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Foreword

Queensland’s system of externally moderated, school-based assessment for Years 11 and 12 involves processes which rely on a network of 50 state and 450 district review panels. Over 4000 experienced teachers work as panellists, peer reviewing other teachers’ judgments about the achievements of students to ensure they are accurate and comparable. This confidence and trust in the professional judgments of teachers about the quality of student work is at the heart of our system of assessment.

This document is a collation of reports prepared by state review panel chairs, in consultation with Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority officers, on the moderation process for each Authority subject offered by schools in 2014. The reports provide a useful summary of the:

- implementation status of the syllabus
- assessment requirements and features of the syllabus
- application of achievement standards
- resources available to support implementation of the syllabus.

I encourage teachers and discipline experts to reflect on the information in these reports to ensure school assessment practices remain consistent with the processes of externally moderated school-based assessment in Queensland.

Chris Rider
Chief Executive Officer
Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies — B31

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies 2009 syllabus is in its fifth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment provided opportunities for students to engage with the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus and to demonstrate the full range of syllabus standards.

Technique 1: Multimodal presentation

This technique requires students to provide supporting documentation of the research process (syllabus, p. 32). The most effective instruments required:

- consent forms, transcripts or recordings of interviews as evidence of observing cultural protocols when working with Indigenous communities
- a referencing convention for research notes or journals that acknowledged the sources used
- annotated research notes, journals or bibliographies demonstrating application of the criteria recommended by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Handbook 2010 (p. 48) for evaluating sources
- evidence of time management through directions such as progress checkpoints or presentation of draft responses to monitor student progress.

Technique 2: Learning log

This technique requires students to reflect on the contexts and processes of critical inquiry (syllabus, p. 32). The most effective logs had the following qualities:

- an expectation of a range of contexts including time, place, land, language and relationships (syllabus, p. 10) as evidence of points of view, perspectives and constructions of knowledge
- a requirement that the log demonstrate analysis, synthesis and evaluation of sources rather than just recalling or paraphrasing information or comprehension activities.

Technique 3: Extended written response

This technique requires students to respond to a research question or hypothesis through a continuous piece of prose writing (syllabus, p. 33). The most effective instruments demonstrated:

- use of accessible language that made the task clear for all students
- use of cues and prompts that narrowed the scope or scale of the response required
- an expectation of appropriate in-text referencing to facilitate consideration of points of view and perspectives over time
- a requirement that Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural protocols be applied to the response developed.
Technique 4: Additional assessment formats

The most effective examples of this technique required knowing and understanding the histories, societies and cultures of Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islander peoples through test items that balanced Indigenous views of knowledge.

Application of standards

There was significant agreement about the application of standards to evidence in sample folios, supporting the on-balance judgments made by schools when awarding standards in each dimension.

Where evidence was not matched to syllabus standards it related to:

- **Dimension 1: Knowing and understanding** at Standard A. Student responses demonstrated knowing and understanding of policies and practices that impact on Indigenous peoples in ‘local and national contexts’ aligning to Standard B rather than ‘local, national and global contexts’ at Standard A.

- **Dimension 2: Managing and processing through critical inquiry** at Standard C. Students demonstrated ‘some basic analysis and synthesis of sources of information’ at Standard D rather than ‘rudimentary analysis, synthesis and attempted evaluation of some sources of information for quality and validity’ at Standard C.

Support

Support materials for the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies 2009* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Information relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives in the senior phase of learning is available on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/3034.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/3034.html).

Lesley Latu  Jackie Dunk
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Accounting — B12

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Accounting 2010 syllabus is in its fourth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment provided opportunities for students to engage with the dimensions and general objectives and to demonstrate the full range of syllabus standards. Schools provided opportunities to demonstrate the objectives of the course in assessment instruments by:

- developing instrument-specific standards matrixes, which involves selecting specific objectives relevant to the task and removing objectives that are not relevant. The objectives are made instrument specific by contextualising the standards using topic information in the task

- providing multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate a standard for each objective in each dimension

- integrating opportunities for knowledge to be demonstrated through procedural practices tasks when assessing the dimension: Knowledge and procedural practices. When assessing the objective identify, describe and explain accounting terminology, concepts and procedures in relation to relevant accounting practices (syllabus, p. 2), knowledge should be demonstrated through the practical processes (objectives two and/or three) being assessed

- considering the match of subject matter in the core and elective studies with the two procedural practices objectives for the dimension Knowledge and procedural practices. Applying fundamental accounting concepts to record and process accounting data and transactions (objective 2) could include the preparation of journals, ledger accounts, payroll registers, inventory cards, depreciation schedules and asset registers. Selecting and organising data to prepare accounting reports (objective 3) could include the preparation of aged accounts receivable, trial balance, income statement, balance sheet, bank reconciliation statement, and cash flow statement and cash budget

- providing comprehensive stimulus for students to analyse accounting data and/or information and to develop reasoned arguments to justify conclusions, decisions, judgments and recommendations for the dimension Interpretation and evaluation. Stimulus may include a variety of accounting documents, financial reports and details of procedures in relation to relevant accounting practices based on a real/simulated business situation. Analysis includes interpreting the accounting data and information and expressing it in words, expounding the meaning of the data and information

- specifying a mode and purpose of communication for extended responses when assessing the third objective for the dimension Interpretation and evaluation. Communication includes the development of a range of communication forms, clarity of expression and logical exposition, understanding the use of technical terms, use of correct spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of referencing techniques (syllabus, pp. 24–25). Students are required to communicate accounting information using a variety of modes which could include business letters, emails, memoranda, short reports, formal reports, articles, graphs and charts, multimodal presentations, seminars, business meetings, interviews, podcasts, videos or web pages
• providing a problem for students to solve for the dimension Applied practical processes. For example, this may involve a situation that is new to students, the correction and annotation of accounting records that are not correct, or a written explanation in response to a given problem

• applying complex concepts and related reasoning and skills to organise, process and report accounting information for the dimension Applied practical processes. Tasks will require students to take a number of complex aspects of a topic and synthesise them to prepare database reports and outcomes.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific standards descriptors drawn from the syllabus standards.

• Schools are generally making appropriate decisions about levels of achievement, using instrument-specific standards matrices to indicate student achievement of the syllabus dimensions, being clear to identify the specific objectives being assessed, and using the syllabus standards descriptors. This is a process of matching the qualities of the student responses with the syllabus standard descriptors.

• Section 5.6, Requirements for verification folio (syllabus, p. 19), indicates that each dimension must be assessed at least twice for verification. Consequently, students may achieve results at two different standards.

• Schools make an on-balance judgment about which standard best matches the quality of a student’s work (syllabus, p. 30). Results are not averaged; rather, the student’s achievement in each objective across the folio is considered, not the overall standard in each dimension, on each instrument.

• When making judgments for the first objective of the dimension Interpretation and evaluation, thorough and effective analysis results in students analysing a complete situation and meeting the assigned purpose (Standard A), while a detailed analysis will include attention to detail (Standard B). Interpretation of relevant data and information requires students to include data and information from the stimulus in their response and to explain the meaning of the data and information in relation to the situation (Standards A and B).

Support

Support materials for the Accounting 2010 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

• syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/11034.html

• assessment advice through the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

• work program requirements, checklist and sample work programs at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/11034-wp.html.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Judy Beausang  Lynda Galway
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Aerospace Studies — A39

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Aerospace Studies 2011 syllabus is in its third year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments were designed to allow opportunities for students to engage with the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus. Assessment packages provided sufficient opportunity for students to demonstrate the full range of standards across all dimensions. The assessable dimensions are Knowledge and understanding, Interpretation and communication and Critical thinking.

Evidence at verification indicated that assessment instruments and instrument-specific criteria sheets typically addressed the objectives, language and the standards of the syllabus.

When an extended written response is used for the supervised written assessment technique, it is recommended that only one item be included (syllabus, p. 16). This will allow students to demonstrate the full range of standards for an extended written response.

Appropriate scaffolding guides students towards demonstrating the objectives of the syllabus. For example, some schools accompanied each of the standards being assessed in the assessment instrument with annotated notes to assist students in developing a succinct response.

Effective assessment instruments showed close alignment between the task requirements and the syllabus’s recommended response lengths and ensured that the task requirements could be met within the recommended syllabus guidelines (pp. 19–21).

In the multimodal assessment technique, at least two different modes are used from the following:

- visual
- electronic
- physical
- audio and/or spoken.

Each of these modes significantly contributes to the presentation of the assessment instrument. Where spoken or multimodal modes are the focus of the assessment instrument, the items are designed to allow students to demonstrate the full range of standards. The spoken or multimodal response is the focus for assessment decisions; however, supporting documentation is required to substantiate decisions for moderation purposes (syllabus, pp. 23 and 25). Supporting documentation may be generated by the teacher or the student. For example, students may provide planning documentation, scripts, a storyboard or slides with presentation notes, while the teacher may provide annotated notes on student responses or use a checklist.

The mandatory aspects of the syllabus require all four areas of study to be assessed at exit. These areas are Aeronautics and astronautics, Aviation operation, Safety management systems, and The business of aviation and aerospace (syllabus, p. 13).
Application of standards

Judgments about the student achievements are made by matching the evidence in the student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus standards (p. 28). To give the students opportunities to produce responses that demonstrate syllabus objectives across the full range of syllabus standards descriptors, assessment instruments should use the language of the objectives and standards descriptors of the syllabus.

The standard awarded is an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each dimension. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension (syllabus, p. 27).

When standards have been determined in each of the dimensions, schools must use the ‘Awarding exit levels of achievement’ table (Section 4.8.1 of the syllabus) which indicates the minimum combination of standards across the dimensions for each level of achievement for each standard.

Support

Support materials for the Aerospace Studies 2011 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/17016.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Kevin Abraham  
State Review Panel Chair

Russell Sky  
Senior Education Officer
Agricultural Science — A21

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Agricultural Science 2007 syllabus is in its final year of implementation. In 2015, the Agricultural Science 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students.

Assessment design

Sample folios identified that schools are continuing to design assessment tasks that show variety while successfully supporting their curriculum. Assessment tasks make good use of school and regional resources and as a result, the Agricultural Science syllabus is being creatively and effectively implemented in all urban, regional and rural areas.

The extended writing tasks and extended agricultural investigations generally provided sufficient opportunity for the students to demonstrate the full range of standards across all the general objectives (syllabus, pp. 28–29).

When developing extended writing tasks or extended agricultural investigations, schools consider the length of the student responses required to complete the task and ensure that the task requirements meet syllabus guidelines (syllabus, p. 26).

Exams should be designed to provide greater opportunity for students to demonstrate ‘detailed recall, description and in-depth explanation’, ‘effective application in a wide range of familiar situations’, ‘consistent and effective interpretation and analysis of complex problems and issues’ and ‘detailed evaluation and synthesis of a wide range of information and concepts to produce extensively supported viewpoints, scenarios and/or proposals’ (syllabus, pp. 28–29).

When developing effective assessment it is essential to match assessment criteria with the standards associated with exit (syllabus, pp. 28–29) and to ensure that criteria sheets are task-specific by eliminating irrelevant descriptors. This will ensure that all tasks allow the student to demonstrate the full range of standards in the objectives assessed. If marks are being used to assign a level of achievement, it is imperative that they be linked back to the standards associated with exit.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in the student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus. Moderation processes identified high levels of comparability across the state. Information gathered at comparability will be used to inform the 2015 quality assurance procedures and processes.

Where evidence was not matched to syllabus standard descriptors, it was commonly related to the Problem solving objectives. The A-standard descriptors for Problem solving require evidence of thorough and efficient planning and organisation of activities; consistent and effective interpretation and analysis of complex problems and issues; and the detailed evaluation and synthesis of a wide range of information and concepts to produce extensively supported viewpoints, scenarios and/or proposals.
Support

Support materials for the *Agricultural Science 2013* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Panel training will be conducted in 2015 focusing on looking for evidence to support the syllabus standards.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Jacqui Schiller  Colleen Palmer  
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Ancient History — B38

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Ancient History 2004 syllabus is in its tenth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Moderation processes provided evidence of effective assessment design for each of the four categories of assessment. When developing instrument-specific standards matrixes, the genre and topic might be specified but the key language of the standards descriptors should not be altered. Where two assessment instruments are drawn from one inquiry, the subject matter for each task should be different.

Category 1: Extended written response to historical evidence

Assessment in this category requires students to address an unseen question or statement using sources provided by the teacher. Effective Category 1 questions are focused on a specific historical issue enabling students to develop succinct historical arguments in the recommended 600–800 words (syllabus, p. 54). While contextual information is often helpful in introducing a question, it should be clear to students what the question is. The selection of an appropriate range of sources is critical to enable students to engage effectively with Criterion 2 descriptors at the A and B standards. The range of sources needs to be manageable within the recommended 1½–2 hour timeframe (syllabus, p. 54). An appropriate range will allow students to work with a ‘diversity of primary and secondary sources’ (Criterion 2, Standard A). Some sources also need to be of sufficient complexity for students to identify implicit meanings, values and motives. For Year 12 the syllabus states that sources should be ‘contestable’ (p. 54).

Category 2: Written research tasks, and Category 3: Multimodal presentations

Students have engaged in a diverse range of investigations into the ancient world in Category 2 and Category 3 assessment tasks. Students may need to be encouraged to narrow the scope of their inquiries to enable them to produce an effective response in the recommended lengths. Evidence needs to be retained to substantiate judgments made about Criterion 1: Planning and using an historical research process, such as research questions, notes, reflections and planning. The four A-standard descriptors should inform the design of a research process. Evidence for Criteria 2 and 3 judgments will be found in the final response where students will demonstrate that they have formed and communicated historical knowledge.

Category 4: Additional test formats

A combination of shorter and some longer responses is appropriate for Category 4 test instruments. Very short items, such as map labelling or one-word answers, provide limited evidence to match to the standards. When Criterion 2 is assessed, developing some items that require students to work across a few sources provides good evidence for aspects of Criterion 2 such as ‘corroborate primary and secondary sources’ and ‘synthesises evidence from primary and secondary sources to justify insightful decisions’ (Criterion 2, Standard A). However, there is no expectation that students write an essay length response as part of Category 4 assessment. Essays written in response to a set of sources are Category 1 assessments.
Application of standards

Moderation processes provided evidence of a very high level of comparability across the state. An on-balance decision requires making a judgment for each criterion given the pattern of evidence across these descriptors. The focus is on what students can do. When making a level of achievement decision, teachers use the table Minimum requirements for exit levels of achievement in the syllabus (p. 61).

Criterion 1: Planning and using an historical research process

Judgments about standards for Criterion 1 must be based on the qualities of the evidence submitted, not the quantity. The aspects of inquiry (syllabus, p. 18) should be built into the research process. To evidence their application of the aspects of inquiry (third descriptor) students should show more than note taking; the thinking they do in response to the evidence they locate is just as important. Reflections (fourth descriptor) should be focused on the direction of and development of the inquiry.

Criterion 2: Forming historical knowledge through critical inquiry

The syllabus glossary (pp. 70–71) provides definitions of key terms used in the Criterion 2 standards such as corroboration, perspective, reliability and representativeness. There are three parts to this criterion, and the first descriptor includes a number of sub-points. When making a judgment about the third descriptor, attention is drawn to the qualifier that distinguishes A and B standard. A ‘reasoned’ decision (Standard B) is one where historical evidence is assembled to provide reasons to support a decision. An ‘insightful’ decision (Standard A) in one where the thinking about historical sources demonstrated for the first two descriptors (for example, about the influence of motives and perspectives, corroboration and reliability) is synthesised, evaluated and used to justify a decision.

Criterion 3: Communicating historical knowledge

There are three parts to Criterion 3. The first descriptor relates to the historical knowledge, the second descriptor, which has a number of sub-points, relates to how the historical knowledge is communicated, and the third descriptor relates to the response meeting the scope of the set task.

Support

Support materials for the Ancient History 2004 syllabus available from the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qca.qld.edu.au/2047.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qca.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Darlene Hill Lyn Sherington
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Biology — A06

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Biology 2004 (amended 2006 and 2014) syllabus is in its tenth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Evidence from moderation indicated that there was a wide variety in the design of assessment tasks across districts. This allowed for the demonstration of the full range of standards across all criteria.

Effective assessment instruments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement in the general objectives across the range of standards.

Assessment plans include Written tasks (WT) to provide much of the evidence for standards in the Understanding biology (UB) general objective. When designing written tasks to assess UB ensure students are provided with the opportunity to apply and link ideas, concepts and theories to explain phenomena in a range of situations.

In particular, students need to be provided with tasks that are both complex and challenging to demonstrate the A standard in UB. A task, which is complex, may involve a number of steps in applying knowledge to the task whilst challenge involves providing either unfamiliar or abstract tasks. Students might also be required to synthesise several biological concepts.

When assessing the Evaluating biological issues (EBI) general objective across the assessment package, the students must be provided with opportunities to:

• recognise relevant past and present scientific and social issues
• explain the explicit and implicit meaning of information selected from a variety of sources
• evaluate and assess the reliability, authenticity, relevance, accuracy and bias of the sources and methods of the collection of information
• justify decisions and develop future scenarios based on the interpretation and analysis of current information.

When designing tasks to assess EBI it is essential that a genuine ‘biological’ issue is used to give context to the task.

Application of standards

In the sample folios provided, evidence was found to support the judgments made by schools. The standard awarded was an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each criterion. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each criterion (syllabus, p. 23).

Some examples of instrument-specific criteria sheets were not reflective of the syllabus standards in sample folios. When developing instrument-specific criteria sheets, schools should ensure they align with syllabus standards.
When determining a standard for a general objective, schools should ensure that an on-balance judgment is made using all of the aspects of the general objective. For example, in EBI at the A standard there should be evidence of gathering, critically analysing and evaluating information and data from a variety of valid and reliable sources; integration of information and data to make justified and responsible decisions; and considering alternatives and predictions relevant in past, present and future biological contexts.

**Support**

Support materials for the *Biology 2004 (amended 2006 and 2014)* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Panel training was conducted in 2014 focusing on judgments and standards.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

James Brennan  
State Review Panel Chair

Colleen Palmer  
Senior Education Officer
Business Communication and Technologies — B28

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Business Communication and Technologies 2012 syllabus is in its second year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments provide opportunities for students to engage with the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus and to demonstrate the full range of standards. Opportunities are provided for students to demonstrate the objectives of the course in assessment instruments by:

- using the language of objectives (cognitive processes) to write assessment tasks (syllabus, pp. 2–3). Providing multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate each objective across the formative and summative year

- integrating business technology in authentic and meaningful ways including a range of applications evidenced in each semester and demonstrating increased complexity across the summative year (syllabus, p. 5). For example, using technology to produce; a business letter, calendar, brochure, vodcast, slide presentation, web page, spreadsheet reports, database reports, flowchart, info graphic, multipage report and feature article

- providing a range of stimulus materials from different sources (representing different stakeholders and their perspectives) to enable students to select data and information that is relevant and significant. Stimulus should also include irrelevant and insignificant information. Using graphic organisers (for example matrix, hierarchical diagram, flowchart, mind map or comparison table) to provide evidence of selecting, sequencing and organising relevant and significant data and information

- applying the inquiry approach to the implementation of research techniques. Research questions may be provided by the teacher or generated by the student. They should guide students to generate and/or collect primary and/or secondary data/information (for example, producing and implementing surveys, collating results into tables and graphs)

- focusing on depth of analysis, not breadth. Students are asked to interpret the data and information to identify, explain and analyse two or three significant issues. This requires students to identify (state) the issue, explain (what is) the issue, and analyse (examine/scrutinise the data/information) the issue

- stating the criteria to be used to evaluate business conclusions, decisions and recommendations for the dimension Evaluating business decisions. When students evaluate they assign merit using criteria. The criteria are usually selected by the teacher and must be relevant to the focus of the task and topic of study

- assigning each instrument a unique focus when assessing the same topic of study twice. For example, for the topic of study International business, the first assessment may focus on business dealings and the second on trade issues. This ensures different business terms, concepts, principles, data, information and issues are assessed by each instrument
• reducing scaffolding across the two-year course. Scaffolding is detailed the first time an assessment technique is implemented but in the summative year the scaffolding is reduced as students have developed the skills required for the assessment technique in the formative year.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus standards.

Across the state, there was significant agreement about the application of standards. When determining a standard for each dimension an on-balance judgment is made. This involves looking at the qualities of the student work for the objectives of the dimension and the match with the standards descriptors.

When determining an overall level of achievement, it is not necessary for students to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension. Folios in the lower range of an achievement level will typically demonstrate achievement at the lower standard in one dimension as shown on the table ‘Awarding exit levels of achievement’ (syllabus, p. 21).

Judgments are indicated on the instrument-specific criteria sheets, which include the objectives for each dimension being assessed. Objectives not being assessed by the assessment technique are removed.

To substantiate judgments for multimodal responses (research or extended-response techniques), supporting documentation is required for monitoring, verification and exit purposes. Supporting documentation may be generated by the teacher or the student. For example, students may provide planning documentation, scripts, a storyboard or slides with presentation notes, while the teacher may provide annotated notes on student responses or use a checklist.

Support

Support materials for the Business Communication and Technologies 2012 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

• syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18151.html
• assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html
• work program requirements, checklist and sample work programs at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18151-wp.html.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Rachel Jackson Lynda Galway
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Business Organisation and Management — B25

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Business Organisation and Management 2007 syllabus is in its final year of implementation. In 2015, the Business Management 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students.

Assessment design

Across the state, it was evident that schools are designing effective assessment instruments. Well-designed assessment provides opportunities for students to demonstrate a range of standards across each of the general objectives. Effective assessment instruments:

- clearly articulate instrument requirements including the format or genre of the required response
- include a variety of new and interesting information and communication technologies
- offer opportunities for students to provide evidence that meets syllabus conditions (syllabus, pp. 18–21)
- include instrument-specific standards matrixes developed to clearly align the task with the relevant standards descriptors.

Implications for the Business Management 2013 syllabus

There are a number of implications for assessment design in 2015:

- the flexibility of the Business Management 2013 syllabus provides schools with options to include areas of study in a range of contextual units. When the work program indicates that a number of areas of study are addressed, each area of study must be assessed at least once in the unit. There should be a different focus each time an area of study is assessed
- feasibility studies have replaced business plans. There are a number of significant differences in these assessment techniques
  - feasibility studies have specific requirements and are central to the strategic management of existing businesses or the strategic development of a start-up business (syllabus, p. 18)
  - the feasibility study gives students the opportunity to focus-in on a specific element of a business and explore it in some depth. For example, in a marketing feasibility study students could focus on one of the elements of marketing (pricing or product). By focusing on depth not breadth in the choice of topic, students are provided with opportunities to demonstrate the dimensions of the syllabus
  - it is not appropriate for terms to be defined or appendixes to be included
- examinations are either short-response tests or extended-response tests. Questions on short-response tests should be designed to enable students to respond within the range of 50 to 250 words per response. Extended-response tests require one response only (syllabus, p. 19)
• when group tasks are undertaken, instruments must be designed so that teachers can validly assess the work of individual students and not apply a judgment of the group product and process to individuals. For example, students may undertake research as a team with individual responses produced as a result.

Application of standards

Decisions about levels of achievement are made according to syllabus information and using syllabus standards descriptors.

There was agreement in all districts regarding the application of standards. When awarding a standard in each criterion, an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student work matches the standards descriptors is made. In other words, it is not necessary for evidence to match with every descriptor for a particular standard in each criterion. Folios in the lower range of an achievement level will typically demonstrate achievement at the lower standard in one criterion as shown on the table ‘Awarding exit levels of achievement’ (syllabus, p. 37).

Support

Support materials for the Business Management 2013 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

• syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20320.html
• assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html
• work program requirements, checklist and sample work programs at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20320-wp.html
• teaching resources at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20320-teaching.html.

Panel training will be conducted in 2015.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Brad Greene Beryl McLachlan
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Chemistry — A44

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Chemistry 2007 (amended 2014) syllabus is in its seventh year of implementation.

Assessment design

It was evident that the majority of schools are continuing to design effective assessment instruments which provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the three assessable general objectives across the full range of standards. When developing assessment instruments consider:

- ways of designing the instrument such that access to general objectives is available at all levels
- how to ensure alignment between what a question in a Supervised assessment is asking and the criteria assigned to the question. For example, Knowledge and conceptual understanding (KCU) ‘linking and applying’ is sometimes mismatched with Investigative processes (IP) ‘systematic analysis’ or Evaluating and concluding (EC) ‘analysing and evaluating’. Evaluating and concluding questions need to involve more complex analysis and evaluation of interrelationships and justification of conclusions when exploring scenarios. Chemistry concepts must be used to justify all conclusions or recommendations
- opportunities to assess the full range of standards; where Investigative processes is assessed in a supervised assessment opportunities are usually limited, so consider presenting data in different formats to students, such as tables, graphs and diagrams
- how the extended experimental investigation (EEI) can provide the opportunity for students to gather sufficient valid data to systematically analyse to identify relationships between patterns, trends and anomalies
- how students can demonstrate the Chemistry concepts they know and understand. There was a large variety of types of extended-response tasks (ERT) seen in the samples. Students must have the opportunity to respond to a question, circumstance or an issue. The majority of topics allowed students the opportunity to meet syllabus requirements to interpret, analyse and synthesise data, and to then evaluate and justify ideas
- the match of instrument-specific criteria sheets with the syllabus standards descriptors; these sheets need to be closely aligned with the terminology used in the syllabus standard descriptors to ensure the reliability of application of the standards in identifying correctly the evidence in student responses.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus standards. Evidence was found to support most of the decisions relating to the match of qualities of student responses in sample folios to the syllabus standards.

Information gathered at comparability will be used to inform the 2015 quality assurance procedures and processes.
Where evidence was not matched to syllabus standards, it related to:

- not using the standards descriptors as stated, by substituting words; in general, application of Knowledge and conceptual understanding standards are reasonably consistent
- the practice of dividing the descriptors into parts and making judgments against parts of a standard rather than the entirety; there are some concerns with the application of standards for Investigative processes in supervised assessment items, particularly formulating a justified hypothesis to inform design; students must demonstrate formulation of justified significant questions/hypotheses that inform effective and efficient design, refinement and management of investigations in order to achieve the standard (the A standard for analysis of data in Investigative processes requires systematic analysis of data to identify relationships, and this is problematic when the data sample is very small or the drawing a graph is all that is required
- the aggregation of grades; all evidence presented, including non-attempts, needs to be considered.

**Support**

Support materials for the Chemistry 2007 (amended 2014) syllabus available from the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Trevor Jones  
State Review Panel Chair

Susan Scheiwe  
Senior Education Officer
Chinese — B03

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Chinese 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation. The Chinese Extension 2011 syllabus is in its third year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: Listening and Reading tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should not distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a barbeque is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- Listening texts are different from Reading texts. Listening texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word. ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. Listening texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than Listening texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: Speaking and Writing tasks

- Speaking and Writing tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students’ demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, Speaking and Writing are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All Speaking tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For Writing tasks, online dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 300 characters is completed by the end of Year 12 (syllabus p. 43).

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course.

Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.
When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.

In a combined task for Chinese Extension 2011, a clear link is needed between the stimulus material and the texts produced by students.

Support

Support materials for the Chinese 2008 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Winnie Edwards-Davis  
State Review Panel Chair

Lester Ford  
Senior Education Officer
Dance — B19

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Dance 2010 syllabus is in its third year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments provide opportunities to gather information about the extent to which students demonstrate achievement of the objectives of the syllabus. The assessable dimensions are Choreography, Performance, and Appreciation. Effectively designed assessment instruments make the task requirements clear and explicit and use the language of the syllabus objectives and standards.

Schools have used a variety of ways of constructing assessment instruments to gather evidence on or before the due date.

Choreography

Effective Choreography tasks require students to select, manipulate, structure and integrate dance components and skills in a context that allows for the demonstration of A-standard qualities such as ‘discerning selection’ and ‘sophisticated integration’ (syllabus, p. 30). Choreography tasks provide opportunity to demonstrate the objectives and standards when they specifically require students to develop a statement of choreographic intent at the beginning of the choreographic process. The student documentation requirements outlined in the syllabus require students to state their intent and explain their choices and manipulation of the dance components and skills to support their intended focus (syllabus, p. 22).

Performance

Effective Performance assessment instruments include a brief statement outlining the choreographic intent. This statement helps students understand the technical and expressive aspects of the task, and clearly outlines the task requirements and parameters.

The selection of danceworks should allow students to demonstrate their ability in the criterion. The choreographed sequence or repertoire performed should provide challenge appropriate for the stage of the course with effective Performance tasks ensuring that both teacher- and student-choreographed sequences are of appropriate challenge and complexity (syllabus, pp. 27 and 28).

Simplistic danceworks may not allow students to demonstrate the range of dance components and skills or portray stylistic or expressive aspects, whereas highly complex danceworks could be beyond the student’s technical or expressive skills or ability. For example, some types of musical theatre or post-modern works may not include sufficient complexity in their integration of movement components.

In Performance assessment, schools may make reasonable adjustments to assessment for students who require special provisions. Conditions may be adjusted by, for example, varying the audience for the performance or adapting the repertoire to provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate different dance components and skills while ensuring the level of challenge is maintained.
Appreciation

Effective Appreciation assessment instruments use the language of the objectives and specifically require students to ‘analyse, interpret and evaluate with justification’ (syllabus, p. 31) rather than ‘discuss’ or ‘comment on’. Effective tasks usually have one succinct question that directs students to focus on certain dance components, such as the use of motifs and form, which can be addressed in the required word length (syllabus, p. 25). The question and scaffolding provided allows students to demonstrate the Standard A qualities by allowing for ‘discerning analysis’ and ‘insightful interpretation’ as well as ‘discerning use of terminology’.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the qualities in the responses with the standards descriptors. The standard awarded was an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each dimension. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension (syllabus, p. 29).

When making judgments at exit, post-verification assessment contributes to the evidence in the student folio and the on-balance decision. This assessment provides additional information in a dimension rather than replacing earlier responses in the folio.

Where schools make reasonable adjustments to the conditions under which tasks are undertaken, judgments are made using the syllabus standards. Standards can be applied for Choreography even if students cannot perform their own choreography. Schools make judgments using evidence such as student notes, diagrams or having others perform their choreography.

Schools consider judgments related to the mandatory aspects of the course, which include the general objectives of Choreography, Performance, and Appreciation. For example, in Performance, ‘students develop and demonstrate dance components and skills to interpret and communicate a choreographic intent in danceworks from differing contexts’ (syllabus, p. 3). Therefore, in order to demonstrate the exit standards for a four-semester course, students need to perform more than one dancework, each in a different context.

Support

Support materials for the Dance 2010 syllabus on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/10700.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Helen Mullins Shauna Bouel
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Drama — B22

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Drama 2007 syllabus is in its final year of implementation. In 2015, the Drama 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students.

Assessment design

Assessment instruments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the objectives across the range of standards when tasks match the syllabus guidelines, state the conditions of assessment, use the language of the objectives and clearly describe what students are to do.

In order for students to have opportunities to demonstrate the syllabus objectives, particularly at the A–C standards, instruments and task descriptions must address the range of dramatic languages including skills of performance or skills of drama, style(s) and their conventions, text and dramatic context for a dramatic purpose.

Forming

Assessment in the Forming objectives is effective in providing opportunities for students to demonstrate syllabus objectives when the instrument selected and the task design allows students to demonstrate the required cognition and is matched with appropriate subject matter from the teaching and learning program selected in the school’s work program. Tasks are effective when they match syllabus requirements for conditions, and students are provided with challenging stimulus material to allow the demonstration of the Standard A descriptors.

Clearly worded task descriptions that specifically indicate the dramatic context, target audience, relevant style, conventions and the purpose of the drama provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the Forming objectives. The documentation required to support teacher judgments should be clearly described in the task. This documentation may include DVD evidence.

Practical directing tasks are effective when they focus on managing elements of drama and conventions of styles to shape dramatic action and create dramatic meaning rather than actors’ warm-ups and games. Directing a published playscript provides opportunities for students to demonstrate the full range of standards.

Presenting

Student-devised Presenting tasks are effective when the student-devised playscript or performance text are completed and quality assured in sufficient time to allow students to polish, refine and rehearse prior to performance. This allows students to demonstrate the Presenting objectives, which are the focus of this type of assessment. Choice of text or playscript allows students in Year 12 equitable opportunities to demonstrate the objectives across the range of standards and match the syllabus conditions for time.
Responding

In appraising live theatre, students are required to analyse, interpret dramatic action and meaning, and present a justified position selecting relevant techniques, conventions and elements of drama to justify their statements. Effective Responding tasks are in response to live or filmed live dramatic action and provide appropriate stimulus for students to make a judgment about the effectiveness of dramatic action in communicating dramatic meaning. The performance viewed provides the opportunity for students to analyse the style or use of conventions that are the focus of the Responding question. When students respond in oral or multimodal modes, effective tasks require a response to dramatic action, enable students meet the required conditions and ensure the collection of evidence to support judgments.

Application of standards

Students demonstrate the higher standards in Responding when they evaluate how successfully dramatic languages are manipulated to create dramatic action and meaning. They use drama terminology and applied language skills to communicate the information. In analysing, interpreting, synthesising and evaluating, students appraise the production and select relevant techniques and conventions from the production to justify statements and a position about dramatic action and meaning.

When making judgments at exit, post-verification assessment contributes to the evidence in the student folio and the on-balance decision. It provides additional information in a dimension rather than replacing any earlier responses in the folio. Post-verification responses can be appropriately matched to standards when the assessment instruments are appropriate for the stage of the course. When students are offered a choice of dimension, they should have the opportunity to demonstrate qualities not yet demonstrated and maintain a balance across the dimensions. Evidence is required to support judgments and decisions at each stage of the course, including monitoring, verification and exit.

On-balance judgments can be supported when schools provide appropriate evidence of student achievement including documentation of practical tasks particularly in the Forming dimension. When DVD evidence is provided to support judgments, the samples chosen match the required assessment conditions. In Presenting, this requires a continuous recording capturing the sample student for the required performance length rather than separate sections, which contribute to a performance. Recorded samples clearly identify the sample student, with the marked standards matrix, task sheet and playscript with the student’s role highlighted. When recordings of performances fail, judgments may be supported using rehearsal footage.

Support

Support materials for the Drama 2013 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20325.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Debb Wall
State Review Panel Chair

Shauna Bouel
Senior Education Officer
Earth Science — A07

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Earth Science 2000 syllabus is in its fourteenth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Across the state, there was evidence of the implementation of effective assessment instruments that provided opportunity for the demonstration of the general objectives of Knowledge, conceptual understanding and application, Working scientifically and Using information scientifically. A range of assessment tasks including extended laboratory-based and/or field-based investigations, extended investigation other than those based in the laboratory or field and written tests provided a balance and opportunities for students to demonstrate a full range of exit criteria and standards.

Extended investigations other than those based in the laboratory or in the field, provide opportunities for students to demonstrate all general objectives except those related to implementing investigations in field and laboratory settings and the collection of primary data. However, extended laboratory or field-based investigations provide students with opportunities to plan investigations, identify and use scientific techniques and collect and organise primary data.

Application of standards

Appropriate school judgments were made on-balance across submissions and folios. Novel assessment tasks used criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus to enable matching of qualities of student work and provide evidence to support school judgments.

Evidence of A-standard responses in Working scientifically can best be exhibited within student work when the assessment tasks provide a range of opportunities for students to demonstrate each of objectives. These include that a student:

- recognises and identifies investigation questions for a range of problems including those that are novel and/or complex
- plans a range of scientific investigations of problems including many with elements of novelty and/or complexity
- implements investigations using scientific techniques and following procedures safely and correctly
- records and organises relevant information logically and systematically
- assesses and critically evaluates the validity and adequacy of qualitative and quantitative data.

While some objectives in the Working scientifically criterion were adequately addressed, judgments became more difficult to support when limited opportunities were given for students to demonstrate the objectives. Standard A judgments could be substantiated where there was evidence of student responses that consistently ‘recognises and identifies investigation questions for a range of problems including those that are novel and/or complex’ and ‘plans a range of scientific investigations of including many with elements of novelty and/or complexity’ (syllabus, p. 32).
Support

Support materials for the *Earth Science 2000* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Panel training, focusing on judgments and standards was conducted in 2014.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Dianne Nichols  
State Review Panel Chair

Colleen Palmer  
Senior Education Officer
Economics — B29

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Economics 2010 syllabus is in its fourth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Moderation processes identified that the majority of assessment instruments were designed effectively. As a result, most assessment packages were able to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the dimensions and general objectives of the syllabus (pp. 3–4) across the full range of standards. Effectively designed assessment instruments also allowed students to demonstrate their use of the key economic ideas for core and elective topics within the syllabus (pp. 9–13).

The supervised written assessment technique is used to assess student responses that are produced independently, under supervision and in a set timeframe (syllabus, p. 24). For verification folio requirements, there must be an extended response written under supervised conditions and in response to stimulus. The question is unseen (syllabus, p. 28). When varied stimulus material accompanies the assessment instrument, opportunities are provided for students to select and organise data and information from sources, and examine data for completeness, relevance, accuracy and bias to determine validity (Dimension 2: Investigation). Opportunities may also be provided to demonstrate general objectives within Dimension 1: Knowledge and understanding and Dimension 3: Synthesis and evaluation.

In terms of the research assessment technique, most assessment instruments incorporated an inquiry approach (syllabus, p. 17) and required students to locate and use information beyond data that they were given (syllabus, p. 26). This provided opportunities to select and organise information from sources, examine data and analyse economic relationships (Dimension 2: Investigation). It also provided opportunities for student work to demonstrate the appraisal of economic ideas and the communication of information through sequencing subject matter to convey economic meaning (Dimension 3: Synthesis and evaluation).

In addition, the most effective supervised written and research assessment instruments allowed students to be able to respond within the conditions stated in the syllabus (pp. 24–28). When stimulus materials are used, they should be succinct enough to allow students to engage with them. If the stimulus materials are lengthy, complex or large in number they may need to be shared with students prior to the administration of the assessment (syllabus, p. 24).

Application of standards

Standards are described in the same dimensions as the general objectives within the Economics 2010 syllabus. This is evident in the standards matrix (syllabus, pp. 31–32).

In the majority of sample folios provided, there was evidence to support the judgments made by schools. The standard awarded was an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each dimension. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension (syllabus, p. 29).
Where there was an issue with on-balance judgments, this was often associated with the evidence within the sample folios related to Dimension 2: *Investigation*. Standard A responses for this dimension have characteristics such as discerning selection, thorough and coherent organisation of data and information from a comprehensive variety of sources, as well as the analysis of complex economic relationships through the reasoned interpretation of patterns, data and information (syllabus, p. 31). However, for this to be demonstrated, scaffolding provided on assessment instruments should not specify or lead the student through a series of steps dictating a solution (syllabus, p. 28).

**Support**

Support materials for the *Economics 2010* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Karen Swift                                      John Langer
State Review Panel Chair                      Senior Education Officer
Engineering Technology — A18

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Engineering Technology 2010* syllabus is in its fourth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Schools have developed a diverse range of assessment instruments that are embedded in and relevant to local contexts across the state. The syllabus requires that each dimension is assessed at least twice in Year 12 before verification (syllabus, p. 26).

The technical engineering report provides an opportunity for students to achieve across all three syllabus dimensions and to apply the engineering design process to solve an engineering design challenge. Effective task design encourages students to interpret and analyse engineering knowledge and data, and to propose engineering solutions to a range of problems within an engineering context. Solutions to engineering design problems take the form of prototypes that are tested and evaluated with the aim of communicating conclusions and recommendations (syllabus, p. 24).

Extended-response tasks assess students’ application of higher-order cognition and may be used in association with the technical engineering report. Students may be involved in expressing and justifying a point of view, explaining and evaluating an issue, or the application of concepts or theories to a circumstance. When designing an extended-response task, the syllabus conditions associated with this assessment technique should be met. Multimodal responses to an extended-response task require the provision of supporting documentation to substantiate school decisions relative to the application of standards for monitoring, verification and exit purposes.

Supervised written assessment could be used to demonstrate student achievement across the three syllabus dimensions. Effective assessment design for short responses that involve calculations should include student demonstrations of problem solving through interpreting and analysing a situation in order to calculate a solution. Throughout the state, schools have developed supervised written assessment instruments that provide students with opportunities to demonstrate the full range of standards descriptors across the three syllabus dimensions.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific standards matrixes or criteria sheets drawn from the syllabus criteria and standards.

Across the state, levels of achievement decisions were appropriately applied using the syllabus requirements for determining exit levels of achievement. It was evident that schools were appropriately matching student responses within sample folios to syllabus standards descriptors across all three dimensions.
Where evidence did not support school judgments of the match of qualities of student responses with descriptors, it was commonly related to the technical engineering report and the differentiation of A and B standards descriptors for Dimension 2: *Investigative and analytical processes of:*

- efficient and mathematically validated engineering solutions based on engineering principles and techniques are proposed
- solutions are analysed in depth and detail from multiple perspectives to identify relevant engineering principles
- optimal prototypes and/or models that validate solutions are developed and refined.

Engineering reports that require students to validate their solutions mathematically facilitate an in-depth analysis and validation of optimal prototypes. Additionally, effective engineering report tasks provide students with opportunities to provide evidence of comprehensive evaluation and valid, well-reasoned conclusions and recommendations based on investigations (syllabus, p. 31).

**Support**

Support materials for the *Engineering Technology 2010* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Tony Muller Brad Walmsley
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
English — B45

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *English 2010* syllabus is in its third year of implementation.

Assessment design

Assessment instruments should provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the relevant objectives for all three dimensions. Effective instruments are carefully contextualised in terms of purpose and audience to provide opportunities for students to use genre patterns and conventions, establish roles and relationships, use textual features for particular purposes, and create and evaluate meaning. Assessment design should be informed by the syllabus length and time guidelines.

Schools should consider whether the scope of assessment allows students to demonstrate the objectives across the range of standards. For example, requiring students to analyse a full-length novel, two Victorian poems and a contemporary media text in a 4–5 minute spoken response might limit opportunities for students to demonstrate both discerning selection and synthesis of substantive subject matter. Likewise, selection of genre should be guided by syllabus guidelines on length. A letter to the editor of a popular culture magazine, for example, is unlikely to align with the guidelines for Year 12 written responses of 800–1200 words.

Assessment should not be so prescriptive as to limit opportunities for students to exploit genre patterns and conventions or manipulate roles and relationships. Specifying the generic features of a conventional short story for example, might discourage students from experimenting with nonlinear narratives or other literary devices and could affect opportunities for them to demonstrate subtle and complex creation of representations of concepts, identities, times and places or discerning use of aesthetic features.

Instrument-specific standards matrixes align with instrument demands and should include objectives from each of the dimensions that relate to the task. Schools should contextualise standards to align with instrument requirements, but should not change the objectives or qualitative descriptors. For example, if students are required to analyse and evaluate how Shakespeare represents particular ideas, attitudes and values about family in *Hamlet*, schools might add ‘Shakespearean texts’ or ‘Hamlet’ to the *evaluating meaning* objectives in Dimension 3. Likewise, if students are required to create their own attitudes about family in a reflective spoken response, schools might substitute ‘reflective speech’ for ‘texts’ in the *creating meaning* objectives.

Decisions about including relevant objectives for Dimension 3 should be made by determining the focus and purpose of the instrument. The analytical exposition in response to the in-depth study of a complete literary text will assess student analysis and evaluation of the meaning (ideas, attitudes and values communicated by perspectives and representations of concepts, identities, times and places) in the specified literary text. Teachers make judgments about student use of generic and textual features by matching evidence in the response to the relevant objectives in Dimensions 1 and 2.
If students are creating or constructing meaning (ideas, attitudes and values) in their own texts, then relevant *creating meaning* objectives are included. Imaginative responses should provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the *creating meaning* objectives in Dimension 3 that require them to use ideas, attitudes and values, create perspectives and representations and use aesthetic features for purposes.

Persuasive or reflective texts might assess either *evaluating meaning* or *creating meaning*. In order to select the relevant objectives, teachers should determine if students are analysing meaning in another’s text or creating meaning in their own texts. For example, a feature article that requires students to analyse how a political cartoonist has communicated attitudes about a particular issue would require students to analyse how ideas, attitudes and values are used to influence audiences by evaluating the representations of concepts, identities, times and places in the cartoons. The *evaluating meaning* objectives would be appropriate to the task. Likewise, if students are required to deliver a campaign speech where they represent their version of leadership, they would use ideas, attitudes and values and create perspectives and representations of concepts, identities, times and places. The *creating meaning* objectives would be appropriate to this task.

**Application of standards**

In making judgments about student achievement, schools match qualities of student responses with the syllabus dimensions and standards descriptors. When making decisions about qualities in responses matched to syllabus standards, teachers consider the whole descriptor. For example, in Dimension 1, students *use* genre patterns and conventions to *achieve* purposes. In Dimension 3, students *use* aesthetic features to *achieve* purposes.

The standard awarded is an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s response match the standards descriptors overall across the three dimensions. It is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard. On-balance judgments are made by matching evidence in student responses with syllabus standards, taking into account that there may be qualities in the responses that match with more than one standard.

Relative achievement decisions at verification and exit are made by looking for the extent to which standards descriptors have been achieved across the three dimensions at a threshold, typical, or better-than-typical standard.

The minimum requirements for Sound Achievement are applied only at exit from a four-semester course. Decisions about achievement for students who exit after one, two or three semesters are made by matching available evidence in relation to the objectives covered to the stage of the course, with the particular standards descriptors related to those objectives. To be awarded Sound Achievement or above, students who exit after four semesters must meet or exceed the minimum requirements for Sound Achievement in both written and spoken modes.

The evidence across all written responses is to be considered independently of the evidence across the spoken responses to confirm that minimum requirements have been met. Teachers should match the evidence of all written or spoken responses with the qualitative descriptors in Section 5.8.2 of the syllabus in order to make an on-balance judgment about the match of all the evidence in that mode with each descriptor. Once the minimum requirements have been confirmed for both modes, schools make relative achievement decisions as described above.
Support

Support materials for the *English 2010* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the ‘Senior moderation hub’ tab on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

In 2014, panel training was conducted in the thirteen districts.

Edna Galvin  Jo Genders
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
English Extension — B37

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *English Extension 2011* syllabus is in its third year of implementation with Year 12 students.

Assessment design

Syllabus dimensions and objectives inform the design of effective assessment instruments. The three dimensions are closely interrelated, involve iterative processes, and describe the complex thinking that students use when working with literary texts and theoretical approaches in their study and responding to assessment. The three assessment instruments must meet the requirements specified in the assessment overview (Section 4.6 of the syllabus) and provide complementary coverage of the syllabus objectives and mandatory requirements.

Assessment instrument 1 requires students to produce two distinct texts: a reading of a selected literary text and a defence of that reading. Alone, these texts do not allow sufficient opportunities for students to engage with the range of objectives across the standards and students must be made aware of the different purposes of these texts. Readings are produced when students make meaning of a text by applying interpretive or meaning-making strategies associated with particular theoretical approaches. Direct and indirect references to the selected text are required as part of a reading. The defence requires students to analyse their own reading, and explain how the theoretical approach used has allowed them to make meaning of the text in particular ways. The defence analyses and evaluates the chosen theoretical approach used to produce the reading.

Assessment instrument 2 requires students to select a literary text suitable for a complex transformation. They select and apply aspects and strategies from theoretical approaches to intervene in the base text and construct a complex transformation. This intervention should make apparent alternative and/or resistant readings other than those the base text seems to invite. The defence must form a symbiotic relationship with the complex transformation through its explication of its clearly identified components in Section 4.6 of the syllabus.

Assessment instrument 3 requires students to select at least one complex literary text and at least two theoretical approaches to apply to the text(s). Students use these theoretical approaches to produce a close reading of the selected text(s) to explore a focus question. This focus question must allow them to evaluate how effective these theoretical approaches have been in producing a close reading. An effective focus question will be:

- refined
- specific
- clearly enunciated
- purposeful
- underpinned by insightful consideration of appropriate literary theory
- the result of initial reading around this topic
- the basis for an evaluation of literary theory (as opposed to literary analysis of a text).
Choices underpinning the selection of literary theory/theories for this task should be informed by the requirement for the exit folio to provide a body of work that allows students to apply and evaluate different theoretical approaches. Literary texts must be sufficiently complex to sustain depth of analysis, and the application and evaluation of the effectiveness of the selected theoretical approaches. Teacher support for this task will be primarily focused at a theoretical level and may involve guiding students in developing and refining the focus question.

Application of standards

In making judgments about responses, schools match the qualities of the work with the syllabus standards. When making decisions about qualities in responses matched to syllabus standards, teachers consider the whole descriptor. For example, in Dimension 1, students apply different theoretical approaches to produce interpretations of literary texts. In Dimension 3, students evaluate theoretical approaches used to produce interpretations.

The standard awarded is an on-balance judgment about the best match to the syllabus standards descriptors across the three dimensions. It is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a judgment of a particular standard to be made.

Relative achievement decisions are made by looking for the extent to which standards descriptors have been achieved across the three dimensions at a threshold, typical, or better-than-typical standard. On-balance judgments made at exit are decisions about student achievement in all the dimensions across the assessment implemented over the course.

Exit decisions are based on the evidence in folios demonstrating achievement of syllabus objectives across a two-semester course of study. Each dimension must be assessed in each instrument; each dimension makes an equal contribution to the exit levels of achievement.

Responses to the three assessment instruments all contribute evidence to exit level of achievement decisions. All three responses are summative and represent the fullest and latest information about which the exit standards may be applied.

Support

Support materials for the English Extension 2011 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/17601.html
- resources including Approaches to Reading Practices to support implementing this subject at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/17601-teaching.html

In 2014, panel training was conducted for district and state review panels.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the ‘Senior moderation hub’ tab on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Tony Hytch                Jo Genders
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Film, Television and New Media — B40

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Film, Television and New Media 2005* syllabus is in its ninth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Moderation processes provided evidence that schools had developed a range of effective assessment instruments allowing students to demonstrate the general objectives of the course.

The key concepts are integral to Film, Television and New Media. Specific advice on assessing the key concepts is provided in the syllabus (pp. 29–33). Careful consideration needs to be given during task design to the selection of the most appropriate key concepts to be assessed. Assessment was most effective in offering opportunities to students when one to three key concepts were selected and explicitly stated as part of the task descriptor.

A *Design* suite is two preproduction formats (syllabus, p. 30). Careful consideration should be given to the preproduction formats that are most suitable for the context of the task. The conditions table (syllabus, pp. 37–40) recommends times for preproduction formats. Some of the time conditions are quite broad to allow for flexibility in school decisions about tasks. It is recommended that schools should select conditions that reflect the specific task students are being asked to undertake, especially if the *Design* task leads to a *Production* task.

Some *Design* formats require students to use explicit film and television language. Storyboards that are effective contain specific information relating to technical (shot type, camera angle, camera movement, lighting, transition device) and audio codes (dialogue, music, sound effects) required for a sequence of shots rather than just descriptions of narrative.

In *Critique*, students apply the key concepts to analyse and evaluate products and their contexts of production and use. Effective *Critique* tasks have a clear focus and provide students with the opportunity to analyse and evaluate moving image media. Tasks are written to focus students on demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the key concepts selected. Students using research should also acknowledge their sources in text and through a bibliography.

Group production tasks should clearly reflect the conditions (syllabus, p. 41) and should specify whether students are assessed in formal roles or informal roles. Time codes shown by adding a student’s name as a title are helpful to identify the individual student’s contribution to the group product, especially if they are sharing formal roles. No matter how the production task is set up, the individual’s contribution to a group product needs to be clear and explicitly stated.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus.

There was significant agreement across the state about the application of standards. When awarding a standard, an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student work match the standards descriptors is made. Where there were issues with on-balance judgments, it was generally associated with the B standard across all three criteria.
The syllabus exit standards describe the characteristics of the general objectives and the qualifiers distinguish the standards from A–E. Instrument-specific criteria sheets should reflect the syllabus standards and include the key concepts being assessed.

It is not necessary for students to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each criterion. Folios in the lower range of an achievement level will typically demonstrate achievement at the lower standard in one criterion as shown on the table ‘Awarding exit levels of achievement’ (syllabus, p. 47).

**Support**

Support materials for the *Film, Television and New Media 2005* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Keri Church  
State Review Panel Chair

Beryl McLachlan  
Senior Education Officer
French — B02

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The French 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation. The French Extension 2009 syllabus is in its fifth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: Listening and Reading tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should neither distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a barbeque is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- Listening texts are different from Reading texts. Listening texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word. ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. Listening texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than Listening texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: *Speaking* and *Writing* tasks

- *Speaking* and *Writing* tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students’ demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, *Speaking* and *Writing* are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All *Speaking* tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For *Writing* tasks, online dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 200 words is completed by the end of Year 12 (syllabus p. 35).

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course.

Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample Standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.

When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.
Support

Support materials for the *French 2008* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Clayton Forno  
State Review Panel Chair

Lester Ford  
Senior Education Officer
Geography — B34

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Geography 2007 syllabus is in its seventh year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments were designed to allow opportunities for students to engage with the general objectives of the syllabus and to demonstrate the full range of standards.

Short-response tests

Short-response tests that best facilitated demonstration of Criterion 1 across the range of standards had the following qualities:

- recall of geographical and spatial knowledge as the cognition, rather than comprehension or interpretation of information
- alignment across the test to the four key questions of geographical inquiry where a recall component was involved
- coverage of a range of the key ideas of the focus units being assessed
- recall of information relating to case studies across a range of scales and geographical contexts
- items requiring paragraph-length responses, providing opportunity for thorough and comprehensive recall of geographical information including spatial information.

Stimulus response essays

The most effectively constructed essays had the following attributes:

- an appropriate quantity of stimulus and a question of sufficient scope and scale for responses across the range of standards, given the time and word length conditions of the task
- a question that separated analytical processes and decision-making processes. Cues prompted students to identify and explain geographical patterns and relationships and predict impacts before they evaluated proposals and made a justifiable decision
- stimulus that modelled geographic conventions with minimal written information
- stimulus that supported both analytical and decision-making processes.

Practical exercises

The most effective instruments had the following qualities:

- questions requiring at least two different data manipulation techniques of sufficient rigour that responses demonstrated highly effective presentation of information
- sufficiently complex datasets that when manipulated, allowed students to identify and explain patterns, complex relationships and anomalies.
Where Criterion 3, *Decision-making processes* was assessed, sufficient supplementary material was provided so that students could comprehensively and thoroughly evaluate strategies and justify decisions.

**Reports**

The most effective reports had the following qualities:

- a requirement that a variety of data collection techniques be used in the field so that data could be presented in ways beyond just photographs and maps, adhering to geographic conventions
- discrete sections where data collected was analysed before proposals were evaluated and a justifiable decision made
- a requirement that maps, diagrams and statistics be annotated and integrated into the body of the report to demonstrate how they relate to analysis.

**Application of standards**

There was significant agreement about the application of syllabus standards to the evidence in sample folios, supporting the on-balance judgments. Responses provided evidence from across the range of topics and assessment techniques.

Where evidence was not matched to syllabus standards it related to:

- **Criterion 2: Analytical processes** at Standard B — geographical patterns and processes were ‘identified and explained’ at Standard C but not with ‘detail’ required for Standard B and ‘simple relationships’ were identified and explained at Standard C rather than ‘simple and complex’ relationships at Standard B
- **Criterion 4: Research and communication** at Standards B and C — there should be evidence of ‘integration of maps, diagrams and statistics showing some adherence to geographic conventions’ at Standard C and ‘effective integration that mostly adheres to geographic conventions’ at Standard B. Expression should be ‘mostly clear and use basic language and geographic conventions’ at Standard C, with ‘clear expression using appropriate language and geographic conventions’ at Standard B.

**Support**

Support materials for the *Geography 2007* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Russell Smerdon  Jackie Dunk
State Review Panel Chair (Acting)  Senior Education Officer
German — B03

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The German 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation. The German Extension 2009 syllabus is in its fifth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: Listening and Reading tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should neither distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a barbeque is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- Listening texts are different from Reading texts. Listening texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word.

  ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. Listening texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than Listening texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: Speaking and Writing tasks

- Speaking and Writing tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, Speaking and Writing are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All Speaking tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For Writing tasks, online dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 200 words is completed by the end of Year 12 (syllabus p. 36).

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course.

Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample Standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.
When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.

Support

Support materials for the German 2008 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/4910.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

John Barker
State Review Panel Chair (Acting)

Lester Ford
Senior Education Officer
Graphics — A13

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

This is the final year of implementation for the Graphics 2007 syllabus. The Graphics 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students in 2015. The process of work program approval is progressing well.

Assessment design

Schools have developed a wide and varied range of contextually based assessment instruments that have provided opportunities for students to demonstrate the syllabus general objectives. Where opportunities were limited, schools should:

- ensure scaffolding allows students the opportunity to demonstrate Standards A and B across the syllabus criteria
- develop assessment that encourage students to focus on planning and producing graphical solutions suitable for a specified target audience
- develop context-based folios which provide opportunities for the documentation of the reasoning behind the planning, refinement and production stages of the implementation model (syllabus, p. 28)
- ensure students have the opportunity in context-based folios to provide documentation of the reasoning behind the planning, refinement and production stages of the implementation model as well as the evaluation of all these stages; this aligns with the planning, analysis, evaluation and refinement aspects of the Reasoning criterion as outlined in the standards associated with exit criteria (syllabus, p. 31).

Implications for Assessment design in the Graphics 2013 syllabus

Students should be provided with the opportunity in their design folios and extended-response tests to explore design options and develop a graphical product. ‘Graphical products are produced as the outcome of a design problem’ (2013 syllabus, p. 11).

A key element in the design exploration process is students developing design criteria for the design solution and graphical product, without which students cannot demonstrate A or B standards in the Evaluation criterion (2013 syllabus, p. 19).

The extended-response test provides an opportunity for students to demonstrate objectives in all three dimensions as they respond to a design problem for a target audience. There must be an unseen component but stimulus material may be supplied prior to the test. In year 12 students need to:

- identify and describe suitable design criteria (for the solution and graphical product)
- demonstrate analysis and interpretation of graphical and design information
- develop and communicate their ideas using a range of graphical representations (with annotations)
• synthesise their ideas to develop solutions
• produce a graphical product — this can be in the form of a high-quality sketch (2013 syllabus, p. 9)
• provide an evaluation of design and graphical representations.

The design folio will include an extended response developed as a result of exploring the design problem, including a design brief that outlines what will be undertaken during the design process, explaining how the solution to the design problem will be solved, and establishing the design criteria upon which the solution and graphical products will be judged (2013 syllabus, p. 19).

The design of the graphical product for a ‘particular audience and purpose’ (2013 syllabus, p. 7) is a key aspect of the syllabus. It is important to give students the opportunity to make decisions about the particular audience and how to best meet their needs with the graphical product. The 2013 syllabus provides important advice regarding the structure of the Design folio (Section 4.5.2) and the appropriate Design problems (Section 3.4.1).

Assessment tasks used for the Graphics 2007 syllabus will need to be significantly redesigned to meet the requirements of the Graphics 2013 syllabus.

Support

Support materials for the Graphics 2013 syllabus on the QCAA website include:

• syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20321.html
• assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html
• work program requirements, checklist and sample work programs at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20321-wp.html
• sample assessment products at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20321-assessment.html
• teaching and learning, including information on composite classes at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/201321-teaching.html.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Wayne Van Den Bos Russell Sky
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Health Education — A19

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Health Education* 2010 syllabus is in its fourth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments provide explicit task directions that require students to address one specific health problem. This enables students to focus their investigation and provides opportunities for demonstration of the full range of syllabus dimensions and standards. In addition, local health issues will provide the opportunity to utilise contextually-specific data and information to inform decisions (syllabus, p. 24).

Effective assessment tasks allow students to apply new information and address differentiated task requirements across sequential tasks. Tasks that require students to repeat information, analysis or synthesis limit opportunity for students to be discerning and insightful (Standard A).

Tasks that require students to develop and justify a decision tend to provide better opportunities for analysis and justification than tasks that provide the decision and ask students to critique or implement it. Government policy and existing practice can be used as a source of evidence within tasks to allow opportunity for purposeful selection of substantial subject matter, rather than task directions requiring a critique of government policy. Critiques of existing policy or practice do not draw on primary data or evidence and can limit opportunity to demonstrate ‘description of facts, concepts and information, including primary and secondary data’.

Identification, collection and analysis of primary data should be explicitly prescribed in task directions. The representation of primary data need not be statistical. Other options include (but are not limited to) observational, notational and anecdotal data. The significance of primary data to the health issue should be established in the health issue statement and task directions. Primary data is particularly relevant in tasks that establish a community context. Such tasks require the students to develop decisions that are relevant to their own community. Synthesis of primary data with interpretation of health theories, concepts and strategies allows students to conduct ‘discerning and thorough analysis of relevant information’ leading to comprehensive ‘justification of recommendations, conclusions, strategies and actions’.

The significance of primary data is informed by:

- Section 3.2.4 Process of Inquiry (syllabus, p. 6)
- Section 3.3 Core theories, concepts and strategies (syllabus, p. 8)
- Section 5.5 Assessment techniques (syllabus, pp.15–20).

Secondary data and evidence is also important, especially in the evaluation of issues and justification of decisions. Synthesis and evaluation of evidence-based practice with interpretation of health theories, concepts and frameworks will provide students the opportunity to demonstrate ‘critical evaluation’ based on ‘discerning and thorough analysis of relevant information’.

Selection of health frameworks within the syllabus should be guided by:

- Section 3.3: Core theories, concepts and strategies (syllabus, p. 8)
- Appendix 1: Concepts of Health Education (syllabus, p. 30).
Scaffolding should allow students the opportunity to address all dimensions at all levels. Tasks that provide extensive and prescriptive scaffolding tend to limit opportunity for effective selection, discerning communication and insightfulness. Tasks should provide scaffolding that allows individuality in interpretation and application of information and frameworks.

**Application of standards**

When making judgments about the extent to which students have demonstrated the general objectives of the course, the syllabus standards descriptors are used. Across the state, there was significant agreement regarding the appropriate application of standards and evidence in sample folios that substantiated on-balance judgments made by schools.

Where there was an issue with on-balance judgments, it was generally associated with the evidence of Dimension 2: *Application and analysis*. The Standard A in this dimension requires discerning and thorough analysis of relevant information, including primary and secondary data on health issues. In addition, it requires insightful interpretation and application of relevant theories, concepts and strategies. Evidence of this dimension is best demonstrated within student responses when current and relevant information is used in analysing the health issue.

**Support**

Support materials for the *Health Education* 2010 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality-assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html)

Shane Roberts  
State Review Panel Chair

Glenn Amezdroz  
Senior Education Officer
Home Economics — A25

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Home Economics 2010* syllabus is in its third year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments are designed to allow opportunities for students to engage with the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus and to demonstrate the full range of syllabus standards. Opportunities are provided for students to demonstrate the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus by succinctly and clearly defining the task using the language of the objectives and explicitly requiring demonstration of an objective; for example, ‘analysis of relevant information’ or ‘evaluation of evidence’.

Assessment instruments are accompanied by an instrument-specific standards matrix that includes descriptors selected from the exit standards that match the objectives being assessed. For example, evidence about ‘description of procedures’ is best gathered in practical performance rather than supervised written assessment and this descriptor is removed if it is not assessed in a supervised written assessment. Only syllabus standards descriptors are used; other descriptors should not be added. For example, where the syllabus standards descriptor says ‘from a variety of sources’, this should not be changed to, for example, ‘relevant information on the sustainability issue’ since this changes the meaning of the descriptor.

Effectively designed assessment instruments offer students the opportunity to examine and explore significant aspects of the key concepts, which includes the wellbeing of individuals, families and communities. Effective scaffolding assists students to access the task without limiting opportunity or prescribing the outcome, allowing opportunities to demonstrate A standards. Giving students scope and choice in issues or design challenges offers an authentic and engaging opportunity for learning. The scope of the issue is considered so that the task is achievable in the syllabus word limit.

Successful supervised written instruments assess Dimension 1: *Knowledge and understanding* and aspects of Dimension 2: *Reasoning and communicating processes*, that is, one, two or three objectives. This technique provides opportunities for Dimension 1 when questions ask students to describe and explain significant information and apply relevant key concepts from the unit. Dimension 2 objectives are effectively assessed in this technique when the questions and stimulus material provided allow students to ‘analyse significant and relevant information’ or to be ‘discerning’ or ‘detailed in the evaluation of the evidence’ provided as stimulus. Articles and lengthy readings are best provided before the exam and time included in the conditions.

Effective research tasks are based on issues — matters significant to the wellbeing of individuals, families or communities, which are contemporary and relevant to students, the locality and experiences of the school or community. Research tasks should avoid value-laden statements, perpetuating stereotypes, and have no gender or ethical bias (syllabus pp. 2, 5 and 11). Selected issues are effective when they are focused and require a conclusion to be drawn which allowing opportunities to demonstrate synthesis and evaluation of evidence to justify the conclusion. When an analytical exposition or a report is chosen as the mode, the assessment task is best linked to an issue rather than a design challenge.
Effective performances and products tasks allow for the demonstration of Dimension 1 objectives, including the ‘application of the relevant key concepts’ related to the design challenge. The design challenge enables Dimension 3: Practical skills to be demonstrated. For example, ‘develop and refine practical skills to produce a quality product for an intended purpose’ (syllabus pp. 3 and 28).

Task instructions for process journals are effective when they are clear and require ‘thorough planning, effective and efficient management and reflection’ on the process rather than just an evaluation of the product. Tasks that require the process journal to collect evidence of planning before implementing a course of action and, where possible, the inclusion of annotated photographs of the process as well as the product, allow students the opportunity to reflect during the process (syllabus, pp. 28–29).

The performances and products technique may also assess one or more objectives from Dimension 2. Tasks are effective if they provide opportunities to analyse relevant information or to evaluate evidence and justify and support solutions related to the practical decisions required in the design challenge.

Application of standards

On-balance judgments about student achievement are made by matching the qualities in student responses in a folio to the syllabus standards. An instrument-specific standards matrix is used to make judgments about individual responses.

Judgments for Dimension 1 are made, on-balance, across the folio of evidence based on responses to a range of techniques. When folios are matched to the A standard, the evidence demonstrates ‘description of a comprehensive range of significant facts’ and ‘thorough explanation and application of relevant key concepts’ across the folio. When making a judgment about Dimension 1 for an individual assessment instrument such as a supervised written assessment, judgments are made across the response to the instrument rather than item-by-item.

Standard A in Dimension 2 requires ‘thorough analysis and discerning evaluation of evidence in order to justify and support the conclusion’, rather than simply researching a topic or the accuracy of a statement.

Standard A responses in Dimension 3 demonstrate ‘thorough planning, effective and efficient management and perceptive reflection’ as well as a ‘refined variety of practical skills and a quality product that enhances the intended purpose’. Responses demonstrate a ‘variety of practical skills’ in a range of ways to suit the particular school context ranging from refining components of one product to producing a number of products. ‘Thorough planning’ includes planning of the whole process rather than a minute-by-minute time plan for a practical food preparation session.

Evidence to support Standard A judgments in Dimension 3 includes annotated photographs of practical skill development and notes about the planning, management and reflection process. Annotations about practical skills highlight refinement, for example, making adjustments during a practical foods preparation session rather than making the same product again. Teacher observation sheets provide evidence of application of knowledge, management and performance of practical skills (syllabus, pp. 28–29).
Support

Support materials for the *Home Economics 2010* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Meredith Gleadhill  Shauna Bouel
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Hospitality Studies — A22

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Hospitality Studies 2012 syllabus is in its second year of implementation, with the first cohort of Year 12 students being verified this year.

Assessment design

Assessment instruments are generally providing opportunities for students to demonstrate the objectives across the full range of standards. Effective assessment incorporates the qualities that are to be demonstrated in the design of the instrument. Using the language of the syllabus objectives will assist in ensuring that these opportunities are provided.

Assessment design is informed by the dimensions, objectives and requirements of the syllabus. The Inquiring dimension and objectives inform assessment design for the Research and Supervised written assessment techniques. The Planning and Performing dimensions and objectives together inform assessment design for the Performance technique to ensure opportunities are provided for students to meet syllabus requirements. Opportunities for students to demonstrate the Planning dimension are provided when students are required to demonstrate analysis (not description) of contextual factors, principles and procedures relevant to the specific hospitality event to be implemented, as well as plans and decisions, evaluation and recommendations.

The research assessment technique assesses research practices and the outcomes of the application of that research. Research practices include locating and using information that goes beyond the data students have been given and the knowledge they currently have (Section 4.5.2 of the syllabus). Communication strategies for this technique include generic requirements for presenting research such as referencing conventions and these conventions must be followed regardless of the mode of delivery (Section 4.5.2 of the syllabus).

Questions or statements for supervised written assessment instruments are typically unseen. If seen, teachers must ensure that the purpose of this technique is not compromised. The purpose is to assess student responses that are produced independently, under supervision and in a set timeframe to ensure authenticity (Section 4.5.1 of the syllabus). Permitted material is indicated in the instrument conditions, e.g. one page of handwritten notes. Completed components of essays to a seen question, such as introductions and/or conclusions, compromise the purpose of this technique. Stimulus material may be used to support the assessment instrument and should be succinct enough to allow students to engage with those materials in the time provided; if they are lengthy, students may access them before the assessment. Stimulus material for this technique, whether seen or unseen, is supplied (Section 4.5.1 of the syllabus). Students should have opportunities to become familiar with the assessment techniques that will be used to make summative judgments, including opportunities to respond to unseen tasks (Section 4.5.1 of the syllabus).

In Dimension 3: Performing, schools ensure that students have the opportunity to demonstrate practical skills in creating products and performing services, and management of resources to implement hospitality events.
Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by using evidence of the match of the qualities in the student responses with the syllabus objectives and standards descriptors. Across the state, there was agreement about the appropriate application of standards. Evidence in sample folios substantiated on-balance judgments made by schools.

For each assessment instrument, schools develop an instrument-specific standards matrix from the syllabus standards. Syllabus standards descriptors are not modified other than to include the genre of the communication, the issue being examined or the context of the hospitality event. For example, the genre of the communication may be changed to research report or magazine article, the hospitality event to high tea or buffet lunch. Schools do not change the qualitative descriptors of the syllabus standards or add descriptors to standards matrices. Assessment in Hospitality Studies requires all standards descriptors of the dimension(s) relevant to the different assessment techniques be retained in whole. When developing instrument-specific standards matrices aspects of standards descriptors are not deleted. Evidence for the Planning dimension includes analysis of contextual factors, principles and procedures pertinent to the hospitality event to be implemented.

DVD evidence illustrating typical A and C standards in practical performance is required to support schools’ judgments about the application of standards in the Performing dimension (Section 4.5.3 of the syllabus). This should be accompanied by commentary explaining the school’s decisions about highlighted standards and be sufficiently clear to illustrate the quality of the product and/or service. A range of practical skills is demonstrated at the A and B standards. The evidence may be drawn from practical skills performed as part of the learning experiences or from the assessment process (Section 4.6 of the syllabus).

Support

Support materials for the Hospitality Studies 2012 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Penny Braithwaite
State Review Panel Chair

Therese Powers
Senior Education Officer
Indonesian — B06

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Indonesian 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation. The Indonesian Extension 2009 syllabus is in its fifth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: Listening and Reading tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should neither distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a barbeque is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- Listening texts are different from Reading texts. Listening texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word. ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. Listening texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than Listening texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: Speaking and Writing tasks

- Speaking and Writing tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, Speaking and Writing are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All Speaking tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For Writing tasks, online dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 200 words is completed by the end of Year 12 (syllabus p. 36).

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course. Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample Standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.

When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.
Support

Support materials for the *Indonesian 2008* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Kath Symmons       Lester Ford
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Information Processing and Technology — A16

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Information Processing and Technology 2010* syllabus is in its fourth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Moderation processes identified that the majority of assessment instruments were designed effectively. As a result, most assessment packages were able to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the dimensions and general objectives of the syllabus (pp. 2–3) across the full range of standards. Effectively designed instruments also allowed students to be able to respond within the conditions for each assessment technique in the syllabus (pp. 31–36).

The supervised written assessment technique is used to assess a range of cognition through responses produced independently, under supervision and in a set timeframe (syllabus, p. 31). For verification folio requirements, at least one supervised assessment instrument must be implemented (syllabus, p. 36). When designing the instrument, it can be constructed using one or more items. However, if an item requires an extended response (400–800 words), it should be the only item used on the assessment instrument. This will better allow students to demonstrate the full range of standards for each of the dimensions being assessed (syllabus, p. 31).

The purpose of the extended-response assessment technique is to assess the sustained application of higher-order cognition (analysis, synthesis and evaluation) to known and provided materials, stimuli and concepts. Research is not the focus (syllabus, p. 32). When implementing the technique, it may occur over a period of time, in class and possibly in students’ own time. This differs from the conditions under which a supervised assessment — extended response is implemented. In addition, when the extended-response technique is implemented, the student response may be presented in a variety of modes, including written, spoken or multimodal (syllabus, p. 34).

In terms of the product assessment technique, assessment instruments that were designed effectively incorporated the design–develop–evaluate approach to solve complex problems (syllabus, pp. 19–20). Also, instruments that included prescribed criteria, to be applied when drawing conclusions and making recommendations on major projects, provided opportunities to gather evidence about student achievement in Dimension 3: *Evaluation and communication*.

In addition, the most effective assessment instruments allowed students to demonstrate the use of core subject material outlined for each topic in the syllabus (pp. 8–16). For example, this was evident when a third-generation programming language was explored and used for Software programming (syllabus, p. 11).
Application of standards

Standards are described in the same dimensions as the general objectives in the syllabus (pp. 39–40).

In the majority of sample folios provided, there was evidence to support the on-balance judgments, which were made by schools on the standard awarded to each dimension. An on-balance judgment is about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each dimension. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension (syllabus, p. 38).

Where there was an issue with on-balance judgments, it was often associated with the evidence within sample folios related to Dimension 3: Evaluation and communication. In this dimension, the Standard A and B descriptors include the testing of processes and solutions, application of prescribed criteria, reasoning and evidence to draw conclusions and making supported recommendations. However, for Standard A, testing is comprehensive with the application of prescribed and self-determined criteria typically characteristic (syllabus, p. 40). These qualities can be demonstrated, for example, through students using the objectives established for a project when they evaluate.

Where students undertake assessment in a group or team, the work of individual students is to be assessed. A judgment of the group product and processes being applied to all individuals is not appropriate (syllabus, p. 30).

Support

Support materials for the Information Processing and Technology 2010 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/11678.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Panel training will be conducted in 2015.

Ross Jardine          John Langer
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Information Technology Systems — A26

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Information Technology Systems 2012 syllabus is in its second year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments were designed to allow opportunities for students to engage with the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus and to demonstrate the full range of standards. Schools provided opportunities to demonstrate the dimensions and objectives of the course in assessment instruments by:

- developing contextualised instrument-specific standards matrixes that selected the relevant standards descriptors to match the criteria and general objectives that the task was designed to assess (syllabus p. 21)
- reducing scaffolding progressively from Year 11 into Year 12 to allow students to demonstrate analysis and synthesis across the range of standards
- ensuring students had the opportunity to demonstrate ‘comprehensive and discerning analysis of client needs to inform the design plan’ (Dimension 2: Design and development, Standard A)
- ensuring that opportunities were provided for students to demonstrate ‘comprehensive and thorough testing of components to refine solutions’ (Dimension 2: Design and development, Standard A) by using a variety of techniques for the testing process
- providing opportunity for students to use a ‘variety of complex technical skills and resources’ (Dimension 3: Implementation and evaluation, Standard A) in projects and practical exercises, in particular video tasks.

The product assessment technique provided the best opportunity for students to demonstrate the project development model (design–develop–evaluate) as the model of inquiry that underpins the problem-solving process (Section 4.5.3 of the syllabus). The skills of analysis, synthesis and evaluation are demonstrated using problem-solving methods appropriate to the task.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific standards drawn from the syllabus standards. There was significant agreement across the state about the application of standards.

The standard awarded is an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each dimension. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension (syllabus, p. 20).

When standards have been determined in each of the dimensions, schools must use the ‘Awarding exit levels of achievement’ table (Section 4.8.1 of the syllabus) which indicates the minimum combination of standards across the dimensions for each level of achievement for each standard.
Where evidence in student responses was not matched to standards, it was related to the following dimensions:

- **Dimension 1:** *Knowledge and communication:* To demonstrate ‘accurate and comprehensive definitions, explanations and use of IT terms, concepts and principles’ (Standard A), students are required to use IT terminology applicable to the context throughout all documentation.

- **Dimension 3:** *Implementation and evaluation:* To demonstrate ‘discerning and thorough evaluation of (Standard A), the contexts, inputs, processes and products (CIPP) model of evaluation needs to be product- and project-based, analysing the quality of context, input, processes and products and including reasoned recommendations for improvement against pre-determined criteria.

## Support

Support materials for the *Information Technology Systems 2012* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Dale Dittman  
State Review Panel Chair

Russell Sky  
Senior Education Officer
Italian — B04

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Italian 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: Listening and Reading tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- The amount of vocabulary assistance given on a task should not prevent students from demonstrating ‘plausible interpretations of unfamiliar language’.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should neither distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a barbeque is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- Listening texts are different from Reading texts. Listening texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word. ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. Listening texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than Listening texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: Speaking and Writing tasks

- Speaking and Writing tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, Speaking and Writing are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All Speaking tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For Writing tasks, online dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 200 words is completed by the end of Year 12 (syllabus p. 35).

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course.

Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample Standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.
When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.

Support

Support materials for the Italian 2008 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/4912.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Sarina Kearney
State Review Panel Chair

Lester Ford
Senior Education Officer
Japanese — B05

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Japanese 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: Listening and Reading tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should neither distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a barbeque is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- Listening texts are different from Reading texts. Listening texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word. ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. Listening texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than Listening texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: Speaking and Writing tasks

- Speaking and Writing tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, Speaking and Writing are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All Speaking tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For Writing tasks, on line dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 400 kanamajiri is completed by the end of Year 12 (syllabus p. 36).

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course.

Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample Standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.

When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.
Support

Support materials for the *Japanese 2008* syllabus on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Paul Dyer 
State Review Panel Chair

Lester Ford 
Senior Education Officer
Legal Studies — B21

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Legal Studies 2007 syllabus is in its final year of implementation. In 2015, the Legal Studies 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students.

Assessment design

Across the state, it was evident that schools are designing effective assessment instruments. Well-designed assessment provides opportunities for students to demonstrate a range of standards across each of the general objectives. Effective assessment instruments:

- clearly articulate the instrument requirements including the format or genre of the required response
- include questions that are designed to allow students to focus on depth rather than breadth with regard to topics
- ensure that the focus of questions is on legal issues, positions and rights and responsibilities rather than social aspects of the issue
- provide comparable questions where students are offered a choice within assessment techniques
- include instrument-specific standards matrixes developed to clearly align the task with the relevant standards descriptors.

Implications for the Legal Studies 2013 syllabus

Knowing and understanding the law involves describing, explaining and communicating legal facts, concepts and processes rather than making statements of specific knowledge based on recall (syllabus, p. 2).

Investigating legal issues involves exploring legal situations through selecting, organising and analysing information to demonstrate legal inquiry processes (syllabus, pp. 2–3). This dimension also involves analysing legal situations and applying concepts and processes to show how they relate to identified legal issues and to determine legal outcomes.

Responding to the law involves examining the attempts of the law to achieve just, fair and equitable outcomes to legal issues (syllabus, p. 3). Student responses involve evaluation by assigning merit according to the criteria of just and equitable outcomes and justifying their decisions and recommendations by providing evidence and logical reasoning. When designing assessment for the new syllabus there are a number of considerations:

- for short-response tests, all questions should provide opportunities for students to respond in 50–250 words
- extended-responses tests require a single response in both Year 11 and 12
- with multimodal responses, each of the selected modes must contribute significantly to the response and replication of a written document into an electronic format does not constitute a multimodal response (syllabus, p. 20)
• when students undertake assessment in a group, instruments must be designed so that teachers can validly assess the work of individual students and not apply a judgment of the group product and processes to all individuals (syllabus, p. 19)

• the independent inquiry should relate to a current legal issue facing Australian society

• assessment for integrated units should involve both of the areas of study

• when assessing Introduction to civil obligations, schools may elect to assess both agreements and negligence or offer students a choice depending on the technique used; if a short-response test is used, it would be expected that both agreements and negligence would be evident

• schools are encouraged to explore a range of genres in the extended responses (syllabus, p. 23).

Application of standards

Decisions about levels of achievement are made according to syllabus information and using syllabus standards descriptors.

There was significant agreement across the state about the application of standards. When awarding a standard, an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student work match the standards descriptors overall in each criterion is made. This means that it is not necessary for students to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each criterion. Folios in the lower range of an achievement level will typically demonstrate achievement at the lower standard in one criterion as shown in the table ‘Awarding exit levels of achievement’ (syllabus, p. 37).

Where there was an issue with on-balance judgments, it was often associated with the evidence in student responses that related to Investigation. Student responses to the Investigation criterion should demonstrate the ability to ‘examine legal situations and issues’, rather than ‘retrieving and communicating information’, which demonstrates the Knowledge and understanding criterion (syllabus, pp. 3–4).

Support

Support materials for the Legal Studies 2013 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

• syllabus information at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20322.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20322.html)

• assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html)

• teaching resources (including information about DVD resources) at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20322-teaching.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20322-teaching.html)


Panel training will be conducted in 2015.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Karyl Young  Beryl McLachlan
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Marine Studies — A27

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Marine Studies 2004 syllabus is in its final year of implementation. In 2015, the Marine Science 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students.

Assessment design

Generally, assessment instruments provided opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of the general objectives across a range of standards. To enable more opportunities for students to demonstrate at an A standard in Knowledge and understanding, especially in the application of learned procedures and concepts, a variety of challenging as well as complex tasks were required.

Schools selected assessment techniques that provided opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement in the general objectives. When selecting an assessment technique that would enable students to demonstrate achievement in Information processing and reasoning, schools ensured that students had the opportunity to:

- plan and conduct investigations
- interpret and evaluate information and ideas
- communicate information and ideas.

Application of standards

Across the state, there was a high degree of agreement on standards within the majority of sample folios. Evidence was also found to support the on-balance judgments made by schools when awarding a standard to each criterion.

There was evidence that teachers have become very proficient at using the language of the general objectives to frame assessment instruments and provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the relevant objectives for all general objectives. Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific criteria sheets drawn from the syllabus standards.

Marine investigations allowed greater opportunities for students to demonstrate ‘planning and conducting investigations efficiently’ and ‘collecting and organising information’ (syllabus, p. 60). Although there has been an improvement in the design of Information processing and reasoning tasks, opportunities need to be provided for greater complexity in relation to the number of variables being investigated so that more relationships and trend analysis can occur. This still appeared to be an issue.
Support

Support materials for the *Marine Science 2013* syllabus available from the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Tanya Martin  
State Review Panel Chair

Susan Scheiwe  
Senior Education Officer
Mathematics A — A36

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Mathematics A 2008 (amended 2014) syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment involves the provision of opportunity to demonstrate the general objectives across the Standards A–E. In particular, items that provide evidence, from simple routine through to complex routine and simple non-routine through to complex non-routine, should be provided to allow for the demonstration of the A-standard descriptors. Item-based assessments that provide evidence across the general objectives, at the upper level of complexity and initiative — particularly in non-routine situations — should be present in assessment packages.

Instruments that provide steps to be completed in non-routine complex tasks, limit opportunity for students to show the required initiative and/or the use of strategies and development of logical sequences required for an A standard.

In items that focus on reflecting on the effectiveness of mathematical models including recognition of the strengths and limitations of the model, responses should encompass mathematical viewpoints expressed using relevant mathematical terminology and/or everyday language.

Extended modelling and problem-solving tasks should not be closed. When tasks are closed the provision of opportunity to demonstrate the general objectives across the standards A–E is reduced and the authentication of student work is more difficult.

Explicit teaching of the general objectives across the syllabus strands integrates learning and assessment and facilitates informed student engagement with assessment tasks. Learning and assessment that considers the principles of application, technology, initiative and complexity creates opportunity for the standards associated with exit criteria to be identified within the assessment package and thereby demonstrated by students.

Application of standards

Appropriate application of standards is being achieved across the state. Level of achievement decisions are made using all available evidence. For example, decisions for some Limited Achievement folios have not considered evidence available in responses to both Knowledge and procedures and Modelling and problem solving questions. While responses may be ‘incorrect’, they may still contribute evidence at the C standard and B standard in the Knowledge and procedures criterion; there is no requirement for a correct answer for the working of the problem to contribute positively at a B standard.

The awarding of standards should reflect the syllabus requirements to demonstrate skills across the range of complexity and initiative from simple routine through to complex routine to simple non-routine. Students who do not demonstrate at the B and C standards when questions provide that opportunity, but do achieve at the A standard on subsequent questions, have not achieved, on balance, at the A standard, as there is no evidence of achievement across the range — the ‘through to’ requirement of the A standard should be applied (syllabus, p. 36).
Support

Support materials for the *Mathematics A 2008 (amended 2014)* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Andrew Foster  
State Review Panel Chair

John Sagner  
Senior Education Officer
Mathematics B —A37

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Mathematics B 2008 (amended 2014) syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Assessment samples provided for comparability demonstrated that using the objectives of the syllabus, described at Standards A–E, was essential to the design of effective assessment instruments and packages. The syllabus general objectives and standards should be explicitly integrated in instruments in the assessment program. Where assessment had this feature, it was very clear where opportunities to demonstrate the syllabus objectives had been provided.

The instruments provided demonstrated effective assessment design; however, there are concerns about the closed nature of the extended modelling and problem-solving items. Closed design with specific detail does not allow students to demonstrate a number of the objectives in Knowledge and procedures (for example, ‘select and apply mathematical definitions, rules and procedures’, ‘select and use mathematical technology’). If the items are closed in nature, it is important to have processes that ensure that the authorship of student responses can be authenticated. Advice and guidelines about authenticating responses can be found on the QCAA website.

Examples of effective assessment included tasks where students were given a situation and were asked to develop a model and show the strengths and weaknesses of the model, along with assumptions and their associated effects. When there are many extended modelling and problem solving tasks in a single instrument, opportunities for the students can be limited to develop a model, identify assumptions (and associated effects), and identify problems to be solved and interpreted, because of the time taken to complete the tasks.

Application of standards

There was agreement at comparability that, in most cases, appropriate judgments about student demonstration of the general objectives of the syllabus were being made and that schools were appropriately applying the standards of the syllabus and making on-balance judgments.

The exit criteria should have equal emphasis across the summative assessment package. It is important to make on-balance achievement decisions across a folio of responses, and across topics, by matching the qualities in the student responses with the appropriate standard descriptors. The exit assessment program must ensure an appropriate balance over the course of study as a whole (syllabus, p. 25).

Some threshold Sound Achievement results were not supported due to a judgment of a Standard D in Knowledge and procedures. Exit achievement levels are devised from student achievement in all areas identified in the syllabus as being mandatory, namely the general objectives and the seven topics (syllabus, p. 25). There was an appropriate application of standards for Communication and Justification.
Support

Support materials for the *Mathematics B 2008 (amended 2014)* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Peter Antrobus  
State Review Panel Chair

Sue Jones  
Senior Education Officer
Mathematics C — A38

This report is based on information gathered from districts and at statewide comparability.

Syllabus

The *Mathematics C 2008 (amended 2014)* syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation.

Assessment

Schools continue to design effective assessment instruments and programs. Effective assessment provides opportunities to gather information about the extent to which students demonstrate achievement of the general objectives.

The design of open-ended extended modelling and problem-solving tasks provides better opportunities for students to demonstrate the higher-order attributes of ‘identification of assumptions (and associated effects), parameters and/or variables’, ‘application of problem-solving strategies to interpret, clarify and analyse problems’ and ‘analysis and interpretation of results in the context of problems to investigate the validity (including strengths and limitations) of mathematical arguments and models’ (syllabus, p. 4).

Assessment packages continue to provide a better balance of simple routine questions to non-routine questions. This balance has provided opportunities for students to demonstrate the general objectives across all levels of achievement.

While the quality, diversity and creativity of assessment instruments have improved, there were some areas where design could be enhanced. For example, the use of formula sheets is a practice that is valid. However, syllabus requirements for ‘recall, access, selection’ in Knowledge and procedures means an inappropriate use of formula sheets risks the opportunity for students to achieve in this standard.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific standards descriptors drawn from the syllabus exit standards. Evidence in submissions at comparability demonstrated that standards are being appropriately applied. For example, schools were consistently making appropriate threshold decisions, with achievement in one criterion being at a standard below that of the other two criteria, as shown on the ‘table of minimum requirements for exit levels of achievement’ (syllabus, p. 39).

Where evidence was not appropriately matched to the syllabus standards, it related to matching the evidence in all three criteria to the C-standard descriptors. Where there is evidence of ‘application of mathematical definitions, rules and procedures in routine, simple life-related or abstract situations’ for Knowledge and procedures; ‘interpretation of results in the context of routine, simple problems’ for Modelling and problem solving; and, ‘translation of information from one representation to another in simple routine situations’ and ‘justification of procedures, decisions or results’ for Communication and justification, an on-balance decision of the C standard should be made.
Schools are better identifying in responses to both supervised tests and extended modelling and problem solving tasks, the following qualities that match with the A-standard descriptors: ‘identify assumptions and associated effects, parameters and/or variables’ and ‘investigate and evaluation of the validity of mathematical arguments including strengths and imitations of mathematical arguments and models’.

The non-submission of an assessment response cannot be graded as an E. It must be recorded as a non-submission. Judgments about achievement can only be made where there is evidence to match to the standards.

**Support**

Support materials for the *Mathematics C 2008 (amended 2014)* syllabus available from the QCAA website include:


QCAA memos also provide educators with important information. These can be received through the memo subscriptions service or the website, at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/1105.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/1105.html).

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub tab on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Bevan Penrose          Sue Jones
State Review Panel Chair    Senior Education Officer
Modern History — B39

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Modern History 2004* syllabus is in its tenth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Moderation processes provided evidence of effective assessment design for each of the four categories of assessment. Instrument-specific standards matrixes may specify the genre and topic but the key language of the standards descriptors should not be altered. The application of the full range of standards descriptors to Year 11 assessment instruments provides valuable formative opportunities for students entering Year 12. Where two assessment instruments are drawn from one inquiry, the subject matter for each task should be different.

Category 1: Extended written response to historical evidence

Assessment in this category requires students to address an unseen question or statement using a range of primary and secondary sources provided by the teacher. Effective Category 1 instruments are focused on a specific historical issue. The selection of an appropriate range of sources is critical to enable students to engage effectively with Criterion 2 descriptors at the A and B standards. The range of sources also needs to be manageable within the recommended 1½–2 hour timeframe for Category 1 assessment (syllabus, p. 49). The syllabus conditions for category 1 tasks are different for Year 11 and Year 12 including the extent to which sources support the statement or question. At monitoring sources are ‘clearly for or against’ the question and ‘contestable’ by verification (syllabus, p. 49). The syllabus specifies that in Year 12 ‘evaluation and application of perspectives must be applied to make judgments’ (p. 49).

Category 2: Written research tasks and Category 3: Multimodal presentations

Category 2 and 3 assessment instruments provide opportunities for students to choose their own issues for investigation within the theme and inquiry topic. Students devise focused research questions to drive the inquiry. A wide variety of research guidelines has been developed to assist students to implement an effective research process. These records of research provide evidence of achievement in Criterion 1. Evidence for Criteria 2 and 3 judgments will be found in the final response where students will demonstrate that they have formed and communicated historical knowledge.

Category 4: Additional test formats

A combination of shorter and some longer responses is appropriate for Category 4 test instruments. Very short items, such as labelling and sequencing events, provide limited evidence to match to the standards. When Criterion 2 is assessed in Response to Stimulus tests, questions should go beyond comprehension to address the range of cognitive skills in Criterion 2 (syllabus, p. 7). To this end, there would be questions that focus on comprehension of explicit and implicit meanings and patterns, as well as interpretation of values, motives and perspectives, corroboration, evaluation of sources and synthesis of evidence to make decisions.
Application of standards

Moderation processes provided evidence of a very high level of comparability across the state. An on-balance decision requires making a judgment for each criterion given the pattern of evidence across these descriptors. The focus is on what students can do. When making a level of achievement decision, teachers use the table Minimum requirements for exit levels of achievement in the syllabus (p. 56).

Criterion 1: Planning and using an historical research process

Judgments about standards for Criterion 1 must be based on the qualities of the evidence submitted, not the quantity. The aspects of inquiry (syllabus, p. 19) should be built into the research process. This begins with the development of research questions that are informed by the aspects of inquiry. The choice of questions may affect the ‘complexity’ (Standard A) of the issue or its ‘significance’ (Standard B). To evidence their application of the aspects of inquiry (third descriptor) students need to show more than note-taking; the thinking they do in response to the evidence they locate is just as important. Reflections (fourth descriptor) should be focused on the direction of the inquiry and can be presented in a variety of forms. For example, a research log which contains metacognitive commentary identifying valid choices in direction; a record of consultations with the teacher; a synthesis of research for each sub-question; and/or research notes that reveal connections across a range of sources to inform the developing inquiry.

Criterion 2: Forming historical knowledge through critical inquiry

The syllabus glossary (pp. 65–66) which provides definitions of key terms used in the Criterion 2 standards such as corroboration, perspective, reliability and representativeness. There are three parts to Criterion 2. The first descriptor includes a number of sub-points and is concerned with comprehending meanings, analysing patterns, interpreting values and motives, identifying perspectives and corroborating historical evidence. The second descriptor is concerned with evaluating historical evidence for relevance, reliability, accuracy and representativeness. The third descriptor is about synthesising evidence to make decisions.

Criterion 3: Communicating historical knowledge

There are three parts to Criterion 3. The first descriptor relates to the accuracy and appropriateness of the historical knowledge recalled or selected by the student. The second descriptor is about the communication of this historical knowledge, and the third focuses on scope. Effective responses that meet the scope of the task will typically be succinct, focused, engage with the theme, and accomplish the aims of the task within the parameters provided.

Support

Support materials for the Modern History 2004 syllabus available from the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/2055.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Kevin McAlinden
State Review Panel Chair

Lyn Sherington
Senior Education Officer
Music — B26

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Music 2004 syllabus is in its final year of implementation. In 2015, the Music 2013 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 and Year 12 students.

Assessment design

It is evident that schools are designing high-quality assessment instruments. Effective assessment instruments provide opportunities to gather information about the extent to which students demonstrate achievement in the general objectives of the syllabus.

Analyzing repertoire

Analyzing repertoire assessment tasks that give students a purpose, context and role, will provide opportunity for students to demonstrate the qualities of an A-standard response. Analyzing repertoire assessment tasks are effective when students are provided with clear and definite instructions that require students to demonstrate higher-order thinking skills, such as hypothesising, deconstructing, evaluating, synthesising, and justifying. Conditions associated with Analyzing repertoire tasks should be clearly listed on the instrument-specific criteria sheet.

Effective formal exams contain a limited number of questions and may focus on shorter repertoire extracts, giving students opportunity to respond in-depth and demonstrate the qualities of an A-standard response.

Composing

There was more evidence of a variety of Composing assessment tasks that allowed students to demonstrate individual style, and increasing independence in this criterion. Effective Composing assessment tasks allow the combination of musical elements and compositional devices, not the manner of presentation (recorded sounds or scores), to be the focus. Students can present their compositions as a score (traditional, graphic or contemporary) and/or a sound recording (syllabus, p. 24).

Performing

Effective Performing tasks provide students with an authentic context in which to present their music. Where practicable, performances for an appropriate audience beyond the classroom should be considered. Performing in an authentic context allows students to interpret and communicate the music to an audience through a convincing performance.

The syllabus provides specific guidance on the conditions for assessment tasks (p. 27). It is important to note that as student performances are assessed using audiation, it is imperative that individuals within an ensemble can be heard clearly.
Application of standards

Analysing repertoire has continued to be an issue throughout the life of the syllabus. Often tasks have not enabled students to demonstrate higher-order thinking skills. Folios in the lower range of achievement in this criterion did not always match the standard awarded. In these cases, the quality of student responses did not match the C standard and was a closer match to the D standard where the student ‘recognises some uses of identified musical elements’ rather than ‘evaluates music by deconstructing repertoire’.

The criteria and standards of the 2004 syllabus were used to make judgments about achievement for Year 12 students in 2014, while judgments about student achievement for Year 11 students were made using the dimensions and standards of the 2013 syllabus.

When awarding a standard, an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student work match the standards descriptors overall in each criterion is made. Relative level of achievement decisions at verification and exit are made by looking for the extent to which standards descriptors have been achieved across the three criteria at a threshold, typical, or better than typical standard.

Section 6.7 of the syllabus (pp. 31–32) describes the awarding of an exit level of achievement.

For moderation purposes, visual samples should be clearly labelled and submitted on DVD or USB in MP4 or AVI formats that are easily accessible with each individual file clearly labelled.

Support

Support materials for the Music 2013 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20324.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Helen Leyden
State Review Panel Chair

Meredith Baxter
Senior Education Officer
Music Extension — B36

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Music Extension 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation.

Assessment design

A wide range of investigating tasks was evident in student folios with the majority of responses presented as written responses. Table 1 of the syllabus provides a range of assessment techniques and conditions of assessment for the Investigation of music sources criterion, including extended responses, multimedia presentations and oral presentations (page 23).

Investigating tasks that centre on a topic or argument provide succinct direction, and effective samples of student responses occur when there is a clear link between the music sources and the analysis of sources. Effective responses were characterised by a correlation between the topic and the best suited techniques of presentation for the topic. Investigating tasks may have a direct or indirect relationship to the Realising assessment task (syllabus p. 21). Effective Investigating tasks provide opportunities to undertake explicit analysis, exploration and synthesis of music sources.

In the Realising assessment task, Performance specialisation, there was more evidence of the tasks being recorded across multiple performances and in a variety of contexts appropriate to the style and genre.

Most compositions were presented as a sound recording with a smaller number presented as scores. Composition assessment tasks should allow for responses in any genre and/or style and for this reason, the standards should be awarded comparably, regardless of genre or style (syllabus p. 23).

It was apparent that the assessment techniques and conditions for the Performance and Composition specialisation were not met in some cases. These are detailed in Tables 3 and 4 of the syllabus (p. 25).

Application of standards

There was a high level of consistency in the application of standards across the Investigating of music sources and Realisation of the work criteria. In the small number of cases across the state where the evidence did not match the standard awarded in Realisation of the work, the disparity did not affect the on-balance judgment for the overall level of achievement.

The result awarded for the Investigating task was a significant factor in threshold sample folios. In most threshold Very High Achievement sample folios, the investigating response demonstrated a lower standard than the responses for the Realisation of the work. This means that achievement in the Investigation of music sources criterion often plays a key role in making judgments about levels of achievement.

Audiovisual documentation of performances should allow the performer to be seen and heard clearly and be clearly annotated to indicate identified students. Section 7.5.4 of the syllabus outlines guidelines for audiovisual documentation.
Support

Support materials for the *Music Extension 2008* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Jo Cunningham
State Review Panel Chair

Meredith Baxter
Senior Education Officer
Other Languages — B32

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Korean, Latin, Modern Greek, Spanish and Vietnamese 2008 syllabuses are in their sixth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment is designed using the syllabus objectives. Using the objectives to design assessment provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate the syllabus standards A–E and to meet the syllabus requirements. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Comprehension: *Listening* and *Reading* tasks and items

- Using more than one text provides more opportunities for students to demonstrate analysis, evaluation, conclusions and decisions; however, excessively long or too many texts require too much time to complete and may affect the complexity of tasks.

- A range of sufficiently complex vocabulary and grammatical structures will be covered and the requirement for ‘a range of topics and text types’ will be met when a variety of text types are used over the assessment program. That variety of text types could include extended passages, blogs, extracts, cartoons, and stanzas from songs and poems.

- ‘Detailed analysis and thorough evaluation’ for Reasoning and responding is best demonstrated through extended responses to tasks rather than short answers to questions that require simple details already stated in the text or provide information that leads students to the answers.

- Tasks should allow responses where inferences may be drawn from the text. Inferences should not be the students’ personal opinions of the topic, recalled knowledge from outside the texts or visual clues in recorded or printed stimulus.

- Contexts or scenarios should be realistic and provide only the essential information students need to understand and complete the task. Contextual information should neither distract from the task nor inform the response.

- Tasks should allow ‘cultural meanings’ to be integrated into responses; students should show an understanding of the culture embedded in the language of a text. For example, a *barbeque* is a style of cooking, but also an informal gathering of family and/or friends, which carries cultural connotations. In this way, cultural meanings are derived from words, or from register.

- *Listening* texts are different from *Reading* texts. *Listening* texts should be clear and in the standard version of the language. Texts should be delivered in the ‘slower range of normal background speaker rate of utterance’ (Section 8.3.1 of the syllabus), giving students time to take notes and demonstrate their comprehension, but not to translate word for word. ‘Judicious pauses’ are made as it is not memory that is assessed, but comprehension. Students may take notes at any time. *Listening* texts are intended to be spoken and heard; texts designed to be read may be more complex, with more ideas and information, and therefore longer than *Listening* texts.
Effective Conveying meaning: Speaking and Writing tasks

- Speaking and Writing tasks are open-ended and require coverage of a variety of issues, perspectives or opinions, prompting the use of a range of complex language and structures, cohesive devices, and flexibility, originality and spontaneity. Closed tasks, such as giving directions or letters of request, limit students demonstrating the qualities listed above.

- Tasks should be complex and challenging. Topics should be selected to suit a particular skill. For example, Speaking and Writing are both suitable when opinions and experiences are sought.

- All Speaking tasks should ‘require spontaneous language used in realistic situations’ (Section 8.3.3 of the syllabus). For prepared tasks, spontaneous responses to questions after the presentation ‘confirm(s) the level of performance’. These questions are formulated by the ‘audience’ as they listen to the presentation. The questions would require students to expand in greater depth on their presentation and not to repeat what they have already said. For unprepared tasks, open-ended questions necessitate the provision of sufficient time to create more extended responses, before moving on to the next question.

- For Writing tasks, online dictionaries may be used but their use must not compromise the conveying of ideas ‘with flexibility and originality’.

- At least one writing task of approximately 200 words is completed by the end of Year 12.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made using the fullest and latest evidence, which comes from Year 12 for students completing a four-semester course of study. As language learning is developmental, tasks and texts increase in complexity over the course.

Standards are determined by the on-balance judgment of the evidence in a folio, not by focusing on the latest or highest result, or by averaging results on a profile, which is a tool for recording student achievement. All the evidence in a folio is used to make a decision at exit. Using all that information, a final standard for each skill can be determined across a ‘range of topics and text types’.

For Reading and Listening, Standard A Reasoning and responding requires students to analyse, evaluate, and draw conclusions from information in texts. Students do not just reproduce information plainly stated in texts.

Standard A Speaking requires students to demonstrate ‘flexibility and spontaneity’. They do this when they elaborate on or lead a conversation. Students who respond to questions do not demonstrate that ‘conversation is initiated and sustained’. Reading from a script also does not meet the standard, though notes can be used.

Recordings are required as evidence that responses have been appropriately matched to the standards. Sample Standards A, B and C recordings are representative of school decision-making and as such apply to the whole cohort. All Speaking performances should be recorded and retained in case further evidence is required to substantiate standards.

Standard A Writing is characterised by ‘flexibility and originality’, a ‘wide range of vocabulary and grammar’, the use of a ‘range of cohesive devices’, and ‘complex language’ with a ‘high degree of accuracy’ in spelling and word order. Formulaic and simple phrases do not match this standard.

When making judgments about Writing, Register is ‘appropriate’ at Standard A, but ‘generally consistent’ at Standard C. The writer’s ideas are ‘conveyed effectively’ at Standard A, but ‘usually communicated clearly’ at Standard B. When student work exhibits descriptors from different standards, an on-balance decision is made.
Support

Support materials for the *Korean, Latin, Modern Greek, Spanish* and *Vietnamese* 2008 syllabuses available on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

George Orfanos        Lester Ford
State Review Panel Chair  Senior Education Officer
Philosophy and Reason — A14

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Philosophy and Reason 2004 syllabus is its tenth year of implementation. The revised Philosophy and Reason 2014 syllabus will be implemented with Year 11 for the first time in 2015.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement across the full range of standards. Assessment packages must provide sufficient opportunity for students to demonstrate the standards across all three criteria: Knowledge, Application, and Communication.

Instrument-specific standards matrixes align with instrument demands and should include objectives from each of the criteria that relate to the task. Effectively designed instrument-specific criteria and standards are aligned to the syllabus criteria and standards (syllabus, p. 44), matched to the requirements of the assessment instrument and clearly indicate which aspects of the syllabus criteria and standards descriptors are being assessed.

Application of standards

The syllabus standards descriptors are used to make judgments about the extent to which students have demonstrated the general objectives of the syllabus. Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus standards (syllabus, p. 44).

Schools match qualities of student responses with the syllabus standards descriptors for each criterion. The standard awarded is an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student's response match the standards descriptors overall. It is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard. On-balance judgments are made by matching evidence in student responses with syllabus standards, taking into account that there may be qualities in the responses that match with more than one standard.

Relative achievement decisions at verification and exit are made by looking for the extent to which standards descriptors have been achieved across the three dimensions at a threshold, typical, or better-than-typical standard.

When standards have been determined in each of the three criteria of Knowledge, Application, and Communication, the table, 'Minimum requirements for exit levels' (syllabus, p. 47) is used to determine the exit level of achievement.
Support

Support materials for the Philosophy and Reason 2014 syllabus available from the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/2057.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html
- work program requirements, checklist and sample work programs at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/2057-wp.html.

In 2014, syllabus orientation workshops were held for the Philosophy and Reason 2014 syllabus. Teachers were supported in the development of new work programs and were provided with work program requirements and checklists, a work program template and a sample work program.

During the year, panel training was conducted for the state review panel.

David Shapland Jo Genders
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Physical Education — A24

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Physical Education 2010 syllabus is in its fourth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment within physical performance requires students to ‘analyse, synthesise and evaluate data and/or information in the development of a performance’ within an authentic environment. ‘Performances involve the creative input of students and the application of technical skill in solving a problem or providing a solution’ (syllabus, p. 25). Schools should ‘implement strategies to provide evidence of decisions including clear and detailed annotations on criteria sheets’ for physical performance assessment (syllabus, p. 25). Schools provide students with opportunities for success when the task requirements for physical performance assessment have clear links to the criteria and are concisely articulated on a task sheet using the language of the standards.

Effective assessment instruments within written and spoken genres provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus through personalisation, where students can make meaning of complex understandings by providing connections with their real-life contexts (syllabus, p. 1). Schools select from the variety of assessment techniques and conditions that are prescribed in the syllabus to allow students to demonstrate achievement across the dimensions and standards. Where schools effectively use the principles of assessment design, opportunities are provided for students to evaluate using ‘information, understandings and skills previously gained in acquiring and applying to make decisions, reach conclusions, solve problems and justify solutions and actions’ (syllabus, p. 4).

Assessment instruments that address Focus Area C will identify an issue related to ‘equity and access to exercise, sport and physical activity in Australian society’ (syllabus, p. 13). Personalisation can be established by considering how the issue relates to each student’s personal experiences, enabling the student to make meaning of and explore connections with their real-life contexts. Students may demonstrate an understanding of Figueroa’s Framework through their examination of factors influencing equity and access; however, the framework should not be the sole focus of the analysis and evaluation.

The syllabus requires that scaffolding ‘be reduced from Year 11 to Year 12 to allow students to better demonstrate independence in research’ (syllabus, p. 24). This quality of independence is required in the A-standard descriptors for the Applying and Evaluating dimensions. Where scaffolding is provided it should assist students to undertake the research process and gather appropriate information to be used in the response.
Application of standards

Across the state, there was general agreement about the appropriate application of standards and evidence in sample folios that substantiated on-balance judgments made by schools. Where there was an issue with on-balance judgments, it was generally associated with one or more of the following factors:

- visual evidence in authentic contexts should substantiate student responses demonstrating the *Evaluating* dimension characteristics of decision making, reflection, initiation of change and/or modification of personal and/or team strategies to solve problems (syllabus, p. 31)

- teachers make judgments about students’ abilities to evaluate performance in a variety of authentic performance contexts. Effective visual evidence for the Dimension 3: *Evaluating* should draw from this variety of evidence to illustrate the school’s judgments. It may use a variety of authentic contexts and be gathered across a period of time as physical performance develops across a unit of work. It may also use spoken justifications of decisions and enhancements made before, during or after the performance by the student

- on-balance judgments about the quality of the communication in written, spoken and multimodal student responses should be made using the final objective in each dimension. Demonstration of an A standard requires ‘sustained and accurate use of textual features’; ‘purposeful and effective selection, sequencing and organisation of relevant and substantial subject matter’ and ‘discerning and effective choice of communication strategies’ (syllabus, pp. 29–31). Schools should not privilege any one aspect of these objectives when making on-balance judgments

- across all three dimensions, the D and E standards have quality and cognitive words, which need to be demonstrated in the student evidence when schools match student responses to these standards. Where there is insufficient evidence supplied in student responses to match the standards, a judgment cannot be substantiated for that specific dimension.

Visual evidence of physical performance that provides voiceover commentary referring to the qualities described in the syllabus standards provides direct evidence of the school’s decisions about student performances in relation to the standards.

Support

Support materials for the *Physical Education 2010* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/11366.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Panel training was conducted in 2014.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Ross Stewart  
State Review Panel Chair

Glenn Amezdroz  
Senior Education Officer
Physics — A45

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The *Physics 2007 (amended 2014)* syllabus is in its seventh year of implementation.

Assessment design

Assessment design is effective when it provides opportunities for students to demonstrate the general objectives of the syllabus, as described by the syllabus Standards A–E.

Extended experimental investigations provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the higher standards in Investigative processes when students are given sufficient time to ‘refine’ their investigations to make them ‘effective and efficient’. This usually requires schools to provide multiple opportunities for students to gather data in the field or laboratory. An effective extended experimental investigation should also collect primary data that allows students to demonstrate ‘systematic analysis’ and to ‘identify relationships between patterns, trends, errors and anomalies’. Although this is commonly done by investigating the effect of more than one independent variable, another effective approach is to progressively refine an experiment to eliminate sources of error.

An extended-response task requires students to respond to a ‘physics question, circumstance or issue’ (syllabus, p. 25). Effective instruments in this category use questions and generic structures that require students to ‘formulate a hypothesis or question’ and then ‘justify conclusions and recommendations’. Tasks should be sufficiently open-ended to allow for ‘exploration of scenarios and possible outcomes’ and should address physics concepts that allow for ‘analysis and evaluation of complex scientific interrelationships’. Framing an extended-response task using a specific local context or scenario can support the authentication of student responses.

Supervised assessment instruments that effectively provide opportunities for students to demonstrate Evaluating and concluding objectives use open-ended items that elicit extended responses rather than short, closed-response items. Scaffolding of items can limit opportunities for students to demonstrate ‘exploration of scenarios’ (Standard A).

In order to assess the Investigative processes Standard A descriptor of ‘systematic analysis of secondary data to identify relationships between patterns, trends, errors and anomalies’, supervised assessments must provide opportunities for students to go beyond the determination of a line of best fit. Items that effectively address this standard involve multiple datasets, require transformation of a dataset prior to graphing or contain data anomalies that must be identified and appropriately managed.

Instrument-specific criteria sheets may specify the concepts, theories, principles, processes and/or phenomena that are relevant to the instrument, but must not alter the key cognition or degree words of the syllabus standards. These cognition and degree words are clearly identified in the highlighted standards available at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/1964-assessment.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/1964-assessment.html).
Application of standards

Across the state, there was a high level of agreement about the application of syllabus standards: evidence in sample folios substantiated on-balance judgments made by schools. However, some specific guidance about the match of particular standards to evidence is warranted.

Across the syllabus criteria, Standard E is described in terms of evidence of student performance, e.g. ‘reproduction of isolated facts’ (Knowledge and conceptual understanding), ‘recording of data’ (Investigative processes), ‘statements about outcomes’ (Evaluating and concluding). When a student does not respond to an item on a supervised assessment, it is not appropriate to match this to Standard E. However, this non-response must be considered as part of the evidence when making an on-balance decision about the student’s achievement in the relevant criterion (or criteria) for the instrument as a whole. Where a student has not submitted a response to an extended experimental investigation or extended-response task, teacher’s notes describing the student’s in-class performance can be used as evidence to support judgments.

When in-text referencing is used in an extended experimental investigation or extended-response task, this can provide evidence of ‘selection, use and presentation of scientific data and ideas’ (Evaluating and concluding, Standard C). Additionally, when electronic resources are referenced, this may also provide evidence of ‘selection of equipment, and appropriate application of technology to gather and record data’ (Investigative processes, Standard C).

In order to demonstrate Standard A in Investigative processes, data analysis must be ‘systematic’ and ‘identify relationships between patterns, trends, errors and anomalies’. Calculation of an equation of best fit for a linear dataset demonstrates Standard B, since this analysis identifies a single pattern. In order to demonstrate Standard A, relationships between different patterns or between patterns and errors/anomalies must be identified.

In Evaluating and concluding, Standard C requires ‘description of scenarios’. According to the syllabus glossary, this can be demonstrated by ‘giving an account in speech or writing, or representing pictorially’. Standard B requires ‘explanation’, which is defined as ‘making clear or understandable, or showing knowledge in detail’. At Standard A, there must be ‘exploration of scenarios’ which requires students to consider more than one possible outcome.

Teachers who annotate student responses with feedback that uses the language of the syllabus standards also support the work of panels by clearly signposting the evidence of achievement.

Support

Support materials for the Physics 2007 (amended 2014) syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

David Austin
State Review Panel Chair

David Madden
Principal Education Officer (Acting)
Science21 — A43

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Science21 2010 syllabus is in its third year of implementation.

Assessment design

Across many assessment packages, it was evident that schools are continuing to design effective assessment instruments that provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the general objectives across the full range of standards.

Effective assessment tasks ensured that the language used aligns to the syllabus standards descriptors to direct students towards addressing the criteria. Use of syllabus terminology within instructions such as explain, compare, synthesise or analyse and interpret can improve the alignment.

Schools should consider the complexity of the task needed to demonstrate the objectives at an A standard. For example, openness is required when setting assessment related to the criterion Issues and impacts (II). Students need to be able to identify and explain issues and evaluate scientific impacts, draw conclusions and express opinions that are scientifically and technologically informed, and analyse a range of factors that influence the development of scientific knowledge.

In order for students to be able to demonstrate the A standard in Knowledge and conceptual understanding (KCU) in supervised written assessments, questions need to provide the opportunity to generate reasoned explanations of real-world phenomena, and relevant scientific concepts need to be covered at a suitable level of complexity. This was not evident in some sample folios reviewed.

Application of standards

Judgments about student achievement are made by matching the evidence in student responses with instrument-specific criteria and standards drawn from the syllabus standards.

Evidence was found to support the majority of the decisions relating to the match of qualities of student responses in sample folios to the syllabus standards. Information gathered at comparability will be used to inform the 2015 quality assurance procedures and processes.

Where evidence was not matched to syllabus standards, it was generally related to the following areas:

- coverage of the Investigative processes (IP) objectives. Drawing a graph, in itself, is not enough to meet the requirements of the third Investigative processes objective and only touches on the gather data and information aspect of the descriptor. Students must also analyse, evaluate and interpret data by identifying trends, relationships and anomalies at the A and B standard. Graphing does not address the objective Assessment and management of risk, safe selection and use of equipment and technology to gather and enhance the reliability of data and information (syllabus, p. 35)
• criteria sheets do not align with wording of the standards. It is important to recognise that in *Knowledge and conceptual understanding*, ‘comparison and explanation of concepts, processes etc.’ is not the same as ‘comparing and contrasting’.

Schools match qualities of student responses with the syllabus standards descriptors for each criterion. The standard awarded is an on-balance judgment about how the qualities of the student’s response match the standards descriptors overall (syllabus, p. 34). It is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard.

**Support**

Support materials for the *Science21 2010* syllabus available from the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Ian Stewart  
State Review Panel Chair

Susan Scheiwe  
Senior Education Officer
Study of Religion — B20

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Study of Religion 2008 syllabus is in its sixth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments were designed to allow opportunities for students to engage with the general objectives of the syllabus and to demonstrate the full range of standards. The following were identified as characteristics of effective assessment.

Effective response to stimulus materials:

- provided a suitable quantity of stimulus materials, appropriate to the time and word length conditions of the task
- provided stimulus such that student responses were derived from the sources provided rather than learned analysis from class
- presented a variety of stimulus, balancing written and nonwritten sources, thereby providing opportunity for authentic analysis and synthesis of religious information and not comprehension or paraphrasing of written text
- ensured stimulus was directly related to a religious tradition or religious issue, rather than social issues, thereby providing evidence of analysis and synthesis of information about religion
- included questions that were manageable in their scope and scale given the conditions of the task.

Effective multimodal presentations and research assignments:

- restricted the choice of research questions to ensure equity in what was required in students’ responses
- provided clear expectations that processing ethnographic data involves more than summaries and descriptions of findings, requiring critical analysis of the experiences of insiders
- required brief, discerning annotations to either research notes or bibliographies establishing the validity of the sources used, that is, their relevance to the various stages of the inquiry process.
Application of standards

In most sample folios there was agreement about the application of standards. Where evidence was not matched to syllabus standards it related to:

- **Criterion 1: Knowledge and understanding** at Standard A — while student responses demonstrated knowledge of key religious ideas and concepts, their understanding of these ideas and concepts was drawn from a ‘diverse range of materials and phenomena’ at Standard B rather than a ‘divergent range’ at Standard A. At this standard student responses demonstrate understanding of how various connections arise out of a common religious idea or concept, either across world religions, within a religious tradition, or over time.

- **Criterion 2: Evaluative processes** at Standard A — students demonstrated ‘synthesis of complex ideas about religion’ at Standard B rather than ‘synthesis of complex and divergent ideas about religion’ at Standard A.

Support

Support materials for the Study of Religion 2008 syllabus on the QCAA website include:


Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

John Thomas
State Review Panel Chair

Jackie Dunk
Senior Education Officer
Study of Society — B11

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Study of Society 2012 syllabus is in its second year of implementation. In 2014, the Year 12 cohort was the first to exit using this syllabus.

Assessment design

Moderation processes at monitoring and verification identified that the majority of assessment instruments were designed effectively. As a result, most assessment packages were able to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the dimensions and objectives of the syllabus (pp. 2–3) across the full range of standards. Effectively designed assessment instruments also allowed students to demonstrate the use of subject-specific terminology, appropriate core theory and selection of relevant theorists (syllabus, pp. 5–6).

The supervised written assessment technique is used to assess a range of cognition through responses produced independently, under supervision and in a set timeframe (syllabus, p. 15). For verification folio requirements, one supervised written assessment instrument must be implemented as an extended written response to an unseen task or question (syllabus, p. 21). When varied stimulus material accompanies this instrument, opportunities are provided to interpret, analyse and evaluate data and information, as well as justify decisions and judgments using evidence, argument and discussion (Dimension 2: Critical processes).

The purpose of the extended-response technique is to assess the sustained application of higher-order cognition (analysis, synthesis and evaluation) to known and provided materials, stimuli and concepts. However, it may be implemented over a period of time, in class, and possibly in the students’ own time. This differs from the conditions under which a supervised assessment — extended response is implemented. In addition, when the extended-response technique is implemented, the student response may be presented in a variety of modes, including written, spoken or multimodal (syllabus, pp. 19–20).

In terms of the research assessment technique, assessment instruments that were designed effectively incorporated an inquiry approach (syllabus, p. 16). These also required students to locate and use information beyond the data they had been given. This provides opportunities to analyse and evaluate data and information (Dimension 2: Critical processes). It also provides opportunities for student work to demonstrate the selection, organisation, recording and presentation of data and information from a variety of sources (Dimension 3: Communication).

Application of standards

Standards are described in the same dimensions as the objectives within the Study of Society 2012 syllabus. This is evident in the Standards matrix (syllabus, pp. 23–24).

In the majority of sample folios provided, there was evidence to support the on-balance judgments that were made by schools on the standard awarded to each dimension. An on-balance judgment is about how the qualities of the student’s work match the standards descriptors overall in each dimension. This means that it is not necessary for the student to have met every descriptor for a particular standard in each dimension (syllabus, p. 22).
Where there was an issue with on-balance judgments, it was often associated with the evidence within the sample folios related to Dimension 2: *Critical processes*. This dimension focuses on interpretation and analysis of data and information to make, evaluate and justify decisions, rather than the description and explanation of terminology, ideas and social theories (*Knowledge and understanding*). Standard A responses for *Critical processes* has characteristics such as accurate interpretation, discerning analysis of ideas and theories, discerning evaluation of complex data and information, and convincing justification of decisions and judgments (syllabus, p. 23). However, for this to be demonstrated, scaffolding on assessment instruments should not specify or lead the student through a series of steps dictating a solution (syllabus, p. 20).

**Support**

Support materials for the *Study of Society 2012* syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- teaching and learning, including information on composite classes at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18156-teaching.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18156-teaching.html)

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at [www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html](http://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html).

Allen Bennett John Langer
State Review Panel Chair Senior Education Officer
Technology Studies — A23

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Technology Studies 2007 syllabus has completed its final year of implementation. The Technology Studies 2013 syllabus will be in its second year of implementation with monitoring of Year 11 results and verification of Year 12 results in 2015.

Assessment design

Throughout the implementation of the Technology Studies 2007 syllabus, schools have developed a wide range of design tasks that engaged students with design problems that required a product solution. Students were encouraged to encounter various intellectual challenges using higher-order thinking skills during engagement with and documentation of an authentic and logically experienced design process. Students developed and tested ideas and produced and appraised products using design criteria identified in response to a design brief drawn from a particular design situation within a context.

Implications for the Technology Studies 2013 syllabus

The Technology Studies 2013 syllabus requires that students use a design process to respond to real-world design problems in consideration of individual and community needs or identified opportunities for improvement or advancement. Design processes are ways of thinking and working that are used to explore a design problem and develop viable and innovative solutions. Students analyse design factors during the establishment of design criteria and in the development of ideas and products that are produced and evaluated. Design is a process that supports students to develop innovation and creativity.

The following notes refer to the context of the syllabus design process:

- design tasks should provide students with a context that identifies a human need for an individual or a community within a field (for example, personal, domestic, commercial, agricultural, environment, transport, communication, health or recreation)

- students should logically document a design process that they have authentically experienced. In other words, the overt scaffolding of student responses that document or template an artificial process should be discouraged as this restricts opportunities for students to display evidence of the A and B standards across the three syllabus dimensions

- the syllabus requires the documentation of a design process using a design folio. A design folio incorporates those aspects of the process that were previously documented across three Technology Studies 2007 syllabus assessment techniques: the project proposal and development, the project (design) realisation and the project appraisal. The word count for the design folio (syllabus, p. 19) requires the effective and comprehensive documentation of a design process using design and communication strategies using fewer words

- the report assessment technique assesses the sustained application of higher-order cognition as students explore the relationships between technology and society (syllabus, p. 20), which provides evidence of the syllabus objectives across all three dimensions. The report is a further development of the 2007 syllabus technique, Investigative analysis, which assessed Knowledge and application and Reasoning processes criteria only.
Application of standards

Across the state, levels of achievement decisions were appropriately determined using the syllabus requirements for determining exit levels of achievement. It was evident that schools were appropriately matching student responses, within sample folios, to syllabus standards descriptors.

Where evidence did not support school judgments of the match of qualities of student responses with descriptors, it was commonly related to the standard descriptors for Knowledge and application and Reasoning processes within the documentation of a design project, including:

- effective and discriminatory application of knowledge to the planning, development and production of products
- thorough analysis of contexts, design situations and products, effectively relating elements to the planning, development and production of products
- creation of appropriate and insightful design solutions that satisfy design briefs
- meaningful reflection shown in all stages of the design process to check the accuracy and suitability of decisions
- evaluation of contexts, design solutions and products, and clear communication of valid judgments and justified recommendations.

Support

Support materials for the Technology Studies 2013 syllabus available on the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20323.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html
- work program requirements, checklist and sample work programs at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/20323-wp.html

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html.

Panel training will be conducted in 2015.

Assessment workshops will be conducted in Semester 1 of 2015 focusing on assessment design (design folio and report) and application of syllabus standards.

Tim Osborne
State Review Panel Chair

Brad Walmsley
Senior Education Officer
Visual Art — B14

This report is based on information gathered by the state panel during moderation processes.

Syllabus

The Visual Art 2007 syllabus is in its eighth year of implementation.

Assessment design

Effective assessment instruments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the syllabus objectives across the range of syllabus standards.

Effective Appraising tasks assess the concepts, focuses and media areas selected by the students. Students select and research mentor artists who are significant to them. Producing developmental or resolved artworks allows students to synthesise information and integrate the Making and Appraising criteria. Appraising tasks should challenge students to justify a viewpoint by responding to a key question or provocation. This allows students to demonstrate independent and informed viewpoints and effective synthesis, which moves beyond formal critical analysis.

A body of work shows progress through the inquiry learning model (developing, reflecting, researching, resolving) as students integrate the components of the course by responding to a concept through a student-devised focus. This includes engagement with a context, media area(s) and the use of visual language and expression to realise artistic intent (syllabus, p. 19).

Effective Making tasks clearly scaffold the inquiry-learning model and sequence learning experiences. The tasks ensure that learning at the beginning of the body of work quickly engages students in the production of concrete and tactile developmental artworks. These tasks also provide timely and targeted opportunities for students to reflect on their work. Making assessment tasks direct students to clearly identify and articulate their personal focus and the context(s) that they were using to develop their response.

Effective tasks ensure that students develop their own source images, rather than appropriating from other sources. This can be done by encouraging students to use photography as both a media area in its own right and as a tool to reconceptualise and recompose imagery. In that way, students build a more relevant and personalised bank of images.

Researching as outlined in the syllabus (p. 6) can be considered much more than the traditional approach of using print or electronic media to source and compile information. Researching can be an active engagement in the set concept or focus being developed and can include concrete and tactile investigations. A series of experimental works could demonstrate student research as effectively as written notes and text from print or electronic sources.

Schools innovatively engage with the inquiry-learning model by increasing time and opportunities for making artworks and by re-sequencing processes to foreground development and reflection; and, by embracing the idea that researching can be demonstrated through action as effectively as it can through text-based forms.
Application of standards

There were very high levels of agreement across the state about the consistent and comparable application of standards and decisions about levels of achievement across sample folios. Significant improvements were evident in the way schools were presenting evidence of the way the qualities in responses in sample folios matched syllabus standards.

Evidence, in print form and digital format, were included with task and criteria sheets, annotated by teachers to clearly identify the qualities in the student work. These qualities included formative artefacts such as artist statements and statements of intent that communicated the intent of the work and how the personal focus of the student related to the concept being studied. Schools also used templates that included images of resolved works with supporting documentation of developmental works and key excerpts from students’ visual diaries.

Schools maximised the integration of learning and assessment to facilitate the collection of evidence of the cognition demonstrated in the assessment process.

The inquiry-learning model encourages students to move beyond acquisition of facts to metacognition. Many schools started with a series of Making experiences to initially ask students to use visual language and expression to begin their development of their personal focus in response to the concept. After these initial activities, students reflect and then begin some more targeted research to refine their thinking. Students resolve one or more works to produce their body of work: a connected sequence or cohesion of ideas and explorations. Commencing a body of work with the development of actual artwork and then reflecting upon the initial use of visual language and expression early in the process has enabled many schools to maximise opportunities for students to fully demonstrate the Making general objectives.

Reflection was evidenced in student work using student annotations and documentation of formative opportunities where students informally display developmental works for peer review, formative written statements of intent produced before the commencement of resolved works and the writing of artist statements. Schools built-in more than one formative opportunity for students to reflect at key points during the production of their body of work. Procedural logs documented the incremental steps and stages of the production of work. These logs were considered less successful in encouraging metacognition and a deep and authentic engagement in the inquiry-learning model.

Support

Support materials for the Visual Art 2007 syllabus available from the QCAA website include:

- syllabus information at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18156.html
- assessment advice from the Senior assessment hub at www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/18874.html

Panel training focusing on standards will be conducted in 2015.

Information relating to moderation and quality assurance processes is available from the Senior moderation hub on the QCAA website www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/586.html

Janelle Williams
State Review Panel Chair

Kathy Owen
Senior Education Officer