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Introduction

During the late 1950s and early 1960s changes in society, and the educational expectations of individuals led to changes in the provision of secondary education. This, in turn, placed stresses on the existing external examination system - the Junior and Senior Public Examinations.

External examinations were controlled mainly by the University of Queensland and were designed to assess the capability of the minority of students who intended undertaking university studies. The examinations were also used as a major criterion by employing bodies to assess the capabilities of potential employees.

This historical study endeavours to identify the major forces for change in the assessment system, trace the changes made, and indicate the problems and the conflict which have emerged during the process of change.

One thing appears certain. Historians of the future will not lack evidence of the intense interest generated by the operation of the Board of Secondary School Studies in the 1970s.

Secondary school external examinations, 1876-1964: A brief historical background

For almost a century, Queensland secondary school examinations were subordinated to the requirements of universities. Shortly after the establishment of the first grammar schools (the first secondary schools in Queensland) during the 1860s, the examinations and the syllabuses of these schools came under the control of the universities. The first public examinations for Queensland secondary school students were the Junior (now Year 10) and Senior (now Year 12) Examinations of the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne. These examinations were conducted in Queensland for the first time in 1876. Three university scholarships, each of £100 per annum for three years, were awarded by the Queensland Government from 1878. These were retained until 1910 when they were replaced by 20 Open Scholarships to the University of Queensland.

When giving evidence before the University Royal Commission in 1891, J. G. Anderson, Under Secretary for Public Instruction, stated, 'There is no doubt that at present the curricula of our grammar schools are more or less affected wholesomely affected - by the Senior and Junior examinations of Sydney'. As the number of Queensland candidates increased, so did the influence of these examinations on the curriculum and teaching methods of the schools. The University of Queensland Act of 1909 provided for the establishment of the University of Queensland, which opened in 1911. This Act, giving power to the University Senate to conduct public examinations and to issue certificates, led to the replacement of the influence of Sydney University on examinations and syllabuses by that of the University of Queensland. The Senate would not accept a proposal by the Department of Public Instruction (now the Department of Education) for an accrediting system whereby certificates issued by schools would admit students to the University without further examination. In December 1910, the first Queensland Junior and Senior Public Examinations were held.

In 1912, the University of Queensland Public Examinations Board (the Board) was established. This Board was responsible to the Senate for the setting and conducting of the Junior and Senior Public Examinations in Queensland, and consisted of 14 academic staff members of the university, one representative of the Public Service Board, head masters of three secondary schools, and two representatives from technical colleges. Because of the way it functioned and its system of representation, the Board was dominated by the academic staff of the University. When the new State high schools came into existence in 1912, the Department of Public Instruction found it necessary to comply with the examination and syllabus requirements of the Board. In 1915, the Secretary for Public Instruction stated, 'the curricula of the secondary schools were determined and governed by the standards prescribed by the University'.

Junior and Senior Public Examination Certificates were issued to those students who had passed a specified number of subjects. A student gained entry into a faculty or faculties of the university by passing specified subjects.

In 1941, the University of Queensland Public Examinations Board was abolished when The National Education Coordination Act and The University of Queensland Acts Amendment Act of 1941 gave the Governor-in-Council the authority to constitute the Board of Post-Primary Studies and Examinations. The Act provided statutory representation for bodies outside the University. The first meeting of this Board was held in 1945. Membership comprised four representatives from the Department of Public Instruction, seven from the University of Queensland, seven from approved secondary schools and one from the technical colleges. In 1949, the non-State School Assistant Masters' Association and the Assistant Mistresses' Association each secured representation on the Board. However, University staff members occupied most of the Chief Examiner positions, and were usually the most prestigious members of the subject committees. Consequently, University influence on syllabuses remained strong.

The functions of the Board as set out in the Act were to make recommendations to the Minister for Education and the Senate of the University concerning the curricula and courses of study in post-primary schools, and the arrangements for the conduct of the Junior and Senior Examinations. In the case of a disagreement between the Senate and either the Minister or the Board, the matter was to be resolved by the Governor-in-Council.

In 1951, the minimum pass for a Junior Certificate was abolished and a certificate was issued to all candidates who passed in one or more subjects. A letter rating A, B, C, N, indicated the performance in each subject for which the candidate sat. There is little doubt that this gave schools some measure of freedom to adapt courses to the ability levels of their students, and encouraged more children to remain at school for the Junior Examination. A similar step was taken for the Senior Certificate in 1956.

An important change was made in 1959 when the responsibility for the administration of the Junior Public Examination was transferred from the University of Queensland to the Department of Education. The first examination conducted under these new arrangements was in 1960. The setting and marking of the papers remained the responsibility of the Board as before, and the influence of the University staff on the examinations and the syllabuses continued to be dominant.
In 1961, The *Interim Report of the Committee Appointed to Enquire into Secondary Education in Queensland* (the Watkin Report) was released. Many of the changes recommended in the Watkin Report were subsequently implemented. Thus, in 1962 the last Scholarship Examination was held. In 1964, Year 8 was transferred to the secondary school, and *The Education Act of 1964* raised the compulsory leaving age to 15 years. Secondary education was now being provided for all children up to the age of fifteen.
Attempts to reform the examination system, 1964-1970

Economic, social and educational changes demanded changes in the examination system. Attempts to reform the system were, however, only partially successful.

The Education Act of 1964

The Education Act of 1964 made it clear that secondary education henceforth was to be designed primarily for the needs of the students and not merely for preparation of students for the University. The recent rapid increase in the number of secondary students with a wide range of abilities made such an approach imperative. The Minister for Education, the Hon. Jack Pizzey, asserted that one purpose of the Act was to establish new Boards 'so that we will have a board that will look after secondary students who do not want to go to the University yet will protect those who do'. Pizzey said that the boards would have almost complete autonomy in the field of post-primary studies. Section 25 of the Act stated:

For every child attending a State secondary school there shall be provided secondary education that is to say, having regard to the age, ability and aptitude of the child concerned and to the period for which he is expected to receive secondary education, progressive courses of instruction in such subjects and of such duration as the Minister approves.

The Act provided for a Board of Junior Secondary School Studies and a Board of Senior Secondary School Studies.

On the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies, nine members representing the Department of Education had a clear majority. Five members represented the nongovernment secondary schools, two represented the Queensland Teachers Union and one represented the University of Queensland. Consequently, the influence of University staff on the Junior Examination was replaced by that of persons directly concerned with the provision of secondary education. On the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, the Department of Education had a representation of nine, the University of Queensland seven, non-government schools six, and the Queensland Teachers Union, two. While the Department of Education did not have a majority on this Board, it had the largest representation, and a combination of those organisations directly involved with secondary education constituted a majority on the Board. The DirectorGeneral, by virtue of his office, became Chairman of both Boards.

The Honourable Jack Pizzey, Minister for Education, 1957-1968, steered through Parliament legislation designed to reform the existing system of external examinations.

The major functions of these Boards were

- to advise the Minister on courses of study which were required to provide for the aptitudes and abilities of students concerned;
- to make recommendations to the Minister on the conduct of examinations and the issuing of certificates;
- to make arrangements for these examinations; and
- to appoint subject committees.
The Education Regulations of 1965 made the Director-General of Education responsible for the administrative work associated with the functions of the Boards, and made further provisions in relation to the subject committees. The special committee appointed for each subject by the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies consisted of:

- the chairman appointed by the Board;
- six secondary school teachers appointed by the Board, four from State and two from non-State schools;
- a representative nominated by an appropriate learned society;
- not more than two members co-opted by the special committee; and
- the Chief Examiner in the subject for the Junior Examination.

Each special committee appointed by the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies consisted of:

- the chairman appointed by the Board;
- five secondary school teachers appointed by the Board, (three from State and two from non-State schools);
- one University representative;
- a representative nominated by an appropriate learned society;
- not more than two members co-opted by the special committee; and
- the Chief Examiner in the subject for the Senior Examination.

The special committees were to recommend to the Board prescribed courses of study, persons for appointment as Chief Examiner and Assessors each year, and to recommend on matters referred to the committees by the Board. The Chief Examiner was responsible for setting the examination papers and the Assessors were responsible for checking these to ensure that they were reasonable papers.

**The Junior Public Examination 1965-1970**

**The Examinations Committee of the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies**

At the second meeting of the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies on 28 April 1965, it was resolved to set up an Examinations Committee to keep the Junior Examination procedures under constant review and advise and make recommendations to the Board about developments in examination techniques.

The Committee consisted of certain Board members, representatives of secondary schools, members of the Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education, and a nominee of the University of Queensland. This committee drew upon the expertise of the Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education and became influential in guiding the examination policies of the Board.

**Role of Chief Examiners**

At a meeting on 7 July 1965 following a discussion by the Board about the content of an English examination paper, it was generally agreed that henceforth, within the syllabus set, the Chief Examiners would have more freedom in the content of the examination papers.

Several years later, however, on 20 November 1968, the Board decided that no author of a textbook used for the Junior Examination should be allowed to act as Chief Examiner. The rule was enforced on 25 February 1970 when the nominations for Chief Examiners in History and English were not approved by the Board because the persons nominated were writers of textbooks.

**The system of grading results**

In 1966, the Parents and Citizens Association of one of the State high schools asked the Board to discontinue the publication of the results of the Junior Public Examination. At that time, much criticism in education circles was levelled at the annual public ‘circus’ of the publication of examination results. The following year in April, the Board agreed to this request and submitted a similar proposal to the Minister for Education. In October of the same year, Cabinet agreed that names of candidates and the names of schools would no longer be published but that the numbers allocated to the candidates, accompanied by results, would be released to the press.

This decision was generally approved by the public including the Queensland Council of State Schools Organisations, but it was extremely unpopular with the press. A spokesman for Queensland Provincial Newspapers stated that his company would not publish examination results in this form as it had no news value. However, that company subsequently published the results in the form of candidates' numbers and results. This form continued to be unpopular with some parents during the next few years. In 1969 the Premier tried unsuccessfully to persuade Cabinet to reverse its decision. Also an attempt was made in the Queensland Teachers Union (QTU) to adopt a policy of supporting the publication of names but this was defeated in the Union Executive Council.
Another change in the form of results took place in 1969 when the grading system, A, B, C, N, was replaced by a descending numerical grading system of 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. The numerical system led to some confusion when it was first used. Many parents, thinking in terms of the previous system, wanted to know what was a pass. Furthermore, it quickly became a common belief, despite Departmental protests, that 4 was equivalent to a C on the old scale, and 3 was placed with 2 and 1 to represent failure. The result was that many employers and institutions were imposing higher entry requirements than before, because, by using this criterion of assessing a pass and a failure, a higher percentage of students failed when the new system was interpreted in this way.

Examination techniques

In 1965, the Examinations Committee expressed to the Board the belief that Chief Examiners and teachers in schools needed advice to improve examination techniques. With the support of the Board, the Examinations Committee then obtained the assistance of the Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education to prepare, in 1966, Examining in the Secondary School: A Guide to the Purposes and Construction of Examinations.

In 1969, the Board blocked what seemed to be an attempt to revert to earlier examination practices which were not considered desirable. When the Queensland Teachers Union requested that examination answers and marking schemes be sent to all high schools on application, the Board replied that this was neither practicable nor desirable for all subjects and that the Chief Examiner was encouraged to forward as much information as was considered desirable.

Standards of the examination

The Board constantly endeavoured, with some measure of success, to ensure that the standards of the examinations conformed to 'the aptitudes and abilities of students concerned'.

To cater for the academically less able, examinations were offered in 1967 and thereafter in the special subjects English Expression, General Mathematics, General Science, Social Studies and Homecrafts. The Chairman of the Board, however, pointed out on 4 August 1965 that, because these subjects were to be offered at the Junior External Examination level, the Board might be doing a disservice to those students who were doing examinations in other subjects which required a higher level of ability. In actual fact, the students and the general public quickly realised that standards in special subjects were not equivalent to standards in other subjects.

To ensure constant standards, in 1965 the Board approved a recommendation made by the Examinations Committee that the Chief Examiners should aim at achieving a distribution of marks having a mean of 62 and a standard deviation of 12 with a distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Percentage of Candidates</th>
<th>Cut-Off Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where the obtained distribution deviated to a significant extent from the above and where the percentage of failures and/or of As, Bs, and Cs differed considerably from the above, scaling of marks was to be carried out.

Responses of students, teachers and the public appear to have been quite favourable to the standards subsequently established by the Board, but some problems did arise. In 1966 the Examinations Committee believed that the failure rate in some subjects, especially Maths A, was too high and the cut-off points were adjusted before the results were released. In 1967 the Board agreed on a principle that the failure rate should be reduced by adjusting the standard of difficulty rather than lowering the pass mark. However, following the 1968 examination, the Queensland Assistant Mistresses Association complained that the standard of Science B was too high and the Board was of the same opinion.

On 27 March 1968 the Examinations Committee reported to the Board that on the basis of research conducted, Technical Drawing was not beyond slower students. In the 1967 Junior Examination, of 548 Special Course students who took English Expression and Technical Drawing, 51 per cent passed Technical Drawing. At the same meeting, one of the members of the Board tried to have the Typing rate lowered but this was rejected by a majority of the Board because it was felt that a lower rate would not be acceptable to employers.
For the new system of numerical grading to be implemented in 1969, the Board established the following cut-off points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Score</th>
<th>Percentage of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This system was passed on to the examiners\(^{18}\).

Another aspect of standards is the relationship of the standard of examinations at the Junior Level to other levels of study. Early in 1966, the Board discussed what the minimum Junior Examination pass should be to allow a student to proceed to the Senior level. It was decided that henceforth this decision should be made by the principals of schools and that it was not a matter for the Board\(^{19}\).

In 1965 and 1966 Commonwealth Secondary Scholarships (for Years 11 and 12) were awarded on the basis of results in the Junior Examination of the previous year. In 1967 the awards were based on results in special examinations (set by the Commonwealth Government) and then in 1968, 1969 and 1970 the awards were based on a combination of results in the special examinations and school assessments in the ratio of three to one\(^{20}\).

**Efforts to abolish the Junior External Examination**

On 4 August 1965, the Board discussed the relative merits of internal and external examinations in the special subjects introduced for the less capable students. A majority decided that parents generally would not accept internal examinations. One member of the Board, however, remarked that the Board might appear somewhat inconsistent in introducing further external examination subjects when it should be working towards the abolition of the Junior as an external examination\(^{21}\).

In the following year during the Address in Reply in Parliament, the Hon. J. Murray, MLA for Clayfield, stated that the Junior Examination should be conducted by the school, with the student's record taken into account, and that a certificate be issued by the Department of Education\(^{22}\).

Then in 1967, the Executive Council of the Queensland Teachers Union carried a motion put forward from Redcliffe Branch that the Junior Examination be discontinued. The following points were made in support of the motion. External examinations were out of favour because of the rigid curricula, the formalising of subjects, and the neglect of certain subjects such as religious instruction and music. Also, employers were wrong to use an academic measurement as a recommendation for vocational training. Furthermore, a more realistic evaluation of a student's ability could be given by school reports. Finally, it was pointed out that Victoria had recently abolished the Intermediate Examination\(^{23}\).

This was discussed by the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies and the following arguments were raised against such a change. It was claimed that if the examination was abolished it would be difficult to assess teaching and employers would have no guide to employing students leaving school. If an external examination was replaced by an internal examination it was doubtful whether there would be sufficient specialists to set papers. It was also doubtful whether the staff of the schools were ready for the abolition of external examinations, and there was the question of who would issue the certificate. An opinion was also expressed that the grammar schools were in favour of some kind of terminal examination.

A decision was deferred first when the Bassett Committee was established to consider the introduction of a Leaving Certificate. A further delay resulted from the decision to obtain the views of professional people and business organisations first. Then further discussion was deferred when the Radford Committee was established in 1969 to review the complete system of public examinations in Queensland. Thus, the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies finally never made a decision on this issue, before the Board ceased to exist in 1970\(^{24}\).

In 1969, two university lecturers were outspoken against a continuation of the Junior Examination as an external examination. Rupert Goodman, Senior Lecturer in Education in the Department of External Studies, stated that the examination tended to be the objective of the Junior course instead of the end product, and that it was characterised by the rigidity and elements of unfairness in questions, marking and assessment. He believed that the correct approach to the question should be in terms of assessment of individuals, and teachers were best able to do this. Robert Lang, Senior Lecturer in Education, asserted that after the scholarship was abolished, the employers soon accepted the changed situation even though before they considered the scholarships important, and, consequently, the claims that the Junior External Examination was important to employers should not be taken too seriously. Furthermore, Lang claimed that this form of examination cultivated rote learning and over concern for the reproduction of facts. Lang also advocated a system of accrediting by schools\(^{25}\).
The Senior Public Examination 1965-1970

Minor reforms of the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies

The System of grading results

The Board of Senior Secondary School Studies adopted the policy of the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies towards the form of results. For the 1967 Senior Examination, the Board implemented a numerical rating system of one to seven with the following recommended distributions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Fair</td>
<td>25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, the Board recommended in 1967 that henceforth the results of the Senior Examination should not be published in the press. As a result of the decision made by the State Cabinet, the candidate's number was published together with the candidate's results26.

Examination techniques

In 1969, the Queensland Teachers Union requested that the Board provide secondary schools with examination answers and marking schemes for subjects. The Board of Senior Secondary School Studies responded in an identical way to that of the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies, stating that it was neither practicable nor desirable to do this27.

Continuing influence of the University of Queensland

University representation on committees

The Board and its special committees were constituted by The Education Act of 1964 so that a majority of the members were representatives of organisations and educational institutions actually engaged in providing secondary education. However, various circumstances combined to result in the representatives of the university having a great measure of control over the Senior Public Examination. Firstly, they continued to set the matriculation requirements and to administer the examinations. Secondly, probably because of deference to tradition and expertise, university lecturers continued to occupy a majority of the chairperson positions of the Special Subject Committees.

For example in 1968, 19 of the 21 chairmen of special subject committees were university lecturers and in 1969 the proportion was 16 out of twenty. Furthermore, of the eight members of a special committee, there were usually three university lecturers - the chairman appointed by the Board, the official university representative, and the representative of a learned society. These university lecturers, because of their status and expertise in the particular subject areas, would have exerted a considerable influence. Also, university lecturers were appointed as examination assessors. At a meeting of the Board on 21 April 1969, the Board had to refer back to the Special Committee for Economics the Committee's nominations of two Assessors. The Board informed the Committee that at least one Assessor should be a person who was not a university lecturer. At the last meeting of the Board in 1970, the Board had to take similar steps with the Special Committees for Geology, Home Management and Art28.

Conflict over goals

Under s.47 of The Education Act of 1964, the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies was responsible to the Minister for providing Senior Examination Certificate courses suitable for the aptitudes and abilities of the students concerned, and for providing senior examinations. This matched the responsibilities of the Department of Education outlined in s.25 of the Act. Furthermore, it matched the interests of non-State schools which required similar examinations.

However, the University of Queensland applied a different criterion to the nature of the Senior Public Examinations. The University, which continued to administer the examination and set matriculation requirements, had as its goal, academic excellence. In discussing the topic, ‘Excellence in the University’, the Vice-Chancellor of the University, Fred Schonell, in 1965 stated that the University should concern itself with the talent of the students admitted. He also claimed that, over the past six years, standards of admission had been raised. He proposed that in future the matriculation rules be reviewed to require adequate passes29. Furthermore, the strong University influence in the Special Committees ensured a strong commitment in these
Committees to the subjects as a prerequisite for university study and the maintenance of standards established in the subject in previous years by more capable students.

Thus the Senior Public Examination was required to continue to carry out a dual role. It served as a terminal examination for those not proceeding to the University and an entrance qualification to those proceeding to the University.

Because of the University's continuing strong influence on the Senior Public Examination and its imposition of its own standards of excellence, problems were created for the Board in its endeavour to fulfil the role required of it by The Education Act of 1964. These problems were aggravated when larger numbers of less able students proceeded beyond Junior.

The Board made an early attempt at a meeting on 7 April 1965 to grapple with the problem when it resolved that Special Committees should be invited to submit to the Board at its third meeting any suggestions as to the form of examinations which would test adequately those who wished to proceed to the University and those for whom the Senior Examination was a terminal examination. Reports from the Special Committees in English, Latin, Greek and Ancient History, Chemistry and Maths suggested that a Matriculation Examination should be offered a year after the Senior Examination.

Then, later in the year, the Board made the following suggestions to the Special Subject Committees for the 1968 Examination so that it would be possible to distinguish between candidates of different levels:
- Setting a paper or papers with questions to be attempted by all candidates.
- Setting papers in which the more able candidates are required to attempt a certain number of more demanding questions marked with an asterisk.
- Setting a paper for all candidates to determine which candidates may be awarded a standard of competency, and a further paper for those seeking to qualify for higher grades of passes, the grades of passes being determined by the results of both papers.

In 1966 students and teachers were highly critical of the physics examination papers set which they regarded as unrealistic and extremely difficult. It was also reported that the university professor who set the paper had, in the previous year, set a question in the physics paper which was not in the Senior Syllabus. During a parliamentary session, Mr Fred Bromley, MLA, drew the attention of the Minister for Education to the difficulties of the physics paper and asked him whether, in future, papers would be set more in accordance with the teaching and capabilities of the students.

The Minister referred the matter to the Board which, in April 1967, discussed the questioning of marking in all subjects. The ratings used and their marks (for matriculation purposes) at this point in time were: A - 6; B - 5; C - 4; P 3; N - failure. To matriculate in most faculties, a rating of at least a C was necessary in specified subjects. The Board was concerned that in some of these specified subjects, particularly physics, the number of P ratings was out of proportion to the number of other ratings. The range of Ps for all subjects set in the Senior Public Examination was 1.14 per cent to 30.7 per cent, the highest being in physics. This practice provided high entry standards in some faculties but depressed the percentage of those receiving A, B, or C ratings, as indicated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths 1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The board drew the attention of the University to this situation.

In an effort to gain more control over the papers set by Chief Examiners, the Board stipulated that a condition of their appointment was that they were to conform to a list of requirements. These requirements basically aimed at ensuring that the papers set were of a reasonably consistent standard not beyond the average student's ability.

However, the 1967 Physics paper once more caused considerable criticism. Moreover, the results of the 1967 Physics paper varied widely from the distribution approved by the Board. The Chief Examiner, Professor R. W. Parsons, failed about 70 per cent of the candidates. Consequently, the Board added one point to each grade and recommended to the Minister that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland make this adjustment. The Board agreed that if this situation were to happen again, the grades should be decided by the Vice-Chancellor and the Director-General of Education or their representatives. For all subjects with an excess of 400 examination candidates, the following distribution was recommended:
Grades | Percentage of Candidates
--- | ---
7 | 2-6
6 | 6-12
5 | 10-20
4 | 30-50
3 | 10-20
2 | 4-12
1 | 0-6

The Bassett Report

Meanwhile, the headmasters of many independent schools were faced with the problem of providing for larger numbers of less able, Sixth Form (Year 12) students. Dissatisfied with the University controlled examinations, a number of these headmasters in 1966 began to agitate for the introduction of a Leaving Certificate for the less able, Sixth Form students. They envisaged this to be based on an entirely different course from that prescribed for University matriculation. They finally requested the Board to investigate the possibility of providing a Leaving Certificate. 

Professor George Bassett, Professor of Education at the University of Queensland, was chairman of a Committee which recommended in 1968 a leaving certificate as a separate qualification for those who had no intention of proceeding to a tertiary institution.

In March 1968, the Board decided to establish a committee to consider and make recommendations to the Board concerning the introduction of a Leaving Certificate. Professor George Bassett, Professor of Education of the University of Queensland, was appointed Chairman and seven members of the Board were also appointed to the Committee.

The Committee's report (The Bassett Reported), published in August stated that:

Present senior examinations are too hard for a significant proportion of students who at present stay on at school beyond Junior. At the completion of their secondary schooling all these students have is a record of failure. This with the results of 7595 students who sat for five Senior subjects in 1967. Of these only 50.6 per cent matriculated, matriculation being defined as the gaining of a point score of 22 in five subjects, (a minimum of 4 in each) English being a compulsory subject...

When the result is reduced to a total of 20 points to include those qualifying for entrance to the Institute of Technology and the Teachers' Colleges, the percentage rises to 65.6. Hence it appears certain that more than one-third of the 1967 Senior candidates failed to obtain any qualification and that considerably more than one-half failed to qualify for enrolment in the degree course aimed at.

If the sub-senior year is taken as a starting point, the failure rate is higher still... of the 8456 who began sub-senior in 1966, approximately 45 per cent only obtained minimum requirements for matriculation in 1967...

In a situation in which a significant and increasing number of students are staying on to the completion of the secondary school without qualifying to enter a tertiary institution (and perhaps without wishing to do so), there is a definite need for a different provision for them. At present the Senior examination has to serve them, and also those proceeding for further study. In attempting to do both of these tasks it falls between the two, not serving either as well as it might.
The committee concluded that a serious problem existed and that courses and examinations did not adequately meet the needs of post-Junior students, and those students who entered tertiary institutions and those who left for work would benefit from the introduction of a Leaving Certificate which should be established at the twelfth grade level, and be concurrent with the Senior.

**Attitudes of the Department of Education**

In the same year, 1968, the Minister for Education, The Hon. Alan Fletcher, indicated Departmental attitudes in Parliament when he said that examinations were needed to provide a measure of a person's educational standards. He thought that some day they might be able to abolish the public examinations and have a Leaving Certificate attested to by a headmaster.

The Report of the Director-General of Education, Gordon Murphy, for 1968 also gave considerable attention to the need for changes in the Senior Public Examinations. The Director-General pointed out that the secondary school population in 1969 was considerably different from that in 1959. The total secondary population (in State and non-State schools) had grown in those years from 36,590 to 116,330, largely due to higher retention rates. Of those who entered Year 8 in 1954, 16 per cent remained to complete Year 12, but the retention rate had risen to 26 per cent in 1964. Further, a longitudinal study of the careers of Year 11 students begun by the Research and Curriculum Branch in 1964 showed that only 40 per cent of the students entered full-time education after Year 12. The courses provided, being geared to tertiary education, were thus unsuitable for the majority. The Director-General concluded:

> An emphasis on a general education and an acceptance of the ideas that an examination at the end of secondary school should be an assessment of a student's work in the upper secondary school rather than a predictor of his suitability for further study are changed approaches that must be seriously considered in the next few years.

Acting on a request from Professor Bassett, the Minister for Education asked that the contents of the Bassett Report be widely circulated and he encouraged public discussion on the topic of examinations.

**Appointment of the Radford Committee**

On 9 June 1969, the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies held a special meeting to discuss the Bassett Report. According to one of the participants, Maxwell Howell, the Board met in an atmosphere which reflected the considerable concern expressed in educational circles about University domination of secondary education, about the educational value of external examinations, particularly the Junior Examination, and about the failure of the existing Senior course to provide a satisfactory education for the growing numbers of secondary students staying on in the final two years.

At this special meeting, an opinion was expressed that the trend was away from external examinations and a reference was made to a Western Australian Report on this subject. One Board member believed that, an overall revision of the Queensland examination system was required rather than a patching up.
Max Howell, Headmaster of Brisbane Grammar School, was a member of the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, the Radford Committee, Board of Secondary School Studies established in 1971, and the Scott Committee which produced ROSBA in 1978.

Another member stated that a proposal was before the Board of Junior Secondary School Studies that the Junior Examination be abolished and this member claimed that the Bassett Committee might not have made the same recommendation if they had taken that proposal into consideration. The Board finally came to the conclusion that the introduction of a Leaving Certificate was not the answer to the problem and they recommended that:

The Minister be requested to set up a Committee to review the system of public examinations for Queensland secondary school students and make recommendations for the assessment of students' achievements.

The unfortunate effects of domination by the University of Queensland had been openly acknowledged two years earlier by one University professor who spoke at the Wynnum State High School Speech Night in 1967. This professor said, 'I agree that in the past, the University, both through the public examinations and in other ways as well, has had a restricting and narrowing influence on the teaching of English'. Furthermore, influenced by a University study, Promise and Performance, the University of Queensland had doubts about the existing methods of selecting students for the University. Also, by 1969, the emergence of other tertiary institutes had made the examining role of the University of Queensland less tenable.

It is not surprising then, that in the opinion of one member at the Board meeting of 9 June 1969, there were no sharp clashes of opinion between representatives of the University, State and non-State schools on the need to review the system of public examinations.

The Board also requested the Minister to have this Committee chaired by someone from outside Queensland, so that there would be a chairman who might be expected to look at the problems to be solved unencumbered by prejudice about what had gone before and what was traditional.

On 18 July 1969, the Minister, the Hon. Alan Fletcher, appointed representatives of major bodies likely to be affected by any proposed changes in the public examination structure. The members were:
- Provincial for Queensland, Christian Brothers Provincialate;
- Prof. R. A. Plowman, Ph.D., D.Sc., A.S.T.C., F.R.A.C.I., Professor of Inorganic Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, University of Queensland;
- Gavin Semple, B.A., B.Ed., M.A.C.E., President, Queensland Teachers Union;
- William Wood, M.A., B.Ed., M.A.Ps.S., F.A.C.E., Director of Special Education Services, Department of Education; and
- Les Winkle (Secretary), B.A., B.Ed., M.A.C.E., Inspector of Schools, Department of Education.

The Committee's terms of reference were 'To review the system of public examinations for Queensland secondary school students and to make recommendations for the assessment of students' achievements'.
Dr William Radford, Director of the Australian Council for Educational Research 1954-1976, was an important member or chairman of major inquiries into education in practically every State and Territory of Australia. The Radford Committee's recommendations for changes to the Queensland examination systems were described in newspaper headlines as 'revolutionary'.

Role of the Queensland Teachers Union

Meanwhile, from 1965 to 1969 the energy of the Queensland Teachers Union had been directed mainly towards reducing oversize classes and raising comparatively low salaries. By 1969, conditions in these areas had begun to improve noticeably, and the Union became more concerned with the problems of examinations, especially the Senior Examination, which was responsible for low morale among students and teachers.

The president of the Union in 1969, Gavin Semple, was one of the members of the Radford Committee. Semple was advised by a special QTU committee. The policies advocated by this Committee were:

- An internal leaving certificate should be available to all pupils at the end of the fourth year. This certificate should have the following features:
  - It should be cumulative. That is, when a student completed a course, he should be credited for it and receive a grading.
  - Students should be assessed in such a course by means of continuous assessment. Marks gained for class exercises and assignments should be combined with those given for tests taken at the end of several assessment periods spread over a school year.
  - The certificate should combine internal assessment with a general school record.
- An accredited school should be responsible for developing its own educational program. The non-accredited school should have its assessment procedures and the content of its educational program moderated by an external authority.
- There should be established a Board of Secondary School Studies financed by, but not responsible to, the Education Department.
- This Board, in addition to specified responsibilities for the secondary school curriculum, was to be responsible for accrediting schools for the purpose of issuing certificates and for the publication of material designed to help teachers in the assessment of their students' work.

When the Radford Report was subsequently published, Semple pointed out the similarities between the spirit and content of the Union committee recommendations and key proposals in the Radford Report.

Further minor developments

Prior to the appearance of the Radford Report, some of the Special Subject Committees of the Board of Senior School Studies on 17 April 1970 introduced some minor reforms in examination assessments. In English, it was decided that in future the results would be based on an average of the results in two papers and that the grade of 1 or 2 might be raised to 3 if the mark in the first
paper was sufficiently high. In Modern History, it was decided that for the 1972 examination 50 per cent of the marks would be derived from the external examination and 50 per cent would be based on a school assessment standardised on the external examination. Also, early in 1970, a pilot study undertaken by the Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education indicated that Senior Examination results did not correlate highly with first year university results in Arts or Science.

Gavin Semple, President of the Queensland Teachers Union, was a member of the Radford Committee. The Radford Report strongly reflected the Union's policies on secondary examinations.
A new system of assessment

The Radford Report advocated a more radical solution to the problem - replace external examinations by a system of internal assessment and a system of moderation to achieve comparability between schools.

The Radford Report

The report of the Radford Committee was presented to the Minister, The Hon. Alan Fletcher, in May 1970. The Committee had considered 26 written submissions and had reviewed the public examination systems of the other Australian States as well as those of New Zealand, England, Scotland, Canada, and the USA. The advantages and disadvantages of continuing public examinations and the possible effects on pupils, schools and teachers were considered. Attention was also given to the relationships between secondary school performance and success in university studies.

Serious objections to the existing system of examining were that the objectives of the syllabus were not tested very well, and that a good examination result was achieved at the expense of attaining other educational goals associated with a broad education and preparation for living. The Report recommended the abolition of the Junior and the Senior external public examinations and the use of school assessments, a trend which had recently developed overseas. The major recommendations relating to examinations were that:

• the existing two boards be replaced by a single Board of Secondary School Studies;
• the existing Junior and Senior Examinations be replaced for the purpose of awarding Junior and Senior Certificates, by school assessment and that these Certificates be awarded by the Board on the basis of school assessment;
• the Certificates indicate whether the subjects studied have Board approval or are courses offered by the school on its own initiative;
• the Board maintain comparability of the Certificate gradings through a Moderation Committee and Chief Moderators and that the Board's Certificate be available only to students in those schools accepting Board moderation;
• in the assessment of achievement for the Senior Certificate, an order of merit list be prepared, based on a combination of scaled school assessments and special examinations not based on prescribed syllabuses (e.g. scholastic aptitude tests); and
• for correspondence and part-time students the Board provide a Senior external examination.

These and other detailed recommendations were to provide a blueprint which was followed closely by the Board of Secondary School Studies when it was subsequently established.

Initial reactions to the Radford Report

Following the publication of the Radford Report, the Minister for Education, the Hon. Alan Fletcher, stated that his Department wanted to test reactions to the Report before any decisions were made about implementing its recommendations. Therefore, he requested that copies of the Report be issued to teachers, the universities, educationists and educational boards. Furthermore, in the next few months the Radford Report was widely publicised in the press and by brief lectures at school speech nights, meetings of Parents and Citizens Associations, Adult Education Centres, and meetings of various other organisations. Generally speaking, the Report was received very favourably.

The Board of Junior Secondary School Studies held a special meeting on 16 July 1970 to examine the Report. The members were unanimous that it had been carefully and thoughtfully prepared and well documented. The Board supported the recommendations but agreed to recommend to the Minister that provision be made for an external examination at the Junior level for correspondence and part-time students.

The Board of Senior Secondary School Studies discussed the Report on 17 July 1970. The members generally commended it and agreed that it had widespread support. However, one member stated that, if the Board went so far as to regard secondary education as having little or nothing to do with tertiary education, the University might be forced to set examinations to ensure students had the necessary requirements before they undertook university studies. Another Board member pointed out that the Australian National University had been accepting entry standards similar to those outlined in the Report. The only recommendations for changes that the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies made were related to representation on the proposed new Board of Secondary School Studies. It was recommended that the proposed one nominee of each University in the State and one representative of the Queensland Teachers Union be replaced by two nominees of the University of Queensland and one nominee of each of the other Universities in the State, and two representatives of the Queensland Teachers Union.

The changes proposed by the Junior and Senior Secondary School Boards were accepted by the Minister, the Hon. Alan Fletcher, and were finally incorporated into the Act which gave legislative effect to the Radford Report.
The Council of the Union supported the principles outlined in the Radford Report except for representation on the proposed Board of Secondary School Studies. They wished to reduce the eight nominees of the Director-General to four and increase the one representative of the Queensland Teachers Union to five. Another concern of the Union was that changes should not be introduced until the teachers had been adequately prepared.

An editorial in the *Queensland Teachers Journal* on the Radford Report stated:

> Thus the Report anticipates autonomy for the teacher in modifying courses of study, in choosing teaching methods and, within the moderation system, in selecting methods of assessment. Teachers will now be in a better position to serve individual students and communities. Furthermore, they will be much closer to full professionalism, the chief characteristic of which is freedom to adapt special skills and knowledge to suit the situation in hand.

The Assistant Secretary of the Union prepared a report on the Radford Report. In this he first described the reactions of teachers:

> Generally speaking, staff teachers can be divided into three groups in their reactions to the Radford Report. Older teachers tend to be opposed to it; they can recall suffering inconvenience and frustration during previous innovations by the Department of Education. Younger teachers are inclined to favour the Radford proposals; they tend to be idealistic. In between these groups is another. It can see the value of the proposals but feels that there are serious problems of implementation.

The Assistant Secretary then went on to describe some of possible problems of implementing the Radford Report. The problems related to assessment were chiefly concerned with teacher competence, size of classes, administration, the time element, facilities for compiling and storing records, staffing requirements and moderation procedures.

Nearly all the principals of non-State schools supported the Radford Report. Some of them pointed out the need for preparing teachers by some in-service training and avoiding an over-emphasis on assessment. A Roman Catholic School principal criticised the composition of the Board which gave too much representation to State controlled institutions and not enough to non-State schools.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland, Zelman Cowen, was rather guarded in his comments, but he did say the Report seemed thoughtful and well set out and that he had been concerned about the ability of the present Senior Examination to predict success at the University. A Senior Lecturer at the University, Rupert Goodman, wanted inspectors excluded from the role of moderators and hoped that the tyranny of examinations would not be replaced by a new despotism of evaluating evaluations.

The public response to the Radford Report was much less enthusiastic. While some letters to the editor welcomed the changes, many of the letters were concerned with such possible difficulties in the system as the following:

- How would gross inconsistency between assessments of different scattered schools be avoided?
- Would teachers be objective in their assessment of students?
- Would private schools upgrade their marks to improve their status?
- Would teachers be adequately prepared?

Business representatives were opposed to the possible abolition of the existing public external examination system. The Queensland Employers Federation Director said that such a step could be a cause for concern for employers because they might not be able to rely on the Junior and Senior Examinations as assessments of prospective employees. The Queensland Chamber for Manufacturers claimed that an external examination was not an unfair test upon a student and it provided a fair assessment.

In December, 1970, the Minister for Education, the Hon. Alan Fletcher, introduced in Parliament a Bill designed to give effect to the Radford Report proposals. The Bill was mainly concerned with making provision for the discontinuance of external public examinations at secondary school level. In support of the Bill, the Minister stated:

> This is what is suggested for students - continuous assessment by the teacher. This would be more reliable and penetrating. But the most serious objection to the external examination is that it does not test the extent to which the objectives of the syllabus in each subject have been met. Only limited areas in the syllabus can be examined in the Junior, Senior examinations. For example, in the English syllabus, spoken English is regarded as very important...

> But the written external examination cannot test ability in spoken English. It is understandable, then, that some teachers do not give spoken English the attention it deserves.

> Let us admit, too, that the build up of tension in examinations constitutes a great disadvantage to a child whose achievement over the years is to be assessed in two hours. What is also disturbing in the present situation is the emphasis the external examination places on memorising and the accumulation of knowledge, often without understanding.
The external examinations also bring about a rigidity within syllabuses. Teachers, in fact, consult past papers more frequently than they consult the syllabuses. Those teachers with special talents are afraid to exploit them fully since students' attention might thereby be taken away from examination material.

To the argument that the external examination result implies the use of a common measure to all students ... with 30 000 Junior candidates, 125 examiners mark say 60 000 English papers. With all the safeguards it is possible to devise, one must get a fairly wide variation in the marking particularly of the essay type questions. So with the larger numbers involved now, a common measure is not really being applied under the existing system.

In the Bill presented, some minor changes had been made to the constitution of the Board of Secondary School Studies as outlined by the Radford Report. The representation of the University of Queensland and the Queensland Teachers Union was increased from one to two for each of those organisations and the representation of four teachers from the Association of Independent Schools was changed to a representation of four from non-government secondary schools to ensure as wide as possible a representation.

The opposition spokesmen welcomed the Bill and concentrated their criticisms on the problems related to the implementation of the Report.

The Bill, assented to on 21 December 1970 became The Education Act Amendment Act of 1970 No. 2. This Act provided for the replacement of the Boards of Junior and Senior Secondary School Studies by a single Board of Secondary School Studies, to comprise:

- a Chairman, appointed by the Governor-in-Council;
- eight nominees of the Director-General (three of whom were to be practising teachers);
- two nominees of the University of Queensland Senate, and one nominee of each other University in the State;
- one representative of colleges of advanced education other than teachers colleges (nominated by the Minister);
- one representative of teachers college (nominated by the Minister);
- four non-government teachers nominated by the Minister;
- two nominees of the Queensland Teachers Union;
- one nominee of the Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools (to be a teacher in a non-government secondary school); and
- the Executive Officer of the Board (ex officio).

The main functions and powers of the Board of Secondary School Studies were:

- to give general advice to the Minister on secondary education;
- to issue the Junior and Senior Certificates, and to determine the assessment procedures for the award of those certificates;
- to approve syllabuses for subjects designated, or to be designated as Board Subjects on the Junior and Senior Certificates; and
- to appoint a Moderation Committee and Subject Advisory Committees, and any other committees considered necessary.

If one compares these functions and powers with those of the earlier boards, it would appear that the Board of Secondary School Studies was given a greater measure of autonomy.

Ray Roberts was Director of Secondary Education, 1965-1973, during a period of radical changes. He was appointed to the Board of Secondary School Studies in 1971.

The Department of Education was concerned that teachers should be informed as soon as possible of changes to be introduced by the implementation of the Radford Report. Anticipating The Education Act Amendment Act, 1970, No. 2, the Director of Secondary Education, C. R. (Ray) Roberts in November 1970, had forwarded a circular to principals of all high schools and headteachers of primary schools with secondary departments. Included in the circular was the following information about assessment:

The continuous evaluation of students' educational progress must be carried out seriously and competently because the assessments given by teachers will be the bases for the various awards shown on the Board Certificates. Evaluation of achievement is not new - it is
fundamental in all teaching so teachers should have little difficulty in meeting this challenge. What is new in the scheme, however, is a need for re-examination of the areas of the syllabus in which student effort should be evaluated. Our assessments in the past have generally been confined to those sections of syllabuses in which the external examination assessed student effort. Some major objectives set out in syllabuses were consequently neglected. There is an urgent need, therefore, for all teachers to study the syllabuses they are following and take steps to ensure that all worthwhile objectives are recognised.

Another important matter for your reconsideration is the type of examination or test to be set. The Department is not going to issue specific directives regarding length of test papers, but I ask you seriously if the three-hour paper serves any useful purpose in the new scheme of things. Did this type of examination grow out of the need to stage rehearsals for the Junior and the Senior? If this is the only reason for it, should we not drop it? A number of short tests on various aspects of the syllabus would probably give a more reliable evaluation and would eliminate student fatigue. While saying this, however, I urge you to be temperate in your testing program. Do not over-examine. Do not let the learning which should be going on be unduly interrupted by testing.

Assistance will be available to teachers from this Department and also from the Board of Secondary School Studies. Early in the new year, seminars, particularly for Principals and Headteachers and Subject Masters, will be arranged. Within schools, subject teachers will have to co-ordinate their assessing and recording of marks. In many schools this is already being done. Moderators will visit schools and advise on testing and on moderating procedures. The details of the moderation machinery have not been worked out at present. This is a task which must be left for the Board of Secondary School Studies.

On 15 January 1971 new education regulations came into force. These included regulations dealing with the composition and functions of the Board of Secondary School Studies in conformity with the Act.
The newly appointed Board of Secondary School Studies experienced difficulty in implementing the Radford Report. In practice, the new system experienced some victories but experienced also much resistance. The QTU emerged as a powerful critic. The Scott Report modified the system to remove some of the criticisms and to make it more acceptable to current educational and social needs.

The major characteristics of the period

The period 1971 to 1979 was characterised by new procedures established by the Board of Secondary School Studies and changes made in response to internal problems and external pressures. The internal problems appear to have been caused by a lack of understanding of the spirit of the Radford Report. The external pressures were caused by the different goals of the various groups and organisations affected by the Board's early initiatives. The University of Queensland was still interested in the maintenance of entry standards. The students and their parents expected some entry qualifications for the University or for employment. The Queensland Teachers' Union was concerned with professionalism and working conditions. The new colleges of advanced education were mainly concerned with their own consolidation and growth and therefore created less pressure.

The Department of Education, however, played a highly supportive role because of its responsibilities to the Minister for Education and its responsibilities for the implementation of certain provisions of the Education Acts and Regulations.

One of the major difficulties faced by the Board was the need to reconcile section 37 of the Act which required the Board to advise the Minister on secondary education, regard being had to the requirements of a sound general education and to the special needs of students related to their age, aptitude, ability and special interests, with Regulation 55 of The Education Regulations of 1971 which stated, 'In 1973 and thereafter the Board shall compile and make available for the use of appropriate authorities an order of merit list on which students shall be ranked'.

Thus the Board of Secondary School Studies had to face up to a problem similar to that which had plagued the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies.

Early stages of the Board of Secondary School Studies, 1971-1973

Structure of the Board

The Board considered that it was important to establish itself as a separate entity with its own distinctive role and responsibilities (see Diagram 1). In 1973, sub-committees were appointed to investigate and make recommendations concerning the financial needs of the Board's operation, the manner and methods of reporting achievement, the nature and form of information which the Board should supply as a service to education institutions, and the effect which the use of this information has upon the functions of the Board and the effect of Board policies upon schools. Subsequently, the Board adopted a committee structure and the following committees were appointed - Management and Finance, Public Relations, Assessment and Moderation, Curriculum, Research, and Junior Standing.
The Moderation System

The relationships between the moderators is illustrated in Diagram 270.

Diagram 2:
The Board appointed a moderation committee to supervise the operation of the moderation system and to advise the Board on structures and procedures for moderation. The members of this committee were the Chief Moderators of 10 subject areas, one representative from each of the universities, one representative from the Board of Advanced Education, one representative from the Board of Teacher Education and, from 1972, a practising classroom teacher.

Chief Moderators
Appointed by the Board in each of the 10 subject areas, a chief moderator was responsible to the Board for all matters concerning his or her subject. The chief moderators made proposals for the distribution of semester ratings to the moderation committee. To assist them in co-ordinating the processes of moderation, the moderators had district moderators in each of the 10 subject groups in each of the 10 State educational districts, as well as State review panels of experienced subject assessors.

The chief moderators endeavoured to achieve comparability of assessments by reviewing the standards of the educational districts through meetings with district moderators.

District Moderators
Nominated by secondary-school principals in the particular district and appointed by the Board, district moderators were responsible for conducting the district moderation meetings. They came from the staffs of State and non-State schools and from teachers colleges and they implemented the moderation policy handed down by the Board through its moderation committee. To this end, they met with the chief moderators in February and in mid-year to obtain guideline information on the distribution of ratings, statistics for their districts, as well as procedures for the conduct of the district moderation meetings. As the representatives of the schools, the district moderators sought to facilitate the work of the Board by achieving consensus in the matter of standards of assessment based on the sharing of informed judgments. In larger districts, some district moderators had the assistance of advisers in specific subjects.

School Moderators
Within the school, the principal or his or her representative acted as school moderator supervising the subject area moderators.

District Moderation meetings
The central component of the operation of the moderation system was the district moderation meetings. These meetings between the school subject-area moderators and the district moderator aimed at achieving consensus among schools on assessments of students.

Each school representative brought to the district meeting samples of assessment instruments used and the procedures of administration and scoring. Before the meeting, the district moderator was provided by each school representative with a proposed distribution of student ratings. At the meeting, the school representative provided information on all the students' scores and proposed ratings. He also indicated the position on the order of merit list of each of the students whose work was sampled.

During the meeting, each school's work program and assessment procedures were discussed, the graded work samples examined, and recommendations made on whether the proposed student ratings be approved or modified. A school could choose to ignore the recommendations that flowed from the district moderation meeting. If this choice was made, the school's work was reviewed by the appropriate chief moderator or by people acting on his behalf.

Schools in remote areas did not meet in the manner of schools in districts. They were visited by panels of chief moderators or inspectors of schools acting as agents of the Board for the occasion.
Development of the Board's Moderation System

The Board believed that, since they were introducing a system with a new order of priorities, it was necessary to have effective communications. Therefore a regular Information Bulletin was produced as a means of communication from the Board and its committees to schools and as a vehicle for the inter-change of ideas between schools. A booklet was also distributed in 1973 to students in Grades 11 and 12 to explain some of the procedures which affected students and to clear up some of the misunderstandings which had arisen during the year.

The Board, from the outset, tried to ensure that a system of moderation did not replace the previous system of public examinations as an influence dominating the school curriculum. Accordingly, the Board in 1971 forwarded the following information to schools:

> The Board would be gravely concerned if its system of moderation were to be seen as dominating the work of schools in the manner of external examinations in the past. To see moderation in this role is to misconstrue its purpose. The Radford Report recommended that within the moderation system, schools should have freedom in methods of assessment of student performance. Freedom in methods of assessment is sincerely given and the moderation system should not be seen as restrictive or used as a reason:
> (a) for doing nothing until a direction comes from the Board;
> (b) for doing only what it is assumed the moderators will like;
> or
> (c) for doing only what moderators have outlined by way of example and advice.

In a later Information Bulletin in 1973, the Board stated:

> …there would appear to be a need to state that district moderation meetings are not intended to tell schools what they have to do. They are intended as a way of discovering what schools are doing, and of expressing an opinion on the acceptability of what is being done. The school has the opportunity of considering an opinion expressed by a meeting, but it is not required to accept it.

The Chief Moderator however cannot lightly dismiss the consensus of opinion of a meeting and may well wish to ensure that the objectives of a syllabus are being met by a school's course of study, and that depth of treatment is acceptable, if the school is to have its results included on Board Certificates. The only constraint imposed is that the school fulfills the objectives of the syllabus.

In 1971, moderation procedures were not applied beyond Grade 10. To assist in planning for 1972, the Board commissioned a survey of teacher attitudes towards moderation procedures. In 1972 and 1973 these procedures were extended progressively to include assessments made for Grade 11 and 12 students at the end of each of the two semesters.

In 1972, the Board commissioned a survey of district moderation meetings. Part of this survey was concerned with the attitudes to moderation of subject area moderators and district moderators who were asked to give their opinions on Junior and Senior moderation in four categories:

- continue with no change;
- change slightly;
- change radically; and
- abolish altogether.

In relation to Junior moderation, 'abolition' was heavily supported, while for Senior moderation 'slight changes' received the most support. Consequently, in 1973, the Board approved the acceptance of school distributions of Grade 10 ratings within prescribed limits of tolerance, while moderation at the Senior level was made more effective.

By the beginning of 1972 the Board was experiencing some difficulty in obtaining suitable persons as district moderators. This problem, which was to remain with the Board for the next three years, was probably caused by the contentious nature of the work.

Assessment

School assessment

The reliability of school assessment

The Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education conducted research into the reliability of school assessment and published the results in August 1972. The relationships among the various measures which, prior to 1971, were available at the Grade 10 level were examined. These measures included the Junior Examination (Junior), the Commonwealth Secondary Scholarship Examination (CSSE), and the Commonwealth Secondary Scholarship school rating (CSS school rating) which was based on school examinations and assessments by teachers. The relationship between two Grade 12 measures was also considered. These were the Senior Examination (Senior) and the Senior school assessment based on school examinations and teacher prediction. Finally, the value of the various Grade 10 measures for predicting success in senior secondary school studies was examined. The conclusions of the research were set out as follows:
1. The results of this study suggest that the Junior Examination, the Senior Examination, the CSS school rating and the Senior school assessment all emphasised similar skills and abilities. However, the CSSE emphasised considerably different skills and abilities.

2. Criteria of academic success were established by the Junior and the Senior Examinations and the framework within which the CSS school rating and the Senior school assessment were made was subsequently determined by those criteria.

3. Although little information is available concerning the reliability and validity of the Senior Examination, this study does suggest that school assessment can provide a measure of academic success at least as reliable and valid as that given by the Senior Examination.

4. The use of a multiple regression model in which CSSE results and CSS school ratings were used as individual predictors of success in the Senior produced a coefficient of multiple correlation which was considerably higher than the correlation between the Selection Measure formed from these two measures and the Senior. This indicates that the Selection Measure did not make optimum use of the predictive information available from the CSSE and the CSS school assessment.

The Research and Curriculum Branch also prepared a series of booklets: School Assessment Procedures. These were designed to stimulate thought and discussion on the topics of school assessment and moderation and to assist teachers in their greater responsibility for assessment of student performance.

**Board Initiatives**
Early in 1971, the Board encouraged 80 schools to avoid rigidity in their school testing program, and it urged schools not to test too frequently nor to rely heavily on common tests within the school.

The Board quickly became concerned with the tendency for some schools to increase the number of students in the 7, 6 and 5 categories in proposed distributions of ratings. In the following year, the Board encouraged the Moderation Committee to counter this tendency.

**Efforts to achieve comparability**

*Minimum assessment and distribution of ratings*

In order to facilitate comparability in Grades 11 and 12, the Board requested moderators to define the minimal essential forms of assessment. Furthermore, to compare students in Grade 11 and Grade 12 with others who had undertaken the same course of study at the same time, the percentage receiving each numerical rating of achievement throughout the State was set within the following limits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Rating</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usual pattern was set as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Rating</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparability tests**

In 1973 a series of tests was developed for use in third semester, Grade 12, to assist in moderation procedures. These Comparability Tests were held in the specific subject areas of English, French, German, modern history, ancient history, maths 1, chemistry, biology, geometrical drawing and perspective, home management, accounting and art. The Moderation Committee nominated the schools required to take individual tests, with no school being required to take more than four or fewer than three tests. A school was able to elect to take tests additional to those which it was required to take and to include a comparability test in the school's assessment program.

**Reference tests**

One of the recommendations of the Radford Report was that an order of merit list could be derived on the basis of a combination of scaled school assessments and special examinations not based on prescribed syllabuses. Regulation 55 of *The Education Regulations of 1971* stipulated that such an order of merit list was to be compiled by the Board in 1973 and thereafter.

The Radford Committee's proposal regarding the use of 'special examinations not based on prescribed syllabuses' was clearly influenced by the development by ACE R of a series of aptitude-type tests for tertiary selection purposes. These tests now comprising the Tertiary Education Entrance Project (TEEP) Series A, B and C and the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test (ASAT), are largely syllabus free, that is the data needed to answer the questions are available on the paper. What the candidate has to do is to demonstrate a capacity to operate intelligently in the area being tested.
In anticipation of the need to develop the necessary testing procedures, the Research and Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education commenced in 1970 the Queensland Grade 12 study to obtain information concerning possible alternative methods of selection for tertiary studies.

The first part of the Queensland Grade 12 Study appeared in Report No. 1. The Performance of Queensland Grade 12 Students on the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test, published by Research and Curriculum Branch, Department of Education, Queensland, in October 1971. The summary of this report stated that the ASAT was administered in October 1970 to 7737 Grade 12 students in Government and non-Government secondary schools in Queensland. The mean score obtained was 51.3 and the standard deviation was 11.7. Scores ranged from 0 to 93. The raw scores tended to be distributed according to a normal distribution. Generally, the mean performance of Science students was superior to that of students in the Humanities and other categories. The difference between the results of male and female students on the total test was not appreciable and there was no consistent pattern of difference in results according to type and location of school.

On 13 July 1972, the Research and Curriculum Branch published a report prepared for the Board - The Use of School Assessments Scaled Against the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test for Compilation of an Order of Merit List. In this investigation, the groups of students who would have been awarded Commonwealth University Scholarships on the basis of each of the two orders of merit were compared. In the conclusion it was stated that:

The evidence therefore indicates that an order of merit based on school assessment scaled against the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test would be as effective as that based on aggregate scores in a student's best five Senior Examination subjects for the award of scholarships.

Accompanying the report was a suggested procedure by which an order of merit could be compiled. The Board circulated this material among educational institutions for their views. These views were taken into consideration by the Research and Curriculum Branch which amended its proposals and the procedures outlined in Diagram 3 were implemented in 1973:

Earlier, in 1972, the Board obtained the results of the Commonwealth Secondary Scholarship Examination for the Chief Moderators to assist them in their moderation procedures.
The External examinations
During the period 1971 to 1973, the Department of Education continued to conduct the Junior External Examination as an agent of the Board, and the University of Queensland continued to conduct the Senior External Examination using the same procedures as those in operation before 1970. For full-time students attending secondary schools, these external examinations were of course phased out. For these students, the last Junior External examination was held in 1970, and the last Senior External Examination was held in 1972.

Certificates
The Board's Certificates were issued on the basis of full-time attendance. Award of the Junior Certificate was dependent on the completion of Grade 10, and the Senior Certificate was awarded after five years secondary education up to Grade 12 level. A descending numerical rating of seven to one derived from school assessment was continued for both certificates.

The Board discouraged the use of assessment results as a basis for the award of prizes, scholarships and bursaries. They believed it was preferable for organisations to use school assessments as one piece of information in a selection process involving other procedures, for example, interviewing.

In 1972, the Board decided not to release Senior results for publication in the press. The following year Senior candidates were issued with interim statements of results which incorporated a list of those tertiary institutions for which they had qualified to enter.

Reaction to assessment procedures
While there was considerable criticism of the Board's assessment procedures, very few vocal critics called for a return to the external examination system.

Principals of State and non-State secondary schools used the annual school speech night to comment on what was commonly called the Radford Scheme. These comments were often reported in the newspapers.

Most principals supported school-based assessment, but some were critical of some aspects, especially the tendency towards over-testing. A minority completely opposed the Radford Scheme as an alternative to external examinations.

While the Queensland Teachers Union did not advocate a return to external examinations, it quickly became critical of moderation procedures. Editorials in the Queensland Teachers Journal summarised the discontent felt in 1971. The editorial in the May issue criticised the practices of overtesting, and testing forced to conform to rigid unimaginative patterns. The editorial in the October issue concentrated on alleged weaknesses appearing in district moderation meetings.

The Queensland Teachers Union supported moderation meetings which acted as a form of in-service training on the techniques and content of evaluation. However, it opposed moderation procedures related to achieving comparability between schools. These imposed a heavy clerical burden on teachers and were considered unnecessary except for Grade 12. The Union also opposed the procedures related to compiling an order of merit list which involved an aggregate of four semester's results. It was believed that this had a detrimental effect on student motivation. Students who did not do well in Semester 1, Grade 11, found it difficult to retrieve their situation, and late developers and those studying subjects at Grade 11, which they had not studied to Grade 10, were particularly disadvantaged.

The Union in 1972 formally indicated to the Board the belief that moderation at the Junior level and the issue of a Board Junior Certificate should be abandoned as soon as possible. One of the Union representatives on the Board moved a motion aimed at terminating the issue of Junior Certificates by the Board and implementing a system whereby certificates issued to Grade 10 students would be school certificates only. The Board did not accept this, but it did relax Junior moderation procedures in 1973.

One teacher, writing in the Queensland Teachers Journal, attributed the problems to teachers' apathy and resistance to change which was inbred in the system. This teacher went on to explain that an antipathy existed between teachers and changes which emanated from educationists who had little observable contact with those on the shop floor. This presented a barrier to the implementation of the Radford Report, which demanded commitment by teachers based on an understanding of the full objectives and implications involved. As solutions, in-service training and first-hand communication between teachers and those initially responsible for the Radford Report proposals were suggested.

A consistent critic was Dr Ted D'Urso of the University of Queensland. His major criticisms were that the Radford Scheme was not guided by a philosophical analysis of the aims of education and there was contradiction between the Board's dual goals of gaining educational flexibility by teacher assessment and gaining the objectivity of grading associated with external examinations. Dr D'Urso also believed that the Board was unwisely giving precedence to the latter goal.

Public opinion expressed in the press was equally critical of moderation procedures. The Queensland Council of State School organisations stated that they had called for submissions and these had been by and large critical of the premature, across the
board, implementation of the Radford Scheme. *The Courier-Mail* adopted a policy of calling for a complete review of the Radford Scheme.

Opposition spokesmen in Parliament repeated many of the criticisms made elsewhere. Peter Wood, MLA, stated that most parents were disturbed and students were dismayed by the methods of assessment being used. He called for a review of the operation of the Radford Scheme. The Minister for Education, Sir Alan Fletcher, rejected this proposal, and stated that an unduly pessimistic and, in many respects, quite inaccurate picture had been painted of the Radford Scheme. The Minister referred to the support for the Radford Scheme voiced by a recent meeting of the State High School Principals Association and by an editorial in a recent Parent and Citizens Association publication.

The Senate of the University of Queensland stated in their 1971 Annual Report, in relation to the Radford Report recommendations on the Senior examination, '... it is to be regretted that there was not fuller consultation with the University'.

The Senate, on the recommendation of the Professorial Board, on 7 October 1971, adopted a new entry policy. This was based on recommendation 6.20 of the Radford Report which stated:

A tertiary institution at present using the external Senior Certificate as its entrance requirement could replace the external examination by one or more procedures such as the following:
- (i) it could accept the schools assessment provided that the semester units completed by the applicant satisfied its requirements.

Furthermore, since the Radford Report stated (see 6.21) that University entry should take account of all the evidence available about student ability and readiness for tertiary studies, the new entrance policy stipulated that teachers' assessments in five subjects over four semesters would become the basis for entry. This policy was applied at the end of 1973.

Since the Board of Secondary School Studies at that time had not announced decisions on the nature of the controls to be exercised over such assessments, the Senate accepted the recommendation of the Professorial Board that the system be reviewed after a period of about three years. The Senate also asserted that it maintained the right to set its own entry requirements and set its own entrance examinations if necessary.

The new policy of the University did not make use of recommendation 6.23 of the Radford Report which stated:

In the immediate future, we consider that tertiary institutions could therefore use in their selection procedures:
- (i) school assessments which could, if desired, be scaled for comparability between schools by the Scholastic Aptitude Test, by the TEEP tests, or by other means such as recent Senior performance and the common reference tests suggested in paragraph 6.15;
- (ii) TEEP-type tests covering a wide range of subject areas and designed to test abilities required in tertiary courses;
- (iii) Scholastic Aptitude Tests.

### The Board's response to criticisms

The Board did not hesitate to acknowledge that problems existed:

It was a break from tradition which called for a completely new set of expectations and attitudes on the part of students, parents, teachers, administrators, employers and the public. It should not therefore be a matter of surprise or disappointment that the implementation of the new system of assessing students' achievements had its teething problems.

In the first year, the Executive Officer of the Board, Les Winkle, said, 'I am well aware that sometimes this rather large machine has creaked and rumbled, lurched and faltered, and this I regret'. A member of the Board, in an interview with a newspaper reporter in 1973, admitted that there were certain internal problems related to obtaining comparability through moderation meetings.

The Board believed that much of the criticism in newspapers was based on misunderstanding and lack of information, and overlooked the positive aspects of the scheme. In a series of correspondence to the newspapers, public forums and lectures, the Board tried to overcome this aspect of the problem.

Unfortunately, according to the Minister for Education, attempts by the Board to secure news space to correct an imbalance in the presentation of views had been too often unsuccessful. Therefore the Board successfully requested the Minister to issue in 1973, *A Statement on School Assessment*.

The Board also pointed out some of the problems that were caused by factors external to the Board's assessment machinery. The Board referred to the resistance of some teachers to change. It also drew attention to how the goals of the University, and of many students, parents and teachers conflicted with a major goal of the Board:

The function of school assessment is to provide a measure of achievement, a measure of how much a student has benefited from his schooling. It is the use of these assessments for the purpose of selection that has bedevilled the processes of assessment of students by
schools, and the moderation of these assessments. The dominance of the function of selection in the minds of students and parents - and teachers has created tensions within the system. The moderation system is seen to be doing more than is intended of it.

There is evidence, in fact, that under the pressure at present exerted on the system, some teachers and some schools, perceive themselves in an advocate role at moderation meetings in an effort to obtain as many high grades as possible for their students. This places strain on the process by which comparability of assessment is to be achieved. Schools which are co-operating to operate moderation procedures correctly, fear that they may be disadvantaged.

The process of selection should be seen as separate from reporting achievement\textsuperscript{107}.

The Board assured the University of Queensland that the standards of the Senior Examination would be maintained. During the trial period 1973-5, the values of the seven to one ratings would be kept comparable to those of the 1967-71 period by moderation procedures\textsuperscript{108}.

In some instances, the Board believed that criticism was valid and made efforts to rectify the situation. Discussions were held with the University of Queensland about the revision of matriculation rules\textsuperscript{109}, and moderation to Grade 10 level was relaxed. Unfortunately, the Board was unable to answer immediately some valid criticisms because it needed time to develop improved assessment measures and to change assessment procedures.

**A critical period, 1974-1976**

**Moderation**

In 1974 the Board made certain changes, many of which helped to make moderation less onerous and more acceptable. Acting on the recommendations of the Moderation Committee and a sub-committee appointed by the Board in 1973 to investigate the present uses and standing of the Junior Certificate, the Board made significant changes to the procedures for the moderation of assessment standards for the 1974 Junior Certificates. Meetings which examined the distribution of ratings proposed by schools and the work of students on which such distributions were based were discontinued.

The Board believed that the community was prepared to accept a decreased level of moderation of standards of assessment and that procedures for moderation for Grade 10 need be minimal only. The procedures retained were:

- The provision of assistance to schools in the development of programs of work and programs of assessment and in the determination of standards of assessment, through meetings of teachers and through visits to schools by Chief Moderators.
- The holding of meetings to establish standards of assessment in newly implemented courses of study.
- The monitoring of the distributions of ratings. Where a school appeared to depart significantly from the recognised standards of assessment, the Board proposed to investigate the standards of assessment adopted by the school in that subject in the following year\textsuperscript{110}.

Changes in method but not in degree were also made in the procedures for moderation of standards of assessment for Grade 11 and Grade 12. The responsibility for recommending approval of a school's standards of assessment remained with the Chief Moderator.

For Semester 1 (Grade 11) and Semester 3 (Grade 12) the moderation meeting remained as the principal instrument for providing assistance to schools and information to the Chief Moderator, but more time was devoted to meetings. In some instances, two meetings were held for a subject to allow for the separation of its main functions - one meeting to assist schools to establish standards, the other to provide information for the Chief Moderator on standards subsequently adopted within each school\textsuperscript{111}.

For Semester 2 (Grade 11) and Semester 4 (Grade 12) the principal instrument of moderation was the advisory panel. The distributions of ratings established for Semester 1 and Semester 3 served as a base. Where a school sought to vary such a distribution, it sought the approval of the Chief Moderator who was assisted by an advisory panel of experienced teachers\textsuperscript{112}.

The moderation meeting had the advantage of involvement of teachers, but it took them from their normal teaching duties. The use of advisory panels overcame the problem of loss of time, but did not provide a ready feed-back for schools. By use of each method at the appropriate time, a satisfactory compromise was reached.

By-products of the moderation system were the positive influence it had on assessment programs within schools and the opportunities it provided to teachers for professional development through contact and discussion with other teachers\textsuperscript{113}.

**Order of merit list**

The Board advocated that tertiary institutions should make use of the Order of Merit list of Grade 12 students prepared by the Board. This appeared as a Tertiary Entrance Score (TE Score) derived from school assessments scaled against the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test.
All tertiary institutions except the University of Queensland made use of the TE Score in their entry requirements in 1974 and the University of Queensland began to make use of it in 1975. This removed certain inequities and anomalies inherent in the University of Queensland system of using aggregates of ratings over four semesters and thus reduced some of the undesirable pressures on schools and students. However, at the end of 1974, the University of Queensland (and subsequently other tertiary institutions) introduced quotas to all Bachelor's courses. This almost coincided with the introduction of TE Scores and it was the TE Score system which was singled out by some of the public as the obstacle to tertiary entrance.

The assessment timetable for 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 4</td>
<td>Meeting of District Moderators with Chief Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11-15</td>
<td>District Moderation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25-29</td>
<td>Chief Moderators visit remote areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28</td>
<td>End of Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8</td>
<td>Meeting of District Moderators with Chief Moderators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15-19</td>
<td>District Moderation Meeting to establish standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22-26</td>
<td>District Moderation Meeting to review proposed distribution of ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4-5</td>
<td>ASAT tests in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>Estimates of proposed distribution for Semester 4 to be sent to Chief Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15-29</td>
<td>Order of merit assessment to be furnished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Information on grades allotted to students furnished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29</td>
<td>End of Semesters 2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>Distribution of ratings for Semester 2 sent to Chief Moderators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important research

The Queensland Grade 12 study
In March 1975 The Queensland Grade 12 Study Report No. 2: Validation of Aptitude Measures for the Rescaling of School Assess- was published. The results presented in this report provided evidence that ASAT could provide a reasonably good basis for rescaling school assessments. TEEP scores were considered better but it was considered doubtful whether the gain in validity was worth the additional hours of testing involved.

Schools under Radford
In November 1975, a report, Schools Under Radford, was presented to the Board. This investigation, undertaken by two research officers of the Department of Education and the research officer of the Board, aimed at placing in perspective the often conflicting reports about practices in secondary schools after the implementation of the Radford Report proposals.

Following an analysis of questionnaires and interviews, the researchers came to the conclusion that while much dissatisfaction was expressed about some aspects of the secondary school system, on balance, respondents favoured the present system over the system incorporating external public examinations. Furthermore, only a small proportion indicated that they would like a return to the external public examination system. Much of the dissatisfaction stemmed from the moderation system. Teachers said that moderation did not achieve comparability, led to an over-emphasis on assessment, caused an increase in the frequency of assessment, created student strain and disadvantaged students in small schools, particularly if they were in a typically bright group. Students also believed that moderation did not achieve comparability, and shared with many teachers the view that a school's allocation of ratings was relatively fixed, despite official statements from the Board of Secondary School Studies to the contrary.

The report recommended that:
1. The Board of Secondary School Studies sponsor an investigation of assessment techniques presently in use in schools to identify those with which teachers experience difficulty and those which appear to be little used and thus to establish:
   (a) areas of need for in-service education,
   (b) the desirability of allowing more freedom to schools in the extent of their use of various procedures.
2. In-service seminars be conducted to coincide with the release to teachers of materials relating to alternative approaches and new ideas so that maximum benefit can be derived from the material.
3. Tertiary institutions, in their general entrance requirements, and in their specific course or Departmental requirements, replace any required minimum number of points over four semesters with a requirement for study of the subject for four semesters with a required minimum number of points in the best three semesters.

4. The Board of Secondary School Studies investigate ways of speeding up the issuing of ratings to students, particularly Semester 2 ratings.

The Campbell Report
In December 1975 the results of another study, the Campbell Report, were made available to the Board. The Australian Advisory Committee on Research in Education (later renamed the Educational Research and Development Committee) had commissioned Professor William J. Campbell and colleagues in the Department of Education, University of Queensland, to undertake a wide-ranging study of the educational effects of those changes which followed the implementation of the Report of the Radford Committee. Regarding evaluation, the Report made the following comments:

The predominant pattern which emerges is thus one in which tests and examinations are the imperatives of school life and the curriculum and tests of information gained are closely co-ordinated, with the moderation procedure acting as the mechanism for the co-ordination. The teachers do not themselves acknowledge that this co-ordination amounts to a strong conscious use of examinations and tests as motivation for school work either through competition or threat of low marks, but there is an undeniable tendency for this to be the case. Data from the student sample also demonstrate this tendency.

From the evidence presented ... one is tempted to conclude that the evaluation arena has witnessed no dramatic change following the introduction of the Radford scheme, and that the promise of freedom in evaluation practices remains largely unfulfilled.

The report concluded:

It would be wrong to suggest that the Radford scheme has been a failure; clearly it has many fine process achievements to its credit. Its achievements, as measured by student outcomes, have, however, not lived up to expectations and hopes, and careful consideration should now be given to new forms of intervention ... The present scheme of moderated teacher assessments has stimulated the professional growth of school administrators and teachers, and has fostered a school identity. As a consequence, school groups are now more educationally sophisticated than they were in 1970, and might well be given greater autonomy in the matter of the ratings which they assign to their students. Perhaps moderation could give way to a gentler scheme of monitoring, involving liaison officers in school districts, tertiary institutions, and employment.

It must be realised, however, that these reports relied on data collected in 1974 and that by 1976 some of the more serious problems had been removed by changes introduced by the Board and the University of Queensland. This was acknowledged in 1976 by one of the authors of the Campbell Report.

Continuing criticism
Between 1974 and 1976, criticism of the Board's assessment procedures continued. These procedures were even seen by some commentators as responsible for the lack of interest in annual school drama and geography competitions.

In 1974 the Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens Associations (QCPCA) advocated that assessment was essentially for information between teacher, child and parent, and that tertiary institutions and employers should not force entrance requirements onto secondary education but make their own assessments when required. Consequently, the QCPCA urged the Department of Education.
1. To allow secondary schools to develop their own assessment principles and practices, with advice and consultation available to them.

   1.1 that these assessments are for information between teacher, child and parent and are only made available to outside interests with the approval of the student and parents.

2. To encourage Principal, teacher co-operation in communicating effectively the student's attainments to parents.

   2.1 to urge primary and secondary school principals and teachers to adopt a ‘face-to-face’ individual reporting system.

The QCPCA maintained this policy, with some minor changes, right through to 1983.

The Queensland Teachers Union stepped up its opposition to moderation and the method of deriving an order of merit list for tertiary institutes. In 1974 the Union advocated a policy of accreditation for schools which should have their own responsibility for courses, assessment and issue of reports or certificates. The Union believed that no single, universally used form of report or certificate could adequately fulfil the requirements of students, parents, employers or higher education institutions. It did believe, however, that assessments in non-accredited schools should be moderated in a similar way to the existing moderation system. The Union also continued to press for the elimination of the Junior Certificate and the abolition of moderation in Grade 11.

In 1975, the Board came under direct pressure from the QTU to eliminate moderation in Grade 11. The Board refused to change its policy. It asserted that it was unreasonable to expect that a society conditioned to external examinations for almost a century would accept, over the span of a few years, the abolition not only of public examinations, but also of a system which provided safeguards of standards and some measure of comparability of standards between schools.

Early in 1976, the QTU Executive Council sent a newsletter to teachers directing them not to supply examples of students' work to any person except for the purpose of moderation within the school. This action, if followed through, would have blocked the Board's provision of Senior Certificates in 1977. On this issue, the Queensland Teachers Union was supported by the Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools.

The Board in May requested the Union to defer their planned action until the Board had time to consider changes dependent upon four developments which had not yet been finalised. These were:

- The moderation committee of the Board was considering several proposals for changes to moderation procedures.
- A select committee, chaired by Professor Ted Scott of the Board, was examining the findings of the Campbell Report and the report commissioned by the Board itself, Schools Under Radford.
- The Board Executive Officer (Les Winkle) was investigating developments in California, Canada, England and Scotland.
- The Board was awaiting the outcome of its submission to the Education Minister (The Hon. Val Bird) for its reconstitution and for a re-statement of its powers and functions.

The Union accepted this proposal and subsequent changes made by the Board defused the situation. After May 1976, the Union became less concerned with these issues.

**External examinations**

After 1973 the BSSS took over the administration of the Junior and Senior External Examinations. Because the Board believed that these external examinations should not provide an alternative to school-based assessment, restrictions were imposed on prospective candidates. Consequently, the majority of students sitting for external examinations since 1973 have been mature age students.

**Press comments**

Discussion about moderation procedures featured less prominently in the press during this period. However, critical comments continued to appear. Of interest was a brief survey conducted by the *Telegraph* which revealed that many employers did not make use of Junior or Senior Certificates or did not understand them. One bank used its own test to select employees. Editorials in *The Courier-Mail* continued to be critical and referred to the confusion that was associated with the Radford Plan.
Efforts to improve or change the new system, 1976-1979

The Queensland Teachers Union

In July 1976, the Queensland Teachers Union conducted a workshop involving a wide range of interested groups including the BSSS, to investigate moderation procedures in Queensland secondary schools. In the final report of this workshop it was stated that 'There was no support expressed for retaining the system of internal assessment with moderation in its present form'. Two changes were generally accepted at the workshop as being necessary. These were that official ratings should be awarded only at the end of Grade 11 and Grade 12 years, and that ratings awarded should be based on agreed standards rather than on relative positions in a group. 

The University of Queensland

In 1976, a Committee was set up by the Professorial Board of the University of Queensland to review the effects of the Radford Scheme. This committee recommended that the Professorial Board advise the Senate that:

- it does not recommend the reintroduction of an external examination or the introduction of a special examination for this University;
- nevertheless, the University should continue to monitor the knowledge and skills of its first year students and, in consultation with the schools, seek to remedy deficiencies;
- Senate recommend to the Minister for Education that results in a subject should not be used in calculating a TE Score unless that subject had previously been approved for that purpose by the universities;
- Senate recommend to the Minister for Education and to the Board of Secondary School Studies that the use of the ASAT be reviewed and a more effective test or procedure for ensuring comparability of scores between schools and subjects be sought.

The Department of Education

The Year 12 study was furthered by the publication of Report No. 3, The Use of Rescaled Teacher Assessments in the Admission of Students to Tertiary Study, Research Branch, Department of Education, Queensland, January 1977. This paper by Barry McGaw assessed the role and effectiveness of external examinations at Year 12 in Queensland and the effectiveness of the alternatives with which they have been replaced, and focused on the selection of entrants to tertiary institutions. The author, on the basis of this study, expressed the belief that rescaling school assessments against ASAT appeared to be producing a selection index which worked almost as well as the former examination. This opinion, then, differed from that formed by the University Committee referred to above.

In 1978 the Research Branch made a study of school assessment procedures. The conclusions were:

- Most decisions relating to assessment procedures in the subjects studied are made by the subject master or subject area co-ordinator in consultation with other teachers of the subject. The principal has the power to veto decisions, but it appears that he seldom exercises it.
- Teachers are generally satisfied that mechanical aspects of assessment and moderation are functioning fairly smoothly.
- There is substantial concern that comparability between schools is not being achieved.
- Schools are utilising the flexibility available to them in their choice of modes of assessment.
- Although outside bodies (particularly the Board) make substantial demands on schools, respondents generally felt that summative assessment did not dominate their assessment program and that they were generally able to integrate formative assessment into their teaching program.
- There is considerable diversity in the procedures used by schools to assign the Special Subject Assessment (SSA) which is sent to the Board for input into the Tertiary Entrance (TE) Score calculations. Only half of the schools used standardisation effectively when combining semester scores in calculating the SSA.
- Most principals and teachers indicated that they were satisfied with the quality of the assessment instruments in their school or subject. However, most indicated that their view was based purely on their own perceptions rather than on any specific validation procedure. In contrast to the apparent satisfaction of respondents in schools with the quality of tests, only one of the inspectors interviewed was satisfied with their quality. Inspectors believed that many teachers did not possess the skills necessary to ensure that tests were valid and reliable.
- Between 1974 and 1978, there have been considerable improvements in:
  - the use of formative assessment
  - the use of appropriate modes of assessment
- the mechanics of the moderation system

- Overall, there is greater satisfaction with the system at present than there was in the years immediately following the implementation of internal assessment.

- Further research into the method of calculation of TE Scores should be undertaken.

- Further research into the validity and reliability of assessment programs and instruments used in schools should be carried out.

The Board of Secondary School Studies - The Scott Report

The Board set up a special sub-committee on 27 February 1976 to determine the implication of the findings of the reports, *The Campbell Report* and *Schools Under Radford*, and to make recommendations concerning the action which the Board should take in response to those findings. This committee was headed by the Dean of Education at James Cook University, Professor Ted Scott. The members were George F. Berkeley, Assistant Director-General of Education, Max A. Howell, Head Master, Brisbane Grammar School, Lyle T. Schuntner, President, Queensland Teachers Union, Richard F. Walker, Assistant Director of Mount Gravatt CAE, and Les Winkle, Executive Officer, Board of Secondary School Studies.

At the outset, the Board claimed, with some justification, that changes made to the moderation system by the Board in 1974 had removed the source of some of the more severe criticisms noted in *Schools Under Radford* and *The Campbell Report*. These studies relied on data collected mainly before the effects of these changes were felt.

The first Report of the Scott Committee was submitted to the Board in December 1976. In summary, the recommendations of the committee were that:

(i) there be a change from the present norm-based system to a competency-based system of assessing and reporting the achievement of students. The ‘competency-based’ system meant that students would be assessed on what they had achieved rather than how they compared with other students. It was hoped that this would relieve the stress on students who felt they were in competition with their fellows.

(ii) more attention be paid to the preparation of teachers for their role in assessment through closer collaboration with teacher-employing authorities and teacher education institutions, and through a new emphasis on assistance and advice in moderation procedures. (It was felt that in the past the Board was too concerned with the final product of moderation - student ratings.)

(iii) positive action be taken to emphasise the importance of the curriculum and to assist schools to provide appropriate courses;

(iv) an expanded and more intensive information dissemination service be established, to develop a clearer understanding of the Board's role and of its policies and procedures; and

(v) a co-ordinated research program be undertaken to assist the Board in evaluating both its own procedures and the proposals made by interested parties.

These five statements were adopted by the Board as basic principles to serve as guidelines for the Board and its committees in determining future policies. Comments and submissions on the Scott Report from Board committees and from outside organisations and educational institutions were taken into consideration in the rewriting of the report for final submission to the Board. The Queensland Teachers Union was one of the organisations which expressed interest in, and initial support for, the five principles. The final report of the Scott Committee, *A Review of School-Based Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools*
Assessment of Student Achievement
The present norm-based assessment procedures in Years 10, 11 and 12 should be replaced by competency-based procedures (P15). Assessment in each year of secondary school studies for all subjects (Board, Board-Approved and School) should be made for the relevant dimensions of achievement in each subject in terms of the following competency categories (P16):
* Highest level of competency
* Highly competent
* Competent
* Limited competence
* Very Limited competence
* Ungraded

The levels of achievement reported in Year 10 should be expressed as levels of competency on the appropriate achievement dimensions of the subject studied, together with a statement of the student's overall level of competency in the subject (P18). In the Senior Secondary School the Board should issue only one assessment in each subject - an exit assessment indicating a student's global level of performance in that subject at the cessation of his/her study of that subject (P19).

Accreditation and certification
The Board's present moderation practices should be replaced by a system of subjects accreditation of proposed work programs and competency criteria, and Certification of reported standards of achievement (P20). The subject accreditation and certification procedures should be operated through a system of Subject Review Panels and a Board Accreditation and Certification Committee, together with associated teachers' meetings in the case of Years 11 and 12 (which, though mandatory, should not be part of the formal processes of accreditation and certification) and with associated School Consortia in the case of Year 10 (P21).

Subject review panels should be established at two levels, viz. district and State. Initially only the State panels should apply to Years 11 and 12 (P22).

The Board's Moderation Committee and Assessment and Moderation Committee should be replaced by one committee.

The Board Accreditation and Certification Committee
This committee should be an executive committee of the Board. Its membership should include a Chairman appointed by and from the Board, all State Subject Review Panel Chairman together with such other membership as the Board determines (P23).

The present moderation meetings in Years 11 and 12 should be replaced by District Teachers' Meetings in each subject or subject grouping. Such meetings should be held twice a year during the mid-semester breaks in the first and second semesters respectively. Attendance at these meetings by school Subject Co-ordinators (replacing the present position of school subject moderators) should be mandatory. However such meetings should not be seen as part of the formal accreditation and certification processes, but rather as professional meetings for teachers to engage in co-operative ventures in planning their work and assessment programs and in arriving at performance standards seen as fulfilling competency criteria (P24).

In Year 10, to assist schools in the establishment of work programs and in the setting of standards, school consortia should be established throughout the state on the basis of geographical and demographical considerations, for example, in the more sparsely populated areas, a large high school and a number of high school tops could form a consortium. Meetings of school consortia should parallel those of the Years 11 and 12 District Teachers' Meetings (P25).

Maintenance of Standards
To assist in the maintenance of State-wide achievement standards and the maintenance of such standards across time, the spirit of paragraph 6.15 of the Radford Report should be endorsed. A policy should be adopted by using Competency Reference Tests in Board Subjects. The sole objective of these tests should be to assist schools in determining standards of performance relative to each level of competency in a subject. Such tests will be an invaluable aid to teachers in determining competency standards in smaller schools. Under no circumstances should the results of Competency Reference Tests appear on Board or School Certificates or Reports. Initially, Competency Reference Tests might be restricted to the Senior Secondary School with extension downwards to Year 10 depending upon the subsequent advice of the Accreditation and Certification Committee (P26).

Tertiary Entrance Score
For the purpose of determining order of merit for entry to Tertiary Institutions, the Tertiary Entrance Score should be retained, though the Board should continue its research into the efficacy of the Tertiary Entrance Score as a method of ranking students (P27).

In calculating the Tertiary Entrance Score use should be made of ASAT, or of a comparable test, as at present. However the Board should continue its research into the use and efficacy of such moderating instruments (P28).

Among the exit assessments to be used in calculating the Tertiary Entrance Score, provision should be made for including,
by choice, exit assessments totalling two semester units of certified School Subjects. Before acting on this recommendation the Board should discuss it with the tertiary institutions (P29).

- Certificates

Formal reporting to students and parents and formal certification of student performance should be the responsibility of both the school and the Board of Secondary School Studies. The Board should be responsible for issuing a Junior Certificate and Senior School Certificate at the end of Years 10 and 12 respectively. Such certificates should report only in terms of academic achievement. The school should provide additional information in those areas of performance and development which are not the Board's concern, viz. leadership, sporting ability, attitudes, values, social developments, emotional maturity. Thus the school should be encouraged to issue a School Leaving Certificate containing such additional information to each student at the time of his/her leaving school. (P30).

Parliamentary Select Committee on Education

During 1978, the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education studied the problem of secondary school assessment and in November issued the *First Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland: Composition and Functions of the Board of Secondary School Studies and Secondary School Assessment*. The Select Committee, chaired by the Hon. Michael Ahern MLA, believed that education should be accountable to the community, that there was a need for consensus between education and the business world, and that standards should be maintained.

Accordingly, it recommended changes to section 36 of the Education Act whereby the size of the BSSS would be maintained at 23 members, but the representation of the Department of Education and non-government secondary schools would be reduced slightly so that a new category of representation could be introduced -‘three persons nominated by the Minister who are representative of community interests, two of whom are to be concerned with commerce and industry, and one of whom is to be a parent appointed as such’. Furthermore, it recommended amendments to section 37 dealing with the functions and powers of the BSSS which would make more explicit ministerial control. It also recommended, at the request of the Board, other additions and amendments dictated by the Board's experiences.

In relation to assessment, the Select Committee expressed concern about over-testing in schools and problems associated with small schools, and it maintained that the student should have a clear right of appeal against a TE Score. It agreed in principle with the major points of the Scott Report, including that of competency based assessment, but preferred different wording to the form of reporting. It recommended the following terms: Highest degree of attainment, high attainment, very competent, competent, coped with basics, low attainment, not tested.

*The Honourable Mike Ahern (on the right) was Chairman of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education which approved the major points of the Scott Report. It also disapproved of over-testing in secondary schools.*
Cabinet

The Minister for Education gave permission for the recommendations associated with ROSBA to be placed before the public, including teachers. After taking into consideration the public response, Cabinet approved of the general principles outlined by ROSBA and the First Interim Report of the Select Committee but changed the terms recommended by the Board to Very High Achievement, High Achievement, Sound Achievement, Limited Achievement, Very Limited Achievement. This approval was made public on 27 November 1979 and reported in the press on the following day. The Minister for Education, the Hon. Val Bird, stated that a competency-based system with verbal descriptions of the student's standards and achievements would replace the norm-based system of numerical grades, that a student would be given a statement of his or her achievement at the end of Year 12 and that the program would be phased in over a five year period beginning in 1981.137

While the machinery to implement ROSBA was put into motion, changes to the structure and function of the BSSS were dependent upon changes to the Education Act. These changes had not been made by June 1983.
Phasing in of ROSBA, 1980-1983

The implementation of the Scott Report phased moderation and the norm-based system of numerical grades out and accreditation of programs and achievement-based assessment in, and in the process met with stiff resistance from the QTU. The TE Score system remained as a source of continuing criticism.

Continuing operation of the moderation and the TE Score systems

While ROSBA was being phased in, the existing system of moderation and calculation of TE Scores for tertiary entrance continued and was the subject of public comment, especially by those most affected by it - the students wishing to enter tertiary institutions and their parents and the staff of the tertiary institutions. The attention and energy of the QTU appeared to be directed more to the problems associated with the progressive implementation of ROSBA. One official of the QTU expressed the opinion in 1981 that teachers had developed competence to deal with moderation, which therefore caused them less concern.

A brief survey of students’ attitudes conducted by a staff member of The Courier-Mail in 1981 showed a mixed response to the continuing system. Some students were highly in favour of it, some appeared confused, and others were strongly opposed. Adverse comments were made about the secrecy associated with the marks sent from the school to the Board, doubts were expressed about the honesty of other schools, and claims were made that undue pressures were imposed by aggressive competitiveness associated with the system. A common belief of many students was that those who did not choose the right type of subject, especially maths or science, would jeopardise the level of their TE Score. Research conducted by an officer of the Department of Education showed, however, that though there was such bias it was too slight to be a matter for concern.

The comments made in 1980 by university professors and lecturers were influenced by the way the TE Score system seemed to affect the intake into their disciplines. Professor C. O’Connor, from the Engineering Faculty, claimed that the ASAT tests used had a sex bias because, in a check over a five-year period (1973–7), girls scored consistently lower than boys. He did believe, though, that the TE Score was a better predictor than the earlier Senior external examination and that the Radford scheme and the TE Score should not be abandoned but improved. Professor H. Kolsen of the Commerce and Economics Faculty stated that there was little correlation between TE Scores and first year university results, and that it was ridiculous to apply a uniform score as a prerequisite for all studies from Engineering to Arts. Professor M. Rex, from the Faculty of Veterinary Science, was dismayed that the new system resulted in fewer students from country properties being admitted to Veterinary Science. Ross Barber, of the Faculty of Law, believed that his faculty could miss out on some highly motivated students. Spokesmen for the medical and dental faculties, however, appeared more contented with the new system because they had lower failure rates in their faculties than those of ten years ago. Another lecturer called for external tests conducted by the Queensland Tertiary Admission Centre to avoid the chances of corruption and favouritism.

As a result of this concern, the Senate of the University of Queensland in 1981 ordered an investigation into the TE Score system and alternatives. The terms of reference included the influence of present procedures on curriculum and teaching methods in secondary schools. An interim report was distributed to selected individuals and institutions for comment so that the future final report would be as thorough as possible.

A newspaper reporter claimed that some schools were attempting to influence the TE Scores by coaching their students in ASAT tests. He also claimed that some schools were disadvantaged in the awarding of TE Scores. Such schools had many students not interested in going to tertiary institutions. These students did not take the ASAT tests seriously and thus depressed the results of those students who did want to go to tertiary institutions. Such criticisms prompted the editor of The Courier-Mail to urge that the BSSS should be given sufficient resources to investigate replacements of ASAT tests and other improvements to the TE Score system.

The Board answered these criticisms by stating that the TE Score represented no more than an index of rank order in a very global sense and that some tertiary institutions and employer groups were attributing to the TE Score a degree of precision it did not possess. The Board urged such bodies to use the scores more cautiously and in conjunction with more detailed subject-based information. The Board advocated that the TE Score should be supported by certain selection procedures. The Board also instituted several procedures to improve the TE Score system. Special procedures were instituted for small schools in which the Year 12 population was less than ten. Furthermore the Board issued firm guidelines in 1981 for the compilation of the special subject assessments used in the compilation of TE Scores. The aim was to achieve greater inter-school comparability and a resulting greater validity for the TE Score as a system of rank ordering of students.
Implementation of ROSBA

To oversee the planning of ROSBA implementation, the Board established the Implementation and Co-ordination Committee which in turn set up four sub-committees. These were the Accreditation and Certification Planning Committee, the Syllabus Review Planning Committee, the Teacher Preparation Committee, and the Publicity Committee. This has resulted in the structure of the BSSS as shown in Diagram 4.48.

To ensure a smooth transition, the ROSBA modifications are being phased in over a period of several years, and the moderation system is being phased out at the same time. The timetable for this phasing in was set out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Board committees redraft syllabuses according to ROSBA principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Phase 1 schools prepare work programs for accreditation at the end of that year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Phase 1 schools will begin to implement the new work programs in Years 9 and 11 (the decision relating to Year 8 will be left to the school).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1983 | (i) Approximately 60 to 80 schools (Phase 11 schools) will begin to implement newly accredited work programs in Years 9 and 11 (and Year 8 if the school so wishes).  
(ii) Phase 1 schools will issue new format certificates. |
| 1984 | (i) The remainder of schools in the State will begin to implement newly accredited work programs in Years 9 and 11 (and Year 8 if the school so wishes).  
(ii) Phase 1 and Phase 11 schools will issue new format certificates. |
| 1985 | All schools in the State will issue new format certificates. |

An important feature of ROSBA is the rewriting of syllabuses expressed as a series of objectives:

- content (factual knowledge)
- process (cognitive skills)
- skill (practical skills)
- affective (attitudes and feelings)

In relation to assessment, the important aspects are the elaboration of assessment techniques, that is, the means (for example essay, objective test) by which teachers make judgments about the students’ achievements of objectives, and the criteria that teachers use to make judgments about achievement levels in three areas of objectives that is, content, process, and skill.

The Board made a special effort to ensure that the community was aware of the significance of ROSBA and the changes which were planned. Officers of the Board visited major centres throughout the State giving talks to various bodies and providing interviews with representatives of the press. The Board disseminated information widely, including teachers, parents, and students.

To provide TE Scores for selection procedures of tertiary institutions, the Board has instructed schools participating in ROSBA to convert achievement-based data into traditional Special Subject Assessments, and submit these to the Board on the 1-99 scale. These were to indicate the rank ordering of student achievement within the subject group. After these have been scaled to ASAT, TE Scores will be allocated.
The timetable leading up to certification of student achievement in Phase 1 schools in 1983 was set out in March 1982 as follows:

Following teacher meetings in September, schools will finalise submissions to be lodged with the Panels during the first week after the vacation. Panels will meet during the second week so that panels and schools can confer if necessary during the following three weeks. Schools will submit their final proposals at the same time as the Special Subject Assessments for their Year 12 students, that is, by the last Thursday in November for most subjects, and the previous Tuesday for small groups. Error corrections and late adjustments will be required by the first Wednesday in December. The timetable for these procedures is set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-21 September 1983</td>
<td>Teacher Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 September-2 October 1983</td>
<td>School Vacation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 October 1983</td>
<td>School Submissions to Panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 October 1983</td>
<td>Panels meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October 1983</td>
<td>Advice to schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October 1983- November 1983</td>
<td>Consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November 1983</td>
<td>Small Groups Special Subject Assessments and Proposal of Levels of Achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 November 1983</td>
<td>Special Subject Assessment and Proposal of Level of Achievement for remaining subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December 1983</td>
<td>Error corrections, late adjustments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In July 1982 the Board was reporting that while writers of work programs had no difficulty in preparing objectives for their courses and in devising a sequence of topics to be studied, there was still a widespread problem in the area of assessment, perhaps because teachers did not perceive it as part of the work program. As well, there seemed to be a paucity of information concerning the methods to be used in arriving at the exit levels of achievement.

Response to ROSBA

Following Cabinet approval of ROSBA in November 1979, the QTU influenced the course of events during the period of implementation of ROSBA. The QTU continually insisted that ROSBA required in-service training and the provision of extra teachers to alleviate a heavy work load on those teachers participating. The Board and the Department denied that the work programs needed to be as extensive and detailed as teachers maintained. Teachers made counterclaims that review panels of the Board required the details and that paperwork was taking over the teaching. In 1981 following a ballot of its members involved in Phase 1 schools, the QTU informed its members not to co-operate with the Board in the implementation of ROSBA. The Department made some concessions in the provision of supply teachers and extra time for compilation of work programs, and the Board postponed due dates for accreditation programs. The Phase 1 teachers thereupon voted to resume ROSBA duties.

In November 1982, the QTU once more decided to withdraw support from ROSBA because the QTU regarded as inadequate the provision of supply and relief teachers to the now increased number of schools implementing ROSBA. The Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools joined the QTU in its boycott of ROSBA.

In January 1983 the Minister for Education, the Hon. Lin Powell, met QTU officials and the Implementation and Coordination Committee of the Board. Following these meetings, the Minister announced that the Government had decided that Phase 1 and II schools would continue with the implementation of ROSBA but that the fate of Phase III would receive more consideration, with a final decision being made in May.

On the Minister’s assurance that the Department would increase the provision of relief to teachers in ROSBA schools, the QTU removed the restrictions it had imposed on the implementation of ROSBA in Phase 1 and 11 schools, but retained a boycott in Phase III.

The Government decided in May that the introduction of Phase III would take place in 1985 and not in 1984 as originally planned. This decision was welcomed by the QTU which subsequently lifted its boycott on Phase 111.

Meanwhile, during 1983, an independent team, led by Professor W. J. Campbell, was undertaking an evaluation of the implementation of ROSBA in Phase 1 and Phase 11 schools. An interim report was completed in May and this report was presented to the Board.
Conclusion

Prior to 1964, the interests of the University of Queensland were paramount in the system of assessment. The *Education Act of 1964* attempted to achieve some balance between the interests of the University, modern curriculum designers, employers, parents and students. This Act attempted to do this by reforming the existing system of external examinations. To implement the reforms, two boards were established, one responsible for the Junior Examination and one for the Senior Examination.

While some success was achieved at the Junior level, University goals continued to dominate at the Senior level. A corollary of this was high failure rates in some Senior Examination subjects which resulted in continued public dissatisfaction and pressures for a review of the system. This culminated in the release in 1970 of the Radford Report which proposed more radical solutions to the problems.

The Radford Report was implemented in the same year, 1970, by amendments to the Education Act which made significant changes. The two boards were replaced by one Board, the Board of Secondary School Studies which was given increased autonomy. The external examination system was replaced by internal assessment which, it was hoped, would enable schools to provide an education suitable for a wide range of individual abilities and aptitudes and for the needs of a modern society. The Department of Education was allocated the task of providing support to the Board.

Assessment at the Junior level soon ceased to be a source of much controversy. However, two features of the new system created much dissension. These were the moderation procedure designed to achieve comparability among schools, and, at the Senior level, the Tertiary Entrance Score which the Board was required by regulation to provide for the benefit of tertiary institutions. Aspects of one or the other of these features antagonised many parents, students, and teachers, and some of the tertiary institutions, especially some of the faculties of the University of Queensland. Also, some concern existed in the community about standards and accountability. Furthermore, the Board wished to improve the internal assessment system.

Consequently, from 1980 on, the Board progressively implemented a system of accreditation of programs and achievement-based assessment to replace the system of moderation and norm reference assessment. The new assessment procedure was designed not only to monitor but also to ensure the maintenance of set standards. Some features of these changes became unacceptable to the QTU which imposed constraints on the Board's actions. Furthermore, the retained TE Score system, which had become so important as a selection device, continued to be a source of discontent to parents, students, and some of the Faculties of the University of Queensland.

Thus, over the last two decades, developments in secondary school assessment have been dominated by the conflict of goals and expectations of tertiary institutions, employers, curriculum designers, students, parents, and teachers. The major conflict has been caused by the need of tertiary institutions to have an efficient predictor of future success in tertiary studies and the desire of curriculum designers to subordinate examinations to an education designed for a wide range of individual abilities and aptitudes and for the needs of a modern society. Also the increased power and autonomy given by the Education Acts of 1964 and 1970 to the Boards responsible for assessment in secondary schools have been subjected to considerable external pressures, especially from the QTU.
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