessment instruments described in the assessment section of the school's accredited work program
- ensure that the student profile of each selected student is up to date and corresponds with the sample in the work program
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio match those listed on each student profile
- ensure that the criteria stated in the syllabus are evident in the student profile
- clearly identify each folio to be presented with a letter code (A ... E)
- write on a Form R3 the school name and code allocated by the Office of the Board (school codes are shown in the annual address list of Queensland senior schools); write the subject name and code allocated by the Board; write the name of the Board district for the school and the review panel code of the review panel for the subject (review panel codes are provided to schools annually by memorandum)
- indicate by writing the letter code (A ... E) on the interim relative achievement section on the left-hand side of Form R3 the standard reached in each interim level of achievement by the selected students
- write the number of students in the subject at the end of Year 11
- write in the ‘School comments’ section brief comments that the school believes are necessary to convey to the review panel information relating to the context in which learning and assessment occurred in the subject in the school
- have the Form R3 signed and dated by the principal
- remove the quadruplicate of the Form R3 and retain for school records
- provide other information in any student folio that will assist the review panel in matching criteria and standards with student work
- where there are fewer than five students in the subject group, include all student folios in the submission.
Preparing a verification submission

The information that follows is provided to assist teachers who are required to prepare verification submissions. In preparing a verification submission the following materials (available from the Office of the Board) in addition to this handbook are required:

- the Board memorandum outlining contents of a submission for verification
- Form R6 ‘Year 12 Levels of Achievement—School Proposal’
- Forms R5 ‘Conditions Relevant to an Assessment Instrument’
- folios of sample students (as described below)
- a copy of the school's accredited work program with Form R1 attached
- clean copies of assessment instruments with marking schemes or model responses where appropriate.

Folios of sample students:
- folios of sample students should demonstrate standards that are typical of student work of the standard at the particular level required. A minimum of nine student folios must be included irrespective of the size of the Year 11 subject group, except where there are fewer than nine students in the subject group.

When compiling the verification submission, complete the following steps:
- select the sample students
- gather and collate in a folio the work of the selected students
- ensure that the student profiles of selected students are up to date and complete
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio correspond with those stated in the assessment section of the school's accredited work program
- check that the assessment scripts provided in each student folio match those listed on each student profile
- ensure that the criteria stated in the school's accredited work program can be matched with sample students' work
- clearly identify each folio to be presented with a letter code (A ... I)
- write on a Form R6 the school name and code allocated by the Office of the Board (school codes are shown in the annual address list of Queensland senior schools); write the subject name and number, and name of the Board district for the school, and the review panel code of the review panel for the subject (schools are notified annually of subject and review panel codes)
- indicate by writing the letter code (A ... I) in the ‘October’ column of the relative achievement section of the Form R6 the appropriate placement of the selected students in each level of achievement
- complete the ‘October’ column of the relative achievement section of the Form R6 by indicating the appropriate placement of all students in each level of achievement in the subject group receiving a Senior Certificate at the end of the year regardless of whether the students have completed 1, 2, 3 or 4 semester units of study in the subject
- complete the ‘Initial School Proposal’ section on the Form R6
- consider providing other information for any student folio which will help the review panel in matching criteria with student work
- have the Form R6 signed and dated by the principal
- remove the quadruplicate of the Form R6 and retain it for school records.

If there are more than nine students in the subject group, the submission is to include the folios of:
- the top student in the subject group
- the student who is placed closest to the middle of each level of achievement (mid-range sample)
- the student who is placed closest to the lower threshold of all levels (threshold samples) except Very Limited Achievement
- complete all steps listed in the section above.

If there are more than nine students in the subject group but there are no students achieving one or more of the five levels of achievement, the submission is to include the folios of:
- the top student in the subject group
- the student who is placed closest to the middle of each level of achievement (mid-range sample)
- the student who is placed closest to the lower threshold of the level (threshold samples) except Very Limited Achievement
- other students from the subject group until at least nine folios have been included; these other folios are to be selected, where possible, from those students who are placed in the Very High Achievement, High Achievement and Sound Achievement bands
- complete all other steps as outlined above.

If there are nine or fewer students in the subject group, include all student folios in the submission.

Check that the work of all students is labelled clearly so that the review panel is able to match assessment instruments in the folio with those listed in the school’s accredited work program, and with results recorded on the corresponding student profile.

Students who have received special consideration:
- the folios of students who have been given special consideration do not need to be submitted except where these students are part of small groups for which all folios are submitted.
- schools may seek advice through the review system about students for whom special consideration has been made; in such cases, a supporting statement describing the difficulties faced by students should be enclosed.
### Preparing a verification submission for state review panel consideration

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to prepare a verification submission **for state review panel consideration**.

A verification submission **for state review panel consideration** is required only where agreement has not been reached with the district review panel. The submission is to contain:
- the complete submission to the verification meeting
- any additional information or materials that the school believes would help the state review panel in its judgments
- the original, duplicate and triplicate of the Form R6
- an explanation of why it has not been possible to reach agreement with the district review panel.

### Preparing a submission for random sampling

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a random sampling submission.

In submitting work for random sampling, ensure that the following are included:
- copy of the accredited work program for the subject
- a set of the summative assessment instruments used in the school’s determination of exit levels of achievement, with details of conditions of assessment attached
- information regarding marking schemes
- exit folios of student work for the students requested, with completed student profile attached, but **with the level of achievement masked**.

Do not include the Form R6 with the submission.
Forward the submission to the district board centre.

### Developing and preparing a work program for a board-registered subject

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit a work program in a board-registered subject.

In preparing the work program, check that staff of the school consider that the requirements as stated on the Form R2 (blue) have been met, that the work program is relevant to student needs and that it:
- is not in an area covered by a study area specification
- has sequential page numbering
- satisfies minimum time requirements for study and assessment
- has a logical framework that can be seen in a contents page
- has a statement of relevant objectives written in terms of student achievement
- includes a sample, completed profile of student achievement
- deals with the principles of criteria- and standards-based assessment, the guidelines for quality and equity in assessment, and the principles for decision making in special consideration cases
- provides opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course
- has been edited by staff of the school other than the primary author to meet the standards of an important school document
- has been audited by staff of the school other than the primary author as meeting the requirements outlined in this section of the handbook.
Amending a work program in a board-registered subject

The information that follows is provided to assist staff in schools who are required to develop, prepare and submit an amendment to an accredited work program in a board-registered subject.

When developing and preparing an amendment to an accredited work program in a board-registered subject, ensure that the proposed amendment:

- is integrated into a single congruous whole work program
- is explained; that is, reference is made to the purpose of the amendment and the precise location or locations of text changes in the work program (include page numbers etc.)
- is submitted in a timely way such that it may be accredited in the semester prior to implementation
- includes only learning experiences that reflect the stated course objectives and are appropriate for the different stages of development of students at different times in the course
- maintains a balanced assessment program with a range of assessment instruments and techniques that are appropriate to the course objectives and learning experiences
- provides clear information about the conditions under which assessment is planned to be implemented
- provides opportunities for students to meet the standards in each criterion of the course.
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Appendix D

Calculating OPs: The Basic Principles
OVERALL POSITIONS (OPs)

WHAT IS AN OP?

OPs provide a statewide rank order of students based on their achievement in Authority subjects taken for the Queensland Senior Certificate. They tell how well students performed in their Senior studies when compared with the performance of all other students in the State. These comparisons are complicated by the fact that different students take different subjects and attend different schools.

‘OP’ stands for ‘Overall Position’. The term ‘overall’ refers to ‘over-all-subjects’ — that is, the student’s average performance across the subjects taken. It also refers to ‘over-all-students’ — that is, comparing all students in the State. The term ‘position’ emphasises that OPs indicate a rank order. Each student receives a single Overall Position. This should be referred to as an ‘OP’, not an ‘OP score’ since it is not a score, simply a position in a rank order (first, second, third, etc.).

There are 25 Overall Positions (OPs), from OP1 (highest performance) to OP25 (lowest performance). This means that many students receive the same position. That is, each OP represents a band of students.

HOW ARE OPs USED?

OPs are intended for use in tertiary selection. They are used by most tertiary institutions as one basis for making selections among applicants for a course when there are more eligible applicants than quota places for that course. There is no requirement for tertiary institutions to use OPs in selection and many alternative grounds for selection are used — for example, auditions, portfolios, interviews and, in the case of non-school-leavers, alternative qualifications. It is also possible for school-leavers to enter some tertiary courses, generally courses in vocational education and training, without an OP. However, OPs provide the most equitable way of comparing overall achievement in Authority subjects among school-leavers.

WHO RECEIVES AN OP?

To gain an OP, a student must study a certain number of Authority subjects and satisfy other requirements. The basic eligibility requirement is 20 semester units of credit in Authority subjects with at least three subjects taken for four semesters. Each completed semester of a subject gives a student one unit of credit; studying a subject for four semesters gives four units; taking five subjects for four semesters gives 20 units. The other requirements are completion of Year 12 and sitting for the Queensland Core Skills (QCS) Test. In special cases, such as illness, these other requirements may be waived.

The restriction to Authority subjects is based on their acceptance as appropriate preparation for university studies, especially in terms of their emphasis on ‘academic’ content and skills. Many students choose to be ineligible for an OP through the number of Authority-registered subjects they take.

HOW ARE OPs CALCULATED?

The calculation of OPs begins with the results students obtain in the subjects they have studied. Results in each subject studied are reported on the Senior Certificate in terms of five ‘levels of achievement’: Very High Achievement; High Achievement; Sound Achievement; Limited Achievement; and Very Limited Achievement. These results are awarded according to specified standards for each level of achievement and are verified through a process of statewide moderation in each subject.

However, each level of achievement covers a range of achievement and these results are too broad for calculating OPs. For these calculations, finer grained comparisons of student achievement are necessary. These finer grained comparisons are provided by the Subject Achievement Indicators (SAIs). Only students who are eligible for an OP are awarded SAIs; students who are ineligible for an OP are not awarded SAIs and are not included in any of the OP calculations.
WHAT ARE SAIS?

An SAI is a number which shows one student’s achievement in relation to the achievement of other students in that subject in that school. Each OP-eligible student is awarded an SAI for each subject studied. The group of students studying a particular subject in a particular school is called a ‘subject-group’.

For large subject-groups (14 students or more studying that subject in that school), SAIs range from 400 (highest performing student in that subject in that school) to 200 (lowest performing student in that subject in that school). This range of numbers from 400 to 200 is used simply to compare the achievement of students in the subject-group.

For small and intermediate subject-groups (fewer than 14 students), SAIs are expressed in terms of ‘level’ (level of achievement) and ‘rung’ (on a ladder of ten equal steps within the level of achievement) — for example, HA6. Small and intermediate subject-group SAIs are scaled differently from large subject-group SAIs.

The subject-group SAIs show the student ranking (‘order’) from highest to lowest and also the relative separations (‘gaps’) between students in that subject in that school. That is, students with similar achievement have SAIs which are close together and students with dissimilar achievement have SAIs which are further apart. Students whose achievement is of the same standard are allocated the same SAI.

In awarding subject-group SAIs, levels of achievement (VHA, etc.) are determined first. The SAIs must be consistent with those levels of achievement. That is, a student with a lower level of achievement cannot be ranked ahead of a student with a higher level of achievement. However, students with the same level of achievement may be awarded very different SAIs if the quality of their achievement is very different. Also, it is possible for some students with different but adjacent levels of achievement to be fairly close together.

HOW DO STUDENTS FIND OUT THEIR SAIS?

Schools are encouraged to provide students with provisional SAIs some time before the end of Year 12 so that there are no last minute surprises. As an accountability mechanism, schools are required to display the final SAIs for every subject so that students can check that their results accord with their expectations. Students and their parents are encouraged to examine these SAIs and discuss any queries they may have with their teachers and their school administration.

SCALING

Schools submit their subject-group SAIs to the Queensland Studies Authority which then undertakes all the scaling calculations leading to OPs.

There are two stages of scaling: the within-school stage and the between-school stage.

FIRST STAGE OF SCALING: THE WITHIN-SCHOOL STAGE

How are subject-groups compared within each school?

The purpose of the first stage of scaling, the within-school stage, is to make it possible to compare the achievement of students in one subject in the school with the achievement of students in other subjects in the school. For this we need a standard baseline of comparison. This baseline of comparison is provided by the Queensland Core Skills (QCS) Test. This test is designed to measure achievement on the Common Curriculum Elements (CCEs) underpinning Authority subjects, independent of specific subject content. Scores on this test provide a measure of achievement across the curriculum and can be used as a basis for comparing different groups of students.

There is another measure of achievement across the curriculum for each student within a school. This measure is derived directly from the SAIs (by interpreting these results as ‘wins’ and ‘losses’ against other students in the school in a type of round-robin tournament). This measure is called the Within School Measure (WSM).

The WSM is used to determine the emphasis to be placed on each student’s QCS Test score in the scaling. If a student’s performance on the QCS Test is different from that student’s overall within-school subject achievement (indicated by the WSM), then it is the overall subject achievement which is taken as more valid and the QCS Test performance is discounted — that is, contributes less to the group calculations. Consequently, for example, a student who has an off-day on the test, for whatever reason, does not affect the validity of the scaling for subjects taken by that student. So too, for example, a student who performs well on the test but has not achieved well in school does not thereby contribute an unfair “boost” to other students in subjects taken by that student.

In the within-school stage of scaling, the average and spread of the subject-group SAIs are re-set (scaled) to that group’s average and spread of performance on the QCS Test. That is, the range of subject-group SAIs is mapped onto the range of scores obtained by those students on the QCS Test. These new numbers are referred to as the scaled SAIs. This is illustrated in Display 1. The relative ‘order’ and ‘gaps’ are retained; only the scale is changed. This change involves sliding (the average is lower) and shrinking (the spread is smaller) the set of SAIs. Because the statewide range of scaling scores derived from the QCS Test runs from about 75 to about 275 (technically: mean=175; mean difference=25), the scaled SAIs for any single subject-group will lie typically within this range.
How are small and intermediate subject-groups scaled?

The standard scaling process is inappropriate for small subject-groups, as there are insufficient data and the results would be unstable. Small subject-groups (fewer than ten students) are scaled by comparison with all large subject-groups in that subject (or similar subjects) in the State. For every large subject-group in the subject in the State, the scaled SAI boundary values relating to each level of achievement are found. These boundary values are then averaged across the State to produce a table of boundary values for small subject-groups. The small subject-group ‘level’ and ‘rung’ SAIs are then inserted between these boundary values to produce small subject-group scaled SAIs directly.

SAIs for intermediate groups (10 to 13 students) are scaled by both small subject-group and large subject-group methods and the two results are averaged.

How is a single rank order calculated within each school?

Once the SAIs have been scaled to produce the scaled SAIs, they can be compared across all subjects within a school. Scaled SAIs show how well each student has performed when compared with the overall performance of all other students in the school. Scaled SAIs only allow comparison of achievement between subjects within a school and do not allow comparison of achievement between schools within a subject.

To produce a single rank order of students within the school, an Overall Achievement Indicator (OAI) is calculated. This is the average result across each student’s ‘best five subjects’. ‘Best’ means best scaled SAIs. ‘Five subjects’ is shorthand for ‘20 semester units of credit’, though for most students this means ‘five subjects’ each taken for the full four semesters. However, students may take some subjects for one, two, three or four semesters and their results need to be used in proportion to the number of semesters.

In calculating the OAI, subjects count equally. To emphasise this, the calculations are actually based on the best ‘100 weighted semester units of credit’ where every subject is given a weight of ‘5’. That is, all scaled SAIs are multiplied by 5.

What does an OAI represent?

The Overall Achievement Indicator (OAI) is an average (across the best five subjects, or best 20 semester units or best 100 weighted semester units). In other words, it indicates how well each student has performed across the Years 11 and 12 curriculum of Authority subjects compared with all other students in the same school. That is, the OAI indicates a rank order, with relative separations or ‘gaps’, for all OP-eligible students within the school. It shows their overall achievement relative to all other students in the school regardless of the combination of subjects each student took.
THE SECOND STAGE OF SCALING:
THE BETWEEN-SCHOOL STAGE

How are the school rank orders compared across schools?

The first stage of scaling produces a single rank order within each school given by each student's OAI. The second (between-school) stage of scaling allows these rank orders to be compared across all schools. For large schools (more than 19 students) the average and spread of the OAI's for each school are re-set (scaled) to the average and spread of QCS Test scores for all the students in that school. The emphasis to be given to each student’s QCS Test score again depends on its agreement with that student’s WSM. The calculation of scaled OAI's is similar to the calculation of scaled SAIs. This time the group is all OP-eligible students in the school, not just the OP-eligible students in one subject, but the principle is the same.

For small schools (fewer than 16 students) there is no second stage of scaling, that is, scaled OAI's = OAI's. For intermediate schools (from 16 to 19 students) a combination of small school and large school methods is used. The emphasis given to each method depends on the number of students.

Scaled OAI's provide a single rank order for the whole State. These scaled OAI's compare each student with all other students in the State regardless of their combination of subjects and regardless of the school attended.

How are OP bands determined?

Scaled OAI's place students in a single rank order across the whole State. However, they are calculated to a greater degree of precision than it is reasonable to report. Therefore, students are 'banded' so that students who have performed very similarly are not falsely reported as being very different. Banding also ensures that the results are relatively stable and not vulnerable to minor uncertainties in subject results.

The cut-off for each OP is set each year so that there is approximate comparability with the standard of performance required to reach that OP in the previous year. This means that OPs are directly comparable from year to year.

IMPORTANT THINGS TO REMEMBER

- Scaling is not a substitute for moderation. Scaling is not concerned with comparing results within a subject across schools. In fact, the scaling process assumes that the subject results are already well moderated.
- In all the calculations for OPs, only those students eligible for an OP are included. Ineligible students are not included in any of the calculations. They will not receive any SAIs.
- Students who are ineligible for an OP may sit for the QCS Test and receive a QCS Test grade on their Senior Certificate. Their QCS Test result will not, however, be included in any scaling calculations.
- A student's own QCS Test result contributes to the calculation of group averages and spreads but does not directly contribute to that student's OP.
- Top and bottom students in each subject in each school are arbitrarily assigned 400 and 200 respectively regardless of their actual level of achievement. This is simply a standard way of capturing the 'order' and 'gaps' for those students.
- SAIs are displayed within each school but are not otherwise publicly available. It is meaningless to compare large-group SAIs across schools since they are on an arbitrary scale (400–200 for all subjects in all schools).
- Scaled SAIs, OAI's and scaled OAI's are also not publicly available since they are merely interim results in the calculation process and have no useful meaning outside that process. Only the OPs are reported as these are the only interpretable and justifiable outcome of the calculations.
- OPs cannot be predicted accurately from levels of achievement. One reason is that levels of achievement provide only a broad measure of achievement whereas OPs are based on finer comparisons (provided by the SAIs).
- Two students in the same school studying exactly the same subjects and obtaining exactly the same SAIs will receive the same OP.
- Schools may have very different proportions of students in each OP band. These proportions depend on the achievement of the students. There is no predetermined allocation of OPs to schools. OPs are awarded to students, not to schools.