



**Teacher Jury
Validation Report
Stages 1 - 3**

Dr Christina Gillgren
Independent Consultant
Department of the Premier and Cabinet

October 2007

Contents Page

VALIDATION 5

PURPOSE: VALIDATION OF JURY DECISIONS 5

JURIES 6

JURIES OUTSTANDING 8

VALIDATION FRAMEWORK 8

 Validation Plan 8

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – general review of documentation 9

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – STAGE 1 10

 Mathematics Courses – Accreditation 10

 Validation Report – Mathematics Course (MAT) 11

 Validation Report – Mathematics: Specialist Course (MAS) 12

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – STAGE 2 13

 Courses being implemented in 2008. 13

 Validation Report – Career and Enterprise Course 13

 Validation Report – Chinese Course 14

 Validation Report – Computer Science Course 15

 Validation Report – Dance Course 15

 Validation Report – Drama Course 16

 Validation Report – Italian LOTE Course 17

 Validation Report – Marine and Maritime Technology Course 17

 Validation Report – Materials Design and Technology Course 18

 Validation Report – Outdoor Education Course 19

 Validation Report – Philosophy and Ethics Course 20

 Validation Report – Psychology Course 20

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – STAGE 3 22

 Courses being implemented in 2009. 22

 Validation Report – Animal Production Systems Course 22

 Validation Report – Automotive Engineering and Technology Course 23

 Validation Report – Building and Construction Course 24

 Validation Report – Chemistry Course 24

 Validation Report – Design Course 25

 Validation Report – Economics Course 26

 Validation Report – French (LOTE: Second Language) Course 26

 Validation Report – German (LOTE: Second Language) Course 27

 Validation Report – Human Biological Science 27

 Validation Report – Japanese (LOTE: Second Language) Course 28

 Validation Report – Modern History Course 28

 Validation Report – Physics Course 29

 Validation Report – Plant Production Systems Course 30

 Validation Report – Politics and Law Course 31

 Validation Report – Religion and Life 31

 Validation Report – Visual Arts 32

CONCLUSION 33

Appendix 1: Teacher Jury Project Deliverables and Measurement 34

Commonly used Acronyms

AISWA:	Association of Independent Schools of Western Australia
ARM:	Assessment Review and Moderation Panel
CEO:	Catholic Education Office
CC:	Curriculum Council
DET:	Department of Education and Training
LOTE:	Languages other than English
MRG:	Mathematics Reference Group
PD:	Professional Development
SSEC:	Senior Secondary Education Committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The validation of recommendations from the 48 juries held to date has been a collaborative process between **Dr Gillgren, Independent Consultant/ Executive Director in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet** and the **Curriculum Council**. This report is the result of the active participation, commitment and input from many quarters. My thanks extend to:

- Jurors, submission writers, facilitators, secondary teaching community, Curriculum Council and media for being prepared to embrace the Teacher Jury process.
- Mr Mal Wauchope, Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for continued support for my work with the Curriculum Council in the role of 'independent consultant' to design, oversee and deliver the teacher jury program of engagement.
- Mr David Wood, Chief Executive Officer, and staff of the Curriculum Council for their ongoing support of the process, provision of necessary resources and for the opportunity to work with a number of very dedicated Curriculum Council staff.
- Special thanks to Mr John Gougoulis, Director Curriculum, and his team for their assistance in providing timely support and documentation for the validation process.

Thanks are also due to:

- Dr Helen Grzyb, advising on the validation process
- Kim Brooklyn, senior policy officer, who undertook much of the validation work for each upper secondary school course.

Please note: This report needs to be read in conjunction with Teacher Jury Reports:

- Teacher Jury Report 1: On readiness of new senior secondary courses due for implementation in 2008;
- Teacher Jury Report 2: Teacher Jury Outcomes for Mathematics and Mathematics Specialist; and
- Teacher Jury Report 3: Teacher Jury Outcomes for Physical Education Studies, Media Production and Analysis, Aviation, Engineering Studies, Applied Information Technology, English as an Additional Language/Dialect, and Earth and Environmental Science.
- Teacher Jury Report 4: Teacher Jury Outcomes for English
- Teacher Jury Report 5: Teacher Jury Outcomes for Mathematics and Mathematics: Specialist Implementation (forthcoming December 2007).
- Teacher Jury Report 6: The Design and Delivery of Teacher Juries to Review Senior Secondary Courses in Western Australia (November 2007)

Copies of these reports can be downloaded from:

http://newwace.curriculum.wa.edu.au/pages/teacher_juries.asp

VALIDATION

While previous reports about the teacher jury process advise on the consultation plans, and recommendations from each jury, the Validation Report Stages 1-3 by the Independent Consultant provides insight into how the recommendations from 29 of the 48 teacher juries held between April and September 2007 have been adopted/implemented by the Curriculum Council. Further validation is required for the remaining 19 courses and this will be undertaken in 2008 when all course materials have been developed.

Validation involves an independent review of the documentation (evidence) about the level of satisfaction by each subject teacher cohort with the Curriculum Council's incorporation of jury recommendations into courses. The validation process for each course has been designed by the Council in accordance with the jury requirements for each course.

These processes include a number of steps to ensure that the teacher cohort for a specific subject has the opportunity to comment on the implementation of the jury recommendations by Council, and on the degree to which the recommendations have been implemented.

Validation processes may include evaluation forms in which the teacher cohort or a course reference group comment on whether the Council has satisfactorily addressed the jury recommendations for a particular course.

The independent Consultant's role is to provide independent comment about the degree to which the jury recommendations for a course are adopted according to the intent of the jury, and to the satisfaction of the teacher cohort for a specific course. Additionally, the role of the independent consultant is to report on the key deliverables for this project that were identified in the Engagement Plan (see Appendix 1).

This report sets out the status of validation of jury recommendations for each course and as such is the final step in the overall consultation process.

PURPOSE: VALIDATION OF JURY DECISIONS

The engagement project to date has provided strong affirmation of the process by teachers involved in all juries conducted to date. As identified in earlier reports, the experiential learning by the 474 teachers involved in the jury processes is an

important part of the sustainable outcomes from the project. It has set the scene for continued collaboration between the Council and teachers, and demonstrates the Council actively listening to, and working with teachers to find solutions to challenges, and to improving courses in line with community needs and expectations.

The format for the validation process allows teachers to consider the Council's actions in relation to jury decisions, and to identify other opportunities for teachers (e.g. take up offers of piloting courses, participating in syllabus development) through which the Council may wish to demonstrate its commitment to working and interacting with its teacher stakeholders.

JURIES

There are 50 courses that are offered to upper secondary students. Two of these courses are new courses that are being introduced in 2008. Aboriginal and Intercultural Studies and Aboriginal Languages of Western Australia have been developed in close consultation with the Aboriginal community and educators of Western Australia. As these courses were developed via a consultative model they were not included in the courses for jury consideration.

Juries for 48 courses were held at different stages as follows:

Round A Juries (n=38):

The first round (A) of juries focused on the readiness for implementation of 38 upper secondary courses in 2008:

- Accounting and Finance
- Animal Production Systems
- Automotive Engineering Technology
- Biological Sciences
- Building and Construction
- Business, Management and Enterprise
- Career and Enterprise
- Chemistry
- Children, Family Community
- Chinese
- Computer Science
- Dance
- Design
- Drama
- Economics
- Food Science and Technology
- French
- Geography
- German
- Health Studies
- History: Ancient and Modern
- Human Biological Science
- Indonesian
- Integrated Science
- Italian
- Japanese
- Literature
- Marine and Maritime Technology
- Materials Design and Technology
- Music
- Outdoor Education
- Philosophy and Ethics

- Physics
- Plant Production System
- Politics and Law
- Psychology
- Religion and Life
- Visual Arts

These juries were held in April-May 2007 and provided three types of recommendations, namely:

- Yes, the course is ready to proceed in 2008
- Yes, the course is ready to proceed in 2008, BUT* ...(there are recommendations that need to be addressed)
- No, the course is NOT ready to proceed in 2008, because ... (there are a series of recommendations outlining what needs to be addressed for the course to be ready for implementation in 2009).

* Some of these courses were deferred to 2009 as the course modifications were significant (For further details refer to the Jury report on the Curriculum Council website at http://newwace.curriculum.wa.edu.au/pages/teacher_juries.asp).

Round B, Phase I Juries (n=2):

The Mathematics juries needed to consider both accreditation and implementation of the two mathematics courses (Mathematics and Mathematics Specialist). The first phase of Round B examined the readiness of the two Mathematics courses for accreditation. These juries were both held on 30 July 2007. The second phases of Round B juries, focussing on course implementation, are scheduled for November 2007 and validation for implementation of the jury recommendations will be reported in an Addendum to this document early in 2008.

Round C Juries (n=8):

The juries for courses in Round C other than English, held over two days on the 27th and 29th August 2007, examined 7 courses that are currently under implementation. The jury task was to look at what improvements needed to be done to improve content and implementation. These courses were:

- Aviation
- Applied Information Technology
- Earth and Environmental Science
- Engineering Studies
- English as an Additional Language/ Dialect
- Media Production and Analysis
- Physical Education Studies

The jury for the English course, its second year of implementation, was held over two days: 27 August and 17 September 2007. English is the only compulsory course for all Western Australian secondary students and a jury consisting of 48 teachers deliberated on what needed to be done to support and improve implementation.

JURIES OUTSTANDING

Round B: Phase II Juries (N=2)

The second phase of the Mathematics juries will focus on implementation of the two mathematics courses (Mathematics and Mathematics Specialist). The Mathematics Course is scheduled for on 20 November 2007. In line with the recommendation of the Round B Phase I jury, 30 teachers will deliberate over a day on Stages 1, 2 and 3 of the Mathematics course. The jury for the Mathematics: Specialist Course will be held on 21 November 2007. Validation for implementation of the recommendations from both juries will be reported on in an Addendum to this document early in 2008.

VALIDATION FRAMEWORK

Independent validation of the implementation of recommendations by the Curriculum Council will be done in stages:

VALIDATION STAGES	Validation Date
Stage 1: Mathematics Accreditation	2 October 2007
Stage 2: Courses for implementation in 2008	10 October 2007
Stage 3: Courses for implementation in 2009	19 October 2007
Stage 4: Courses for implementation in 2009 but with significant course revision	February 2008
Stage 5: Courses currently under implementation	February 2008
Stage 6: English	February 2008
Stage 7: Mathematics Implementation	February 2008

Validation Plan

A validation plan of the work to be undertaken by the Curriculum Council to address teacher jury recommendations was developed by the Curriculum Council in consultation with the Independent Consultant.

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT: General Review of Documentation

In undertaking this validation of engagement process, the review has sighted a large number of documents relating to both course specific content and support materials, as well as any other relevant documentation*. These include:

1. Course materials, such as grade descriptors, examination briefs, sample exams (written and/or practical and performance based examinations where appropriate), examination marking keys, specification booklets (course specific), course support material including the most recent course information, and the course outline provided to jurors prior to the juries being convened.
2. Minutes and related papers of a number of the Curriculum Council meetings. These minutes contain all reports and significant decisions made by the Council, including those pertaining to the teacher juries. For example, the 5 September 2007 minutes provide information regarding course approvals and reaccreditation of courses following the modifications recommended by teacher juries. All minutes note actions taken to support or facilitate teacher jury recommendations, including reports on the activities on the newly established reference groups.
3. The Reports: *Consultation with the WA Curriculum Council regarding Senior Secondary School Courses Part 1 and Part 2* (dated August and September 2007 respectively) by Mr Robert Randall, Director, Curriculum New South Wales Department of Education and Training (referred to in this document as *the Randall Report*). This report provides a “3rd party view about the readiness of the syllabuses for implementation in Western Australian schools” (p1) for 21 courses.

The Randall Reports identifies where teacher jury recommendations have been incorporated into the 21 courses reviewed, and where further improvements could be made to each course. All courses were recommended to proceed, with some caveats for courses where the report notes that the course should proceed once any issues identified had been resolved.

Comment contained in the Report pertaining to the high level of motivation and commitment of Curriculum Council staff to ensure they design the best quality courses that meet teacher needs is noted.

4. Teacher Jury Reports and actions taken. This is an internal Curriculum Council document that outlines all teacher jury recommendations and all actions undertaken by the Curriculum Council to address jury recommendations for each course.
5. Senior Secondary Education Committee (SSEC) minutes and papers (dated 23 May 2007, 25 July 2007, and 29 August 2007, inclusive of Curriculum Council minutes dated 4 April 2007, 22 May 2007, and 6 June 2007). These minutes outline decisions and actions taken regarding the teacher jury recommendations for all courses.

6. Correspondence to and from SSEC members regarding jury recommendations and course feedback.
7. Revised courses Batch 1 (7 September 2007), 2 (14 September 2007) and 3 (21 September 2007) – providing SSEC members with the revised versions of courses.
8. Letter of invitation to participate in the Formal Consultation - Mathematics and Mathematics: Specialist (5 April 2007)
9. Sample grade descriptors
10. Results of the web based teacher satisfaction survey for 16 courses (August 2007). Note: the response rate for these surveys was low, the largest number of responses being 10 for the Materials Design and Technology course.
11. Curriculum Council Briefing Note: Professional Development 1 June 2007.
12. Curriculum Council Report: Senior Secondary Education Committee (SSEC): Response to Jury Reports (Round C), 7 October 2007.
13. 15 October 2007 Professional Development Day course materials.
14. Draft Curriculum Council Briefing Note: Professional Development 15 October 2007.

*Primary sources (i.e. original feedback forms and teacher satisfaction surveys) are noted where sighted, reported activities are also identified).

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – STAGE 1

Mathematics Courses – Accreditation

These include Mathematics and Mathematics Specialist courses.

The Curriculum Council determined that:

1. The recommendations of the jury for the accreditation of the mathematics courses are to be validated by a reference group comprising of stakeholders. The role of this reference group will be to determine if the recommendations of the jury have been fully completed by the Curriculum Council to the standard required by the jury.

Some of the overarching validation processes apply to both the Mathematics and Mathematics: Specialist Courses and are reported below. Specific information pertaining to either course is reported separately:

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

Minutes and related papers (such as Curriculum Council action related to the MAS and MAT teacher juries) from the MAT and MAS Reference Group (11 December 2006, 24 January, 7 February, 21 February, 14 March, 28 March, 13 June, 1 August, 14 August, 5 September, 19 September 2007) were sighted, as was correspondence to and from Reference Group members, and the iterations of both course outlines (up until the current documentation). The Mathematics Reference Group is comprised of teacher and tertiary education representatives who appear to have been very active in the development of the Mathematics course both before and after the teacher juries.

The Randall Report (Part 2) provides feedback on the MAT and MAS course syllabus and support materials to the Curriculum Council with specific reference for areas of course improvement, and/or questions from the consultant concerning whether the jury concerns had been addressed in the new course material. The Curriculum Council reported that all issues raised by the consultant have been addressed.

According to the minutes and reports sighted, significant consultation with teachers occurred prior to the MAT and MAS juries. Post jury consultation has also occurred via:

- 1. The Mathematics Reference Group*
- 2. Sector representatives as reported in the MRG minutes (e.g. AISWA consultation with 16 teachers regarding the Mathematics examination)*
- 3. The 15 October Professional Development (PD) day.*

The 15 October PD Day overall evaluation results indicate that of the 295 MAT and MAS teachers who responded to the questionnaire 74% found the course material useful or very useful. Specific results indicate that the majority of this cohort believed that the material relating to the course pathway and what's changed, sample programs, grade descriptors and examination was useful (average response was 58%) whereas on average 16% found it very useful, and 22% found it somewhat useful. The qualitative data indicates that while appreciative of the new syllabus, assessment and work undertaken but the Curriculum Council to date, many teachers felt that more time was needed to fully 'digest' the course material.

VALIDATION OF THE MAT AND MAS courses:

From the evidence reviewed the MATHEMATICS and MATHEMATICS SPECIALIST courses meet the criteria for validation (Accreditation) and can now move on to the next round of juries which will look at Implementation.

Validation Report – Mathematics Course (MAT)

I confirm that I have reviewed the above courses in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The current Mathematics Course outline was reviewed and teacher jury recommendations have been incorporated into the course wherever possible. The exceptions to this were in relation to recommendations that contravened education or Curriculum Council policy (i.e. combine the pairing of units into one unit, providing pre-requisites for Year 10 students).

All available course support material was sighted (including a draft Teaching and Learning program, and sample assessment tasks for each stage), as was pathway documentation, a discussion paper relating to resource free and resource rich assessment (i.e. the use of calculators), scope and sequence, sample examination design briefs, sample exams, marking keys and October 15 Professional Development (PD) day material.

Validation Report – Mathematics: Specialist Course (MAS)

I confirm that I have reviewed the above courses in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The current Mathematics: Specialist Course outline was reviewed and all jury recommendations have been incorporated into the course documentation wherever possible. The exceptions to this were in relation to recommendations that contravened education policy (i.e. examinations), and in the case where more than one sample exam was recommended (only one sample exam was sighted). The grade descriptors, design briefs, sample examinations, marking keys and October PD day materials were also sighted.

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – STAGE 2

Courses being implemented in 2008.

These include:

- Career and Enterprise
- Computer Science
- Chinese
- Dance
- Drama
- Italian
- Marine and Maritime Technology
- Materials Design and Technology
- Outdoor Education
- Philosophy and Ethics
- Psychology

The Curriculum Council determined that the validation process for courses to be introduced in 2008 is as follows:

1. Initial responses on actions to be taken to each of the points in the jury report validated by ARM panel and school systems/sectors.
2. Jury report, proposed actions and responses, and revised courses placed on council website with survey questions. Feedback requested from teachers, professional associations and DET/AISWA/CEO networks.
3. Work related to jury report undertaken and validated by teacher groups in consultative forums including exam and grading seminars and DET/AISWA/CEO networks.
4. Final product/s along with jury report circulated to representatives at DET, AISWA and CEO for final comment.
5. Independent validation undertaken by Director, Curriculum from NSW Department of Education and Training.

Validation Report – Career and Enterprise Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Career and Enterprise course outline was reviewed and two of the nine recommendations of the teacher jury have been incorporated into the modified course documentation. The remaining 7 recommendations related to timelines for course material completion and/or distribution to teachers (for the most part this was 1 June 2007 PD day). According to the Curriculum Council, teachers reviewed these materials during consultation meetings (see below).

Minutes from the ARM Panel (June 2007 – August 2007), and Career and Enterprise Exam Working Party minutes were sighted for 18 May 2007. All minutes indicate that the representatives were satisfied with the course development.

An annotated timeline of teacher consultation was provided indicating that 14 meetings with various parties had occurred between 18 May and 27 September 2007, and 9 follow up emails or telephone conversations occurred with stakeholders. According to the 1 June 2007 PD Day Briefing Note, Career and Enterprise teachers (n = 265 with 137 completing feedback forms) were positive about the materials of the course and the opportunity to work with colleagues in planning exercises.

The 15 October 2007 PD Day evaluation outcomes indicate that 82% of Career and Enterprise teachers (n=59) found the course materials useful or very useful. The qualitative feedback was very positive overall, with many suggestions offered for further PD.

The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the CAREER AND ENTERPRISE course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Chinese Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The LOTE Chinese Course outline, support materials and sample exams were reviewed and there are obvious modifications evident to the course documentation which comply with the primary recommendations of the jury (i.e. frameworks for 2A and 2B are clearly defined, a complete set of exams and sample programs are provided, and there is more information in the course).

This course was reaccredited by the Curriculum Council after all modifications had been undertaken.

Minutes from the ARM panel (handwritten notes for 21 May, 10 August, and 14 September 2007), Exam Working Party (25 May, June 1, 6 June, 13 June, and 29 June 2007) and a combined Chinese, French, German, Indonesian, Italian and Japanese ARM Panel (26 March, and 21 May 2007) were sighted demonstrating involvement in the modification of this course.

Chinese teachers were consulted regarding the Curriculum Councils activities related to the jury recommendations and it is reported that all of these teachers were satisfied with the material.

100% of the Chinese teachers (n=11) who attended the 15 October 2007 PD day found the course material useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback indicates that Chinese teachers found the day informative.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the Chinese course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed, the CHINESE course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Computer Science Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The modified course outline and support material reflects a number of changes in line with the teacher jury recommendations. Support materials (for e.g. sample grade descriptors, examination briefs and sample examinations) have been supplied to teachers (According to the Curriculum Council this was achieved via email with 25 teachers 14 September 2007 and with 120 teachers undertaking PD training on 4 August 2007).

ARM panel minutes from were sighted (dated 6 June, 15 August, and 17 September 2007), as was an annotated timeline of consultation (eight meeting occurred between 1 June and 14 September 2007 inclusive). According to the minutes and timeline, 90 teachers met on June 1 and provided feedback regarding course modifications. Additionally, 15 AISWA teachers provided feedback on 21 June 2007. In a related document, the 1 June PD Day Briefing Note, 92 % of Computer Science Teachers present (n = 90 with 62 completing feedback forms) felt that the course material was useful or very useful.

One response was received to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction: no issues or concerns with the course were raised.

Ninety four percent (94%) of Computer Science teachers (n = 56) who attended the 15 October 2007 PD day felt that the course material (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning, assessment, examinations, and 'other' resources) was useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback indicated that Computer Science teachers are supportive of the new course.

The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the Computer Science course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the COMPUTER SCIENCE course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Dance Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Dance Course outline, and support materials address the teacher jury recommendation to reduce content repetition and there is now more specificity in content areas. Other recommendations were based on the need for teachers to review documentation which, according to the Curriculum Council, occurred on 1 June 2007.

ARM Panel (15 February, 26 March, 5 June, 30 July, and 3 September 2007) and Dance Exam Working Party (May 18) minutes, and supporting course material (inclusive of sample exams) indicate that representatives of these groups were and

are currently actively engaged in the modification of the course/course material and approved any amendments.

In relation to teacher feedback, the Briefing Note for the 1 June PD Day identified that Dance staff gained feedback from teachers (n = 91 with 68 teachers providing feedback) with 96% of respondents finding the course material useful or very useful – there was overall positive feedback regarding the course.

On 6 September 2007 eight teachers attended a consultation meeting to review the work undertaken by the Council. All eight teachers agreed that the council had accommodated all recommendations from the Dance Teacher Jury.

On 15 October 2007 56 Dance teachers attended the PD day. Of these teachers, 98% believed the course (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning, assessment, examinations, and other resources) was useful or very useful. The qualitative results indicate that Dance teachers were satisfied with the course and that they feel more confident to implement the program in 2008.

The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the Dance course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the DANCE course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Drama Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Drama course outline was reviewed, and a number of teacher jury recommendations are incorporated into this document (i.e. grading of performance differentiation, separate production roles and performance aspects, and 'set' text lists per unit). Units now offer more specificity in some areas, with the addition of dot points in each learning area. Draft grade descriptors, examination design briefs, sample examinations, and marking keys were sighted.

ARM panel (28 February, 10 May, 12 June, 29 June, 3 September) and Exam Working Party (18 June) minutes were sighted. These minutes indicate that all changes to the course and/or support material were approved by the ARM Panel.

Also sighted was an annotated timeline of consultation. This timeline provided information about meetings that have occurred, and also included results of two consultation meetings related to set text lists dated March and 1 June 2007.

The Briefing Note for the 1 June PD day noted that 90% of Drama Teachers (n=191 with 93 completing feedback forms) were positive about the materials of the course; however, there was some concern about assessment and 'resourcing'. According to the Curriculum Council the resource issues have since been resolved.

Eighty nine percent (89%) of Drama teachers (n= 52) who attended the 15 October 2007 PD day stated that the course (inclusive of course design, teaching and

learning, assessment, examinations, and other resources) was useful or very useful. The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the Drama course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: *From the evidence reviewed the Drama course meets the criteria for validation.*

Validation Report – Italian LOTE Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The LOTE: Italian Course outline was reviewed, and recommendations of the teacher jury have been addressed (e.g. the text types for both instruction and assessment are specified and more comprehensive, and the assessment tables provide clear instructions and assessment weightings).

Minutes from the Italian course ARM Panel (21 May, 12 June, 11 July, 25 July, 7 August, 13 August, and 22 August) and Exam Working Party (16 May, 30 May, 12 June, 27 June, 10 July, and 30 May) show that both groups were supportive of the course modification and implementation.

An annotated timeline of teacher consultation was provided by the Curriculum Council indicating that consultation with Italian teachers occurred on 1 June, 17 and 18 September 2007 respectively. The consultation with teachers (n = 40) resulted in most teachers believing that the jury recommendations had been addressed for each recommendations (i.e. 28 teachers believed the first jury recommendation had been addressed, 9 believed it had not and 3 did not provide a response).

There was only one response to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction. The Curriculum Council states that the issues raised have since been resolved.

Thirty six Italian teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. Of these, 94% believed the course (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning, assessment, examinations, and other resources) was useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback from Italian teachers was very positive overall, with teachers noting that the materials were “great”.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the Italian course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: *From the evidence reviewed the ITALIAN course meets the criteria for validation.*

Validation Report – Marine and Maritime Technology Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The recommendations of the Marine and Maritime course Teacher Jury to include further Stage 1 units have been undertaken, as has the inclusion of more specificity in content to be covered (mostly pertaining to Stage 1 units), assessment weightings, and exam mark allocations. Some recommendations of this jury were not acted on as they did not comply with education policy (i.e. teachers writing exams for their own context; and having exams restricted to Stage 3).

ARM Panel minutes (22 March – 13 September 2007) and Exam Working Party minutes (28 May – 9 July 2007) were sighted, as was an annotated time line that reflected ongoing consultation with sector and industry representatives as well as teachers.

The Briefing Note for the 1 June 2007 PD day noted that Marine and Maritime Teachers (n = 23 with 15 completing feedback forms) found the course useful or very useful (June 1 PD Report).

There were no responses to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction.

Of the 17 Marine and Maritime technology teachers who attended the 15 October 2007 PD day 95% felt that the course (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning, assessment, examinations, and other resources) was useful or very useful.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED. The consultant offered suggestions for further course improvements that the Curriculum Council reports have been incorporated into the course.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the MARINE AND MARITIME course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Materials Design and Technology Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Materials Design and Technology Course outline was reviewed and it is evident that two (clear information regarding exams, and the larger recommendation of more specificity in course assessment and better distinction between units) of the five recommendations have been addressed. The remaining recommendations relate to course support materials that teacher jurors needed to sight prior to offering comment.

It should be noted that the Materials Design and Technology Course outline now includes four extra units, which represents a significant change in the course structure.

The minutes of the Course Accreditation and Review minutes (22 May), ARM Panel (6 June, and 9 August), Exam Working Party (16 May) and numerous emails regarding examinations and course content were sighted. The Reference Group minutes note all approvals for the course modification and resource development.

Ten responses to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction resulted in nine teachers stating that they believed the jury's recommendations have been addressed.

174 Materials Design and Technology teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. The evaluation results indicate that 77% of these teachers found the course (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning, assessment, examinations, and other resources) useful or very useful. Materials, Design and Technology teachers provided a large amount of qualitative feedback to the Curriculum Council. Most comments provided constructive feedback regarding examination questions and support materials, and issues relating to cut off date for entry into the course. There were also some positive comments about the new course and course materials.

The Randall Report recommended that the Materials and Design course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the MATERIALS DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Outdoor Education Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The review of the documentation for Outdoor Education has determined that all recommendations from the Outdoor Education Course Teacher Jury have been incorporated into the course.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (23 March, 18 May, 8 June – agenda only, and 21 September 2007) demonstrate that all changes to the course were approved. According to the report on the teacher consultation that occurred on 1 June PD day, 136 teachers (all evaluation forms sighted) provided very positive feedback about the course development.

One person responded to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction and noted that they believed the jury recommendations had been addressed.

58 Outdoor Education teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. Of these, 92% believed the course (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning, assessment, examinations, and other resources) was useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback indicated that while teachers had some queries, they were satisfied with the course.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the Outdoor Education course PROCEED "if the issues identified [by the consultant] are adequately resolved". According to the Curriculum Council the issues identified by the consultant have since been resolved.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the OUTDOOR EDUCATION course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Philosophy and Ethics Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

From the course material reviewed it is evident that all recommendations from the Philosophy and Ethics Course Teacher Jury have been addressed.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (21 June, 9 August, and 13 September), Exam Working Party (9 May, and 6 June), Grades Consensus meeting (16 August 2007) attended by 6 teachers) as well as various email correspondence related to the examinations were sighted. The documentation provided clear evidence that the Reference Group has approved all changes and material inclusion.

18 Philosophy and Ethics teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. 96% of these teachers believed the course was useful or very useful. The qualitative feedback provided further support for the course (i.e. “Looks great” and “very good materials and excellent supporting material”).

The Randall Report recommended that the course PROCEED with some minor clarification provided in some areas. According to the Curriculum Council these clarifications have been made to the course material.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Psychology Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Psychology Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been incorporated into the course documentation.

Minutes and correspondence of the Psychology ARM Panel (29 March, 17 May, 2 August, and 23 August 2007) indicated that all actions taken to address teacher jury recommendations were approved. A copy of the Psychology Teacher Jury report and actions taken by the ARM Panel and emails reporting that teacher consultation was to occur during the 1 June PD day (other than what is noted below and in the Briefing Note for 1 June PD Day were sighted.

Teacher feedback forms dated 29 March 2007 relating to the quality of support materials were sighted. The results of this feedback (n =12) indicated that teachers felt that the program was comprehensive, the depth of knowledge sufficient, and them timeline realistic. The Briefing Note from the 1 June PD day indicated that 90% of teachers attending the PD day (n = 22 responded although 31 teachers attended) felt that the course materials were useful or very useful.

There was only one response to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the respondent noting that the jury recommendations had been addressed (“in the main”).

Teacher feedback gathered on the 15 October 2007 PD day indicates that 100% of Psychology teachers in attendance (n =17) believed the course was useful or very useful. Psychology teachers provided very positive feedback regarding the course, and the materials provided on the day.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the PSYCHOLOGY course meets the criteria for validation.

VALIDATION OF ENGAGEMENT – STAGE 3

Courses being implemented in 2009.

These include:

- Animal Production Systems
- Automotive Engineering and Technology
- Building and Construction
- Chemistry
- Design
- Economics
- French
- German
- Human Biological Science
- Japanese
- Modern History¹
- Physics
- Plant Production Systems
- Politics and Law
- Religion and Life
- Visual Arts

The Curriculum Council determined that the validation process for courses to be introduced in 2009 is as follows:

1. Initial responses on actions to be taken to each of the points in the jury report validated by extended ARM panel including school sectors.
2. Jury report, proposed actions and responses, and revised courses placed on council website with survey questions. Feedback requested from teachers, professional associations and DET/AISWA/CEO networks.
3. Work related to jury report undertaken and validated by teacher groups in consultative forums including exam and grading seminars and DET/AISWA/CEO networks.
4. Final product/s along with jury report circulated to representatives at DET, AISWA and CEO for final comment.
5. Independent validation undertaken by Director, Curriculum from NSW Department of Education and Training.

Validation Report – Animal Production Systems Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The teacher jury recommendations for Animal Production Systems Course have been addressed.

¹ Modern History and Ancient History have now replaced History; Ancient and Modern

Email correspondence and draft documentation relating to the development of grade descriptors were viewed and document the input of teachers and ARM Panel members in the process. It is of note that the ARM Panel for this course is the same panel for Plat Production Systems, and that the two courses are provided oversight by this group collectively.

According to reports from the Curriculum Council, Animal Production Systems teachers were consulted on 2 and 3 July 2007 during the 'Harvey consultation meeting'. The Curriculum Council states that teachers felt the material presented was appropriate and useful.

The feedback gathered during the 15 October 2007 PD day indicates that 94% of Plant Production Systems and Animal Production Systems teachers (n = 18) found their courses (inclusive of sample teacher support materials, sample examinations and sample grade materials) useful or very useful. The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the ANIMAL PRODUCTION SYSTEMS course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Automotive Engineering and Technology Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Automotive Engineering and Technology Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and it is evident that all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been addressed.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (22 February, 22 March, and 17 July), email correspondence to/from the Exam Working Party, and a copy of the actions taken against each jury recommendation indicate that all course development activities were approved by the ARM panel. The documentation also provides evidence that ARM panel representatives provided assistance in the design and testing of materials.

Ten Automotive Engineering and Technology teachers (n=10) attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. Of these teachers 93% felt that the course was useful or very useful. There was limited qualitative feedback with comments focussed on the quality of the course (i.e. "well organised"), the presentation from the Motor Industry representative (which was seen as "good") and the need to progress to the implementation phase.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the AUTOMIOTIVE ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Building and Construction Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Building and Construction Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been addressed (with the caveat that the reviewer was not able to determine if the course is now aligned more effectively with the K-10 syllabus as this determination is outside the reviewers competency).

Minutes from the ARM Panel (27 March, 21 May, and 25 September 2007) and email correspondence requesting feedback on assessment weightings indicate that the ARM Panel approved course changes, and that all respondents were satisfied with assessment weightings.

All eight Building and Construction teachers who attended the 15 October 2007 PD day believed that the course was useful or very useful. Written feedback provides further evidence that teachers are satisfied with the Building and Construction course.

The Randall Report (Part1) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Chemistry Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The course material incorporates all recommendations from the Chemistry Course Teacher Jury.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (3 April, 22 May, 31 July, and 4 September) provide clear evidence that all teacher jury recommendation and course improvements were approved by this panel.

Two teachers responded to the Curriculum Council web based survey of teacher satisfaction (posted in August 2007) and indicated that they did not believe the jury recommendations had been adequately addressed. The Curriculum Council have stated that the course materials have since been improved.

Teachers attending the 15 October 2007 PD were asked to complete a teacher satisfaction survey related to the teacher jury recommendations and course improvement (cited in PD day material). The feedback indicated that 75% of Chemistry teachers believed that the course was useful or very useful. The qualitative feedback indicates that teachers are looking forward to the ongoing development of the course materials.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that this course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: *From the evidence reviewed the CHEMISTRY course meets the criteria for validation at this stage.*

Validation Report – Design Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Design Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and it is evident that all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been addressed.

Minutes of the Design ARM panel (29 May, 3 July, and 21 August 2007) and Exam Working Party (24 May and 14 June 2007) indicate that all course and exam modifications were approved by these bodies.

According to a report from the Curriculum Council, consultation meetings occurred with the Photography Teachers Association (17 July 2007), Design and Technology Teachers Association (30 July 2007) and Arts Educators Association (9 August 2007), resulting in positive feedback about the progress of the course modifications.

On the 10 September 2007, 25 teachers attended a systems sectors representatives meeting) and provided specific feedback regarding jury. The results of the evaluation were very positive with 63% of those polled indicating that the information was clear; 100% agreed that technical graphics had been included, and 96.6% agreed that CAD could be used in the course.

Four teachers responded to a web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the modified Design course. Two respondents believed that the Curriculum Council had addressed the teacher jury recommendations, and two did not. These results were gained in August and the Curriculum Council states that further consultation with teachers has occurred since this time.

36 Design teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day with 62% stating that the course was useful or very useful (31% believed it was somewhat useful). The qualitative feedback indicates that Design teachers are looking forward to the PD days in 2008 to further expand their course understanding.

The Randall report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: *From the evidence reviewed the DESIGN course meets the criteria for validation.*

Validation Report – Economics Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

It appears that all recommendations from the Economics Course Teacher Jury have been addressed in the course documentation.

ARM Panel and Exam Working Party Minutes were sighted, as was original evaluation feedback forms from teacher consultations. All feedback indicates that Economics teachers are satisfied that the course materials are of an appropriate standard.

72 Economic teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. Of these teachers, 94% believed that the course was useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback from Economics teachers was constructive (e.g. the need to develop more sample materials) and/or positive (e.g. “the courses are much better than the original” and “A good beginning”).

The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the ECONOMICS course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – French (LOTE: Second Language) Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

It is evident that all recommendations from the French Course Teacher Jury have been incorporated into the course documentation.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (26 March, 21 May, 30 July, and the agenda for the 30 September 2007), and the Examination Working Party (17 May, 1 June, 21 June and 25 July) indicate that all course modifications were done with approval of these bodies.

According to an annotated time line and email correspondence, consultation with French Teachers occurred during the 14 to the 18 September 2007. There was limited response from French teachers at that time.

One respondent completed the web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the modified course and indicated that they were not in agreement that the course modifications met the jury recommendations. The Curriculum Council indicated that the course had been refined since the August survey.

39 French teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. 85% of these teachers found the materials (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning sample materials, assessment, examinations and other material) useful or very useful. The

qualitative feedback indicates that French teachers feel that the next 2 PD days in 2008 will be very helpful in preparing them to implement the course in 2009.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the FRENCH course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – German (LOTE: Second Language) Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The German Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been addressed.

Minutes of the ARM Panel (28 June, and 16 August) were sighted and provide evidence that the ARM panel approved course modifications.

According to the Curriculum Council report developed for this validation process, on 18 August 12 teachers from the Professional Association reviewed the course materials and verbally stated that they were satisfied with the course. The report also stated that the course materials were emailed to 11 other teachers to gain feedback on 5 September 2007 the results of this feedback was not available at the time of this validation process.

There were no respondents to the web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the modified course (posted August 2007).

Eight German teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. The evaluation results indicate that 94% of these teachers found the course useful or very useful.

The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed, the GERMAN course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Human Biological Science

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

From the documentation reviewed it is evident that all recommendations from the Human Biological Science Course Teacher Jury have been addressed.

Minutes from the ARM Panel and email correspondence were sighted from April 2006 to December 2006. More recent minutes (29 March and 7 June 2007) provided evidence that the ARM Panel approved all recent course modifications.

Three people responded to the web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the modified course (posted August 2007) and reported that they were not satisfied with

the course. The Curriculum Council reports that the respondents concerns have since been addressed.

Eighty percent (80%) of the 110 Human Biological Science teachers who completed evaluation forms at the completion of the 15 October 2007 PD day stated that they found the information provided useful or very useful. Written feedback indicates that teachers are satisfied that the new Human Biological Science Course better meets the needs of both student and teachers.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: from the evidence reviewed the HUMAN BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Japanese (LOTE: Second Language) Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Japanese Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and it is apparent that all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been addressed.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (21 May, 24 July, and 6 September 2007) and email correspondence related to the jury recommendations indicate that the ARM Panel supported all modifications to the course and/or course materials. The Curriculum Council provided a report that indicated that Japanese teachers agree that the jury recommendations had been addressed (the number of teachers included in this consultation is not included).

There were no respondents to the web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the modified course (posted August 2007).

Thirty nine (39) Japanese teachers provided feedback on the examinations, support materials and grade descriptors on the 15 October 2007 PD day. The results of this feedback indicate that 88% of these teachers stated that the course information (inclusive of course design, teaching and learning sample materials, assessment, examinations and other material) was useful or very useful. Written comments focussed on the need to develop resources that will be compatible with the new course.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that this course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: from the evidence reviewed the JAPANESE course meets the criteria for validation

Validation Report – Modern History Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

It is noted that Modern History was originally part of the History Ancient and Modern course. As such, course specific grade descriptors, examination design briefs, sample examinations, document booklets, and marking keys have been developed or expanded from the original documentation. All of the course material was sighted during this validation process.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (dated 6 June, 20 June, 1 August, and 5 September 2007) and the Exam Working Party (dated 11 June 2007) indicate that both groups approved all course modifications. Diary notes indicate that the working party also met on 6 July, 25 July, 6 August, and 17 August 2007. There was evidence of ongoing engagement with the History Teachers Association of W.A. with Curriculum Council staff attending meetings on the 23 May, 19 June, 14 August, 21 August, and 19 September 2007. Other meetings occurred to develop grade descriptors (GRD) with the GRD working group (5 meetings to date) and Pairwise Marking.

According to Curriculum Council consultation with Modern History teachers occurred on 22 August 2007, with 32 teachers indicating that the recommendations of the jury have been addressed. Further consultation occurred on 3 September 2007 (with 16 Catholic Education Office teachers providing feedback) and on 6 September 2007 with DET teachers (n = 27). Both of these groups also indicated that they believed the teacher jury recommendations had been addressed.

On the 15 October 2007 PD History teachers (n = 170) were asked to provide feedback on the course, sample examination and grade descriptors. The results of this feedback indicate that 92% of History Teachers believe that the teacher support materials, sample examination materials, and sample grade material were useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback indicates that teachers are pleased with the significant changes to the course since "2006".

The Randall Report recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the MODERN HISTORY course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Physics Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

All recommendations from the Physics teacher jury have been incorporated into the course documentation. Where recommendations were difficult to address (i.e. catering for female students), the Curriculum Council has undertaken research and provided this information to the ARM Panel and teachers (in the 15 October 2007 materials). Similarly where trialling of the new material was recommended, the Curriculum Council has indicated that components of the course may be trialled in 2008. However, any trialling would be at the discretion of the schools involved (or as a result of specific requests).

Minutes from the ARM Panel (2006 minutes in addition to 20 March, 22 May, 21 August, and 18 September 2007), Exam Working Party (18 May, 5 June, 19 June

and 31 July 2007), and email correspondence relating to the Exam Working Party indicate that the course modifications were approved.

The jury report and actions taken by the Curriculum Council state that prior to October 2007 the course was modified via:

1. An independent review of the course by a tertiary educator.
2. Material development undertaken by ARM Panel and Exam Working Party members.

On 31 August 2007 four teachers provided written feedback on each of the three stages of the Physics course (original feedback forms sighted). All four teachers believed that the teacher jury recommendations were addressed in the course material they reviewed.

During the 15 October 2007 PD day the Curriculum Council asked Physics teachers to provide evaluation of the course as it related to the teacher jury recommendations. Of the 125 teachers who completed the second feedback form 92% (n=105) believed that the recommendations had been addressed in the new physics course. Ninety percent (90%) found the sample teaching programs were appropriate, 91% agreed that the sample assessment material was appropriate and 73% stated that the assessment items and marking keys were appropriate.

The Randall Report recommended the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the PHYSICS course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Plant Production Systems Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

All recommendations from the Plant Production Systems teacher jury have been addressed in the new course documentation. Two Stage P units and two Stage 1 units (1C and 1D) have been added to the course along with all related support materials.

Minutes from the ARM Panel (16 February, 31 May 2007, and 10 August) indicate that ARM Panel members were actively engaged in the course development and approval process. The ARM Panel minutes noted that consultation had occurred in the development of Stage P and 1C and 1D units, as well as in relation to the Curriculum Council response to the teacher jury recommendations. The first of these consultations occurred at Harvey Agricultural College on 2 and 3 July 2007 with 23 teachers from Agricultural Schools. Teacher consultation also occurred on 24 August 2007 in Narrogin at the request of the ARM Panel. The results of the consultation are positive with teachers being satisfied that the jury recommendations had been addressed.

The feedback gathered during the 15 October 2007 PD day indicates that 94% of Plant Production Systems and Animal Production Systems teachers (n = 18) found their courses (inclusive of sample teacher support materials, sample examinations and sample grade materials) useful or very useful. The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the PLANT PRODUCTION SYSTEMS course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Politics and Law Course

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

The Politics and Law Course outline and supporting material was reviewed and it appears that all recommendations from the Teacher Jury have been addressed.

The ARM Panel minutes (2 April, 11 June, 30 July, and 10 September 2007), and email correspondence between the Curriculum Council and stakeholders (such as Head of Departments) regarding course development were sighted. According to the minutes, consultation with teachers occurred resulting in respondents (n = 34) agreeing that the jury recommendations have been addressed, the course content is clearly differentiated between essential and desired, and that the course is much easier to read.

Feedback from Politics and Law teachers (n = 47) regarding the course was gathered on the 15 October 2007 PD day. The results of this feedback indicate that 87 % of teachers who completed evaluation forms believe that the teacher support materials, sample examination materials, and sample grade material were useful or very useful. Qualitative feedback from the Politics and Law teachers was all very positive, especially in relation to the changes made to the course

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: from the evidence reviewed the POLITICS AND LAW course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Religion and Life

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

It is evident that all recommendations from the Religion and Life teacher jury have been addressed (eg. the specificity of content has improved, as has the information pertaining to assessment and examinations, and student pathways). The course now includes to P Stage units and a further two units in Stage One (1C and 1D).

Minutes of the Religion and Life ARM Panel (23 May, and 1 August 2007) and email correspondence relating to course development indicated that the ARM Panel

approved all course modifications, and were active in the ongoing development of course material.

According to course documentation, on the 16 and 23 August 2007 AISWA and CEO met with approximately 23 teachers to discuss the course in light of the jury recommendations. The result of this consultation was that teachers were satisfied that the jury recommendations had been addressed. Original feedback (n = 19) forms from this consultation were sighted, and alongside the measures of satisfaction, these teachers also offered feedback for course and/or support material development.

One teacher responded to the web based survey of teacher satisfaction with the modified course. The result of this survey is not reliable (i.e. the responses were random letters “vczbz”).

17 Religion and Life teachers attended the 15 October 2007 PD day. All 17 teachers believed that the teacher support materials, sample examination materials, and sample grade material were useful or very useful.

The Randall Report (Part 2) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the Religion and Life course meets the criteria for validation.

Validation Report – Visual Arts

I confirm that I have reviewed the documentation of the above course in line with the identified validation process as follows:

It is apparent that all recommendations from the Visual Arts teacher jury have been incorporated into the course documentation. There have been significant changes to the course including the addition of P Stage units.

Minutes of the Visual Arts ARM Panel (2 August, 13 August, 22 August, and the agenda for the 13 September 2007 meeting) and related correspondence provide evidence that the ARM Panel were active in the development and approval of course materials.

According to a Curriculum Council report consultation of Visual Art teachers from AISWA (n = 28) on the 22 August 2007, CEO (n = 16) on the 4 September 2007, and a further meeting at CEO (n = 5) on 6 September 2007 resulted in teachers indicating that the material provided (i.e. course) was relevant and useful. Feedback specifically pertaining to the jury recommendations indicated that teachers found that the recommendations had been addressed. Teachers also provided recommendations to improve course and/or support material clarity/specificity. According to the Curriculum Council these recommendations have been incorporated into the current course material.

132 Visual Arts teachers completed evaluation forms after attending the 15 October 2007 PD day. Of these teachers 93% believed that the teacher support materials,

sample examination materials, and sample grade material were useful or very useful. Teachers provided qualitative feedback which indicated that teachers, while providing suggestions and/or requests to further improve the course, are now very satisfied that the course is teacher and student 'friendly'.

The Randall Report (Part 1) recommended that the course PROCEED.

VALIDATION: From the evidence reviewed the VISUAL ARTS course meets the criteria for validation.

CONCLUSION

The validation of these courses has been undertaken to determine the level of satisfaction by each teacher cohort of the actions taken by the Curriculum Council with regard to the jury recommendations for each course. This validation process does not provide comment on the ongoing course development and continuous quality improvement that Curriculum Council envisages will continue over the period of implementation.

From the documentation reviewed, it is evident that the Curriculum Council has invested considerable time and energy into redrafting all of the courses to meet the recommendations of the teacher juries. In most cases the Council has gone beyond the recommendations and has actively engaged with consultative groups to develop collaborative partnerships that aim to continue to enhance the quality of the courses.

All 29 courses that comprise Stages 1-3 of this process have met the criteria for validation. The design of the validation process for each course was set out by the Curriculum Council. It is envisaged that this has laid a stronger foundation for and will contribute to ongoing collaboration between the teacher and other key stakeholders, and the Curriculum Council. The 18 courses that comprise Stage 4-7 of this validation plan will be reviewed in February 2008 when all course documentation is available.

Appendix 1: Teacher Jury Project Deliverables and Measurement

The success of the Independent Consultant’s activities relating to the teacher jury project will be determined by achieving the following Key Performance Indicators:

Deliverables	Completed	Comment
1. Design a comprehensive consultation process to provide teachers and the Curriculum Council an opportunity to review 48 senior secondary school courses that are either (a) in the final phases of development prior to implementation in 2008 or 2009, or (b) are in their first phased of implementation in 2007.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Completed for all juries September 2007
2. Undertake a selection process for highly experienced professional facilitators via Government tendering processes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Completed for all juries
3. Development of a comprehensive Engagement Plan in consultation with the Curriculum Council.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Finalised and submitted to the Curriculum Council 4 August 2007
4. Provide strategic advice and support to the Curriculum Council to develop Communication and Governance plans relative to this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Communication Plan was finalised in August 2007. The Governance plan has not been developed (October 2007). The Curriculum Council is considering developing the plan in early 2008.
5. Ensure that an open and transparent process (e.g. the jury design and jury processes) is made available to stakeholders in a timely manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jury processes have been made available to all stakeholders via the website, facilitator guidelines and information packs sent to jurors.

Teacher Jury Validation Report

6. Assist the Curriculum Council to develop timelines and forward planning documents for all 48 juries.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Completed for all juries.
7. Ensure selected facilitators are fully briefed for each 'jury round'.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All jury rounds are predated by facilitator meetings. All facilitators also comprise the integrity group for the Teacher Juries and are heavily involved in process design and evaluation.
8. Establish an integrity group, comprising of the Independent Consultant and selected facilitators, to refine, oversee and deliver a credible and robust process that elicits the trust and respect of all participants.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	See above
9. Develop a reporting format so that each jury report will clearly identify both the overall jury decision and all jury recommendations regarding course improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All jury reports follow a clearly defined format that identifies the issues, recommendations and time lines developed by juries for course improvement.
10. Ensure that reports are generated for each individual jury undertaken, and that these reports are provided to jurors for sign off on the night of the jury, or within ten working days of the jury date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All jurors were required to endorse their jury report either after the jury had been convened (as was the case for Round A juries), or at the completion of the jury itself (for Rounds B-C). All signed reports are stored at the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
11. Compile a report incorporating the individual records of each of the Juries Rounds A and B-C. The report will also provide a record of the overall jury process and findings.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Submitted 25 th October 2007.
12. Report on the activities undertaken by the Curriculum Council's validation processes to confirm that all jury recommendations, and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Stages 1-3	*Stages 1-3 completed in October 2007. Stages 4-7 will be

Teacher Jury Validation Report

post jury consultations have been carried out in an appropriate and satisfactory manner.		completed in February 2008.
13. Undertake a teacher satisfaction survey regarding the validation of teacher jury recommendations/decisions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Forms part of validation process undertaken by Curriculum Council.
14. Provide a final report regarding the validation process to the Minister of Education, teachers, the Curriculum Council and other stakeholders in 2008.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Stages 1-3	*The report for Stages 1-3 of the validation process has been completed and will be made available.

MEASUREMENT	Completed	Comment
1. Jury processes and design is clearly documented and available for perusal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The jury process is well documented in Teacher Jury Reports 1-6.
2. Facilitator selection complies with the standards set by Government,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Facilitator selection is fully compliant.
3. Facilitator briefings undertaken at each phase of the teacher jury process and documentation held on file regarding these briefings.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All agendas, facilitator guidelines and notes from briefings are held on file within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
4. The Stakeholder Engagement plan is completed prior to 30 July 2007.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engagement Plan completed and forwarded to Curriculum Council 4 August 2007
5. Forward planning is undertaken at the beginning and during the project. The documentation of these plans will be developed in collaboration with the Curriculum Council. However, responsibility for these documents remains with the Council.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All plans have been completed, with the exception of the Governance Plan.
6. 48 Juries, separated into Rounds A and B-C will be completed prior to 30 November 2007 (inclusive of the second mathematics jury).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	48 Juries have been conducted prior to 19 September 2007. The second Maths juries to be

		undertaken in November.
7. 48 reports will be developed and signed off by jurors no more than ten working days after each jury has convened.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	38 jury reports from Round A signed off within 10 working days. All Round B and C jurors signed their jury reports at the completion of the jury process.
8. Juries will receive at least 70% positive feedback from jurors as indicated on the Teacher Jury Evaluation Forms completed by jurors at the completion of each individual course jury.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All evaluations of the teacher jury has resulted in at least 70% positive feedback, with the major complaint from all jurors being insufficient time to fully deliberate on the course. This latter result is indicative of the commitment and enthusiasm teachers have in participating in course juries and the jury process generally.
9. Full reports from each jury submitted to the Minister within three weeks of the completion of the final Round jury,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All Round A-C reports have been submitted within the specified timeframe, with most reaching the Ministers office within one week of the completion of the juries.
10. A report will be written by the Independent Consultant regarding the validation process undertaken by the Curriculum Council and teacher satisfaction of council actions in early 2008. This report is to include the steps taken by the council to validate all jury decisions, results from a quantitative measure of teacher satisfaction with the process, and any recommendations for future action.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Stages 1-3	*Currently under way