



This file is one of seven that make up the downloadable version of *The New Basics Research Report*. The Report is very extensive and it has been necessary to divide it in this way to ensure that each file is of a reasonable size for transmission over a slow internet connection.

You are encouraged to ensure that you have the whole of the Report before you come to any conclusions about its content. The sections are closely inter-related and there is a risk of misinterpretation in relying on any one part.

The full contents of the Report are:

CONTENTS

Preface

Acknowledgments

The New Basics: Key Elements of the History 1

1 The New Basics idea 2

2 The New Basics developed in Queensland, Australia 2

3 The why and how of a trial 4

New Basics Research Program: Synthesis of the Research 9

1 Setting the scene 10

2 Design of the New Basics Research Program 10

3 Results 12

4 Key messages 21

New Basics Research Papers: In Essence 23

25 research papers 23

The New Basics: Narrative and Commentary 87

1 From concept to commitment 88

2 Conduct of the project 102

3 Reflections 129

The New Basics Research Report: End Matter 139

Appendices 140

Abbreviations & Acronyms 159

Glossary 161

References 166

In order to keep the file size as small as possible, a high degree of compression has been used. Although acceptable for reading on-screen, you will notice the negative effects of this if you print the document. These files are not intended to produce high quality hard copy versions of the Report. Alternative arrangements will be made for that.

THE NEW BASICS RESEARCH REPORT

END MATTER

| | |
|---|------------|
| Appendices | <i>140</i> |
| 1 New Basics trial schools | <i>140</i> |
| 2 Principals during the Trial | <i>141</i> |
| 3 Critical friends to trial schools | <i>142</i> |
| 4 Ministers and senior departmental officers during the Trial | <i>143</i> |
| 5 Project staff (2000–04) | <i>145</i> |
| 6 Schedule of FRAG meetings | <i>147</i> |
| 7 Characteristics of the trial population | <i>148</i> |
| 8 Chronology of the external evaluation | <i>149</i> |
| 9 Guidelines for the Evaluator | <i>151</i> |
| 10 New Basics Phase II schools | <i>154</i> |
| 11 Conceptual audit | <i>155</i> |
| 12 Ministerial Portfolio Statements | <i>156</i> |
| 13 The New Basics in journals, magazines and books | <i>157</i> |
| 14 Delegations to the New Basics Project | <i>158</i> |
| Abbreviations & Acronyms | <i>159</i> |
| Glossary | <i>161</i> |
| References | <i>166</i> |

APPENDIX 1

NEW BASICS TRIAL SCHOOLS


| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| | Aurukun State School (later Aurukun Campus of Western Cape College) |
| | Buranda State School |
| | Eagleby State School |
| | Goondiwindi State High School |
| | Helensvale State High School |
| | Hopevale State School |
| | Inglewood State School (P-10) |
| | Kelvin Grove State High School (later Kelvin Grove State College) |
| | Kenmore State High School |
| | Mackay Central State School |
| | Mackay State High School |
| | Maryborough Special School |
| | Mount Gravatt West Special School |
| | Mountain Creek State High School |
| | Thabeban State School |
| | The Willows State School |
| | Thursday Island State School |
| Cairns Consortium | Cairns West State School |
| | Edge Hill State School |
| | Parramatta State School |
| | Woree State School |
| Charters Towers Alliance | Charters Towers School of Distance Education |
| | Charters Towers State High School |
| | Charters Towers Central State School |
| | Millchester State School |
| | Richmond Hill State School |
| Suncoast Cyberschools | Burnside State High School |
| | Burnside State School |
| | Chevallum State School |
| | Eudlo State School |
| | Glenview State School |
| | Mapleton State School |
| | Mooloolah State School |
| | Montville State School |
| | Nambour Special School |
| | Nambour State High School |
| | Palmwoods State School |
| | Woombye State School |

APPENDIX 2

PRINCIPALS DURING THE TRIAL

The role of the trial school principal was understood to be crucial from the outset of the project. Each school's application for inclusion in the trial rested upon the commitment of the principal and other staff.

Summarised below are the comings and goings over the period of the Trial, and a description of the stayers. Of the 38 who "signed up" their school in 1999, 3 had acquired positions elsewhere by the time that project activities commenced.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Destination of out-going Principal | 3 | Promoted to non-New Basics school |
| | 1 | Relieving at level in non-New Basics school |
| | 1 | University lecturer |
| | 1 | External agency secondment |
| | 2 | Internal secondment |
| | 1 | Overseas exchange |
| | 2 | Requested transfer to non-New Basics school |
| | 3 | Unassigned |
| | 2 | On leave |
| | 2 | Retired |
| 2000  2003 | 20 Principals remained in original post throughout the Trial. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 females and 15 males • Average age = 47 years • Average teaching experience = 24 years • Average time in position less holidays = 1008 days • Average time in position less holidays and leave = 961 days • Average long service leave taken = 19 days | |
| Origin of in-coming Principal | 4 | Deputy Principal from New Basics school |
| | 1 | HOD from New Basics school |
| | 1 | Teacher from New Basics school |
| | 5 | Principal from other school |
| | 5 | Deputy Principal from other school |
| | 1 | Relieving above level from other school |
| | 1 | District Office |

APPENDIX 3

CRITICAL FRIENDS TO TRIAL SCHOOLS

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Ray Barrett | Ray Land |
| Sandra Bowtell | Carrie Law |
| Ros Capeness | Trudy Large |
| Karen Boer | Sherilyn Lennon |
| Peter Evans | Doune Macdonald |
| Leanne Fox | Gail Mackay |
| Peter Freebody | Kay Martinez |
| Jill Freiberg | Martin Mills |
| Allan Georgee | Nicole Muirhead |
| Heather Gosens | Noel Pearson |
| Bruce Grigg | Ray Pembleton |
| Robyn Groom | Cindy Percy |
| Shan Haines | Linda Peterson |
| Monica Halbert | Vivian Pittendreigh |
| Karen Harris | David Robinson |
| Hannan Harrison | Rosie Scholl |
| Nicole Haxton | Andrew Smith |
| Geof Hill | Lyn Stevens |
| Simon Hill | Sharyn Stubbs |
| Colleen Hope | Richard Tinning |
| Lisa Hunter | Scott Young |
| Lyn Jantke | Robyn Zevenbergen |
| Detta Lange | |

APPENDIX 4

MINISTERS AND SENIOR DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS
DURING THE TRIAL**Minister for Education**

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|--|
| Dean Wells MP | 1999–2001 | Thence Minister for Environment. Retired from Ministry in February 2004. |
| Anna Bligh MP | 2001– | Formerly Minister for Families, Youth and Community Care and Minister for Disability Services. Additional portfolio as Minister for the Arts from February 2004. |

Director-General

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|---|
| Terry Moran | 1999–2000 | In June 2000, became Secretary, Department of Premier and Cabinet (Victoria). |
| Jim Varghese | 2000–2003 | Formerly Director-General, Main Roads. Appointed Director-General, Employment and Training January 2003. Thence Director-General, Primary Industries and Fisheries. |
| Ken Smith | 2003– | Formerly Director-General, Employment and Training. |

Deputy Director-General

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Professor Allan Luke ⁶⁴ | 1999–2000 | Returned to the position of Dean of the Graduate School of Education, The University of Queensland in March 2000. From March 2003, Professor and Dean, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. |
| Professor Roger Slee | 2001–2004 | Formerly Dean of the Faculty of Education and Dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Western Australia. From January 2004, Dean of the Faculty of Education, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. |

⁶⁴ Also Principal Educational Adviser to Minister for Education

Assistant Directors-General

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Bob McHugh | In 1999, Assistant Director-General (Education Services). New Basics Branch originally located in Education Services Director, Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (2001–02) Currently Assistant Director-General (Planning, Resourcing and Performance) |
| Kim Bannikoff | An architect of QSE – 2010 Assistant Director-General (Strategic Planning and Portfolio Services) (1999–2000) Director, Office of Training and Tertiary Education, Department of Education and Training, Victoria (2001–02) Director of Schools, Department of Education and Training, Victoria (2002–03) Currently Director, Queensland Studies Authority |

APPENDIX 5

PROJECT STAFF (2000–04)

(listed in order of appointment within the relevant span)

| <i>Name</i> | <i>Role/Contribution</i> |
|-------------------|---|
| 2000–2004 | |
| Gabrielle Matters | Director |
| Anna van Hoof | Development; Assistant Director ⁶⁵ |
| Kirran Follers | Implementation; Moderation |
| Ken Gray | Development; Research (Contractor) |
| 2002–2004 | |
| Diane Ware | Implementation; Moderation |
| Robert Lake | Research |
| Boyd Paties | Research; Moderation |
| David Kelly | Research; Moderation |
| Karen Harris | Research (Contractor) |
| Janina Drazek | Chief Moderator |
| Suzanne Henden | Moderation |
| Trish Glasby | Moderation |
| 2003–2004 | |
| Janis Stevens | Moderation |
| Shiron Dixon | Moderation |
| Lesley Friend | Research; Moderation |
| Trudy Large | Moderation |
| Desley Delley | Information |
| Michelle Choules | Research |
| Karen Barnett | Research |
| Nada Griffiths | Moderation |
| Anh Nuyen | External moderator |
| Peter Panteleit | External moderator |
| Mary Shipstone | External moderator |

⁶⁵ from August 2002

The New Basics Research Report

| <i>Name</i> | <i>Role/Contribution</i> |
|--------------------------|--|
| 2000–2003 | |
| Ezette Grauf | Implementation ⁶⁶ |
| Peter Lloyd | Implementation; Moderation |
| Paul Sutton | Implementation; Moderation ⁶⁷ |
| 2000–2002 | |
| Tony Cook | Principal Adviser; Assistant Director |
| Paul Herschell | Research; Implementation |
| 2000–2001 | |
| Neville Grace | Development |
| 2001–2002 | |
| Cath O'Hara | Implementation |
| Nola Simpson | Research |
| Madonna Morton | Research; Information |
| Bill Wall | Development |
| Carole Kerr | Development |
| 2002–2003 | |
| Rosie Scholl | Implementation; Moderation |
| Della Nanka | Research |
| Executive support | |
| John Martin | Senior Education Officer (2001–2002) |
| Robert McAllister | Executive Officer (2003–2004) |
| Barbara Henderson | Principal Policy Officer (2003–2004) |
| Consultants | |
| Ray Barrett | Researcher (2000, 2003–2004) |
| John Pitman | Moderation Strategist (2003–2004) |

Note: Entries in the role/contribution column represent from 100% to 25% of an officer's time. Balance of time devoted to other functions of the Branch (e.g. Assessment & Reporting Framework).

⁶⁶ includes 8-month secondment to Victoria in 2002

⁶⁷ shared .5 fte with Cape York Justice Strategy project team in 2003

APPENDIX 6

SCHEDULE OF FRAG MEETINGS

| 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 23 Mar | 28 Feb | 09 Feb | 08 Feb | 22 Feb |
| 17 Oct | 04 Jun | 11 May | 15 Mar | 04 Apr |
| | 08 Sep | 08 Jun | 10 May | |
| | 06 Oct | 20 Jul | 14 Jun | |
| | 11 Nov | 21 Sep | 12 Jul | |
| | 08 Dec | 16 Nov | 16 Aug | |
| | | 15 Dec | 20 Sep | |
| | | | 18 Oct | |
| | | | 08 Nov | |

Members also gathered at other times to work on various aspects of the research program, but these were not formal meetings as such. Times when members gathered in this way to provide direct input to the research activities included 24–28 November 2003, 15–16 January 2004, and 8 and 16 February 2004.

FRAG MEMBERSHIP 2003-04

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Dr James Ladwig | Senior Lecturer, School of Education, The University of Newcastle |
| Dr Reg Allen | Director of Assessment and Testing, Minnesota Department of Education (2002 – April 2004) CEO Tasmanian Qualifications Authority (from April 2004) |
| Associate Professor Jim Butler | Graduate School of Education, The University of Queensland |
| Dr Mark Bahr | Lecturer, School of Education, The University of Queensland |

APPENDIX 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRIAL POPULATION

| School | Principal's band level | Year level range | Number of students | Proportion of ATSI students | IRSED98 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Buranda SS | 6 | 1–7 | 168 | .00 | 1004 |
| Burnside SHS | 10 | 8–12 | 653 | .06 | 986 |
| Burnside SS | 9 | P–7 | 457 | .09 | 969 |
| Cairns West SS | 9 | P–7 | 475 | .69 | 885 |
| Charters Towers Central SS | 7 | P–7 | 198 | .28 | 958 |
| Charters Towers SDE | 9 | P–10 | 348 | .02 | 960 |
| Charters Towers SHS | 9 | 8–12 | 430 | .14 | 960 |
| Chevallum SS | 7 | P–7 | 244 | .004 | 999 |
| Eagleby SS | 8 | P–7 | 428 | .07 | 863 |
| Edge Hill SS | 10 | P–7 | 816 | .13 | 1005 |
| Eudlo SS | 6 | P–7 | 85 | .04 | 992 |
| Glennview SS | 6 | 1–7 | 148 | .00 | 991 |
| Goondiwindi SHS | 9 | 8–12 | 431 | .07 | 981 |
| Helensvale SHS | 11 | 8–12 | 2021 | .01 | 1023 |
| Hopevale SS | 7 | 1–7 | 114 | .98 | 899 |
| Inglewood SS | 8 | P–10 | 158 | .17 | 913 |
| Kelvin Grove State College | 11 | P–12 | 1610 | .03 | 1053 |
| Kenmore SHS | 11 | 8–12 | 1244 | .01 | 1130 |
| Mackay Central SS | 7 | P–7 | 143 | .32 | 927 |
| Mackay SHS | 10 | 8–12 | 890 | .12 | 961 |
| Mapleton SS | 7 | P–7 | 214 | .005 | 1012 |
| Maryborough Special School | 8 | | 42 | .10 | 909 |
| Millchester SS | 7 | P–7 | 282 | .21 | 966 |
| Montville SS | 6 | 1–7 | 84 | .00 | 1040 |
| Mooloolah SS | 7 | P–7 | 312 | .00 | 965 |
| Mount Gravatt West Special School | 10 | | 68 | .00 | 995 |
| Mountain Creek SHS | 11 | 8–12 | 2041 | .01 | 1018 |
| Nambour SHS | 11 | 8–12 | 1431 | .03 | 975 |
| Nambour Special School | 9 | | 91 | .01 | 987 |
| Palmwoods SS | 8 | P–7 | 396 | .01 | 989 |
| Parramatta SS | 8 | P–7 | 295 | .60 | 950 |
| Richmond Hill SS | 8 | P–7 | 398 | .12 | 977 |
| Thabeban SS | 8 | P–7 | 313 | .13 | 909 |
| The Willows SS | 10 | P–7 | 988 | .05 | 1045 |
| Thursday Island SS | 8 | P–7 | 470 | .87 | 890 |
| Western Cape College—Aurukun Campus | 8 | P–10 | 331 | .998 | 626 |
| Woombye SS | 8 | P–7 | 427 | .007 | 988 |
| Woree SS | 9 | P–7 | 710 | .25 | 1012 |

Note: Bold figures represent highest and lowest five in each column.

APPENDIX 8

CHRONOLOGY OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

-
- 30 Oct 2001 Initial closing date for *Invitation to Offer* for the “External Evaluation of New Basics Research Program” (later extended to 8 February 2002)
- 8 Feb 2002 CO 01/2002 *Invitation to Offer* closed
- 12 Feb 2002 *Towards the New Basics Evaluation – Some musings*, New Year 2002 Memorandum from Director, New Basics to DDG copied to DG and Allan Luke
- Mar–Apr 2002 *External evaluation of New Basics Research Program Formal Instrument of Agreement* signed by Geoff N Masters, Chief Executive Officer (ACER) on 28 March and by Professor Roger Slee, DDG (Education Queensland) on 17 April
- Apr 2002 First interim evaluation report scheduled delivery date
- 11 May 2002 Members of FRAG note reluctance of Branch staff to be closely associated with external evaluation so as to ensure independence
- 3 June 2002 E-mail from Director of Branch to trial school principals seeking expressions of willingness to host visits from Evaluator
- 6–7 Jun 2002 Evaluator visits Branch and two trial schools (Eagleby SS and Chevallum SS)
- 8 Jun 2002 Evaluator attends FRAG meeting
- 3 Feb 2003 *Formative evaluation of the New Basics initiative* received from Evaluator
- 8 Feb 2003 Evaluator attends FRAG meeting
- 19 Feb 2003 Director attends Minister’s business meeting to discuss first interim evaluation report
- 7 March 2003 Briefing note to Minister from the Director of the Branch: *Response to the first interim evaluation of the New Basics*
- 17 Mar 2003 *Post-evaluation decisions re supplementary Year 9 achievement data* Memorandum from Director, New Basics to DDG
- Apr 2003 Second interim evaluation report scheduled delivery date
- 20 May 2003 Evaluator visits New Basics Branch
- 27 May 2003 Receipt of *Second interim formative evaluation report of the New Basics Research Program*
- 29 May 2003 Meeting in Melbourne of DDG and Evaluator

The New Basics Research Report

- 14 Jun 2003 Dispatch to Evaluator of New Basics Branch feedback on draft interim evaluation
- 26 Jun 2003 Receipt of final version of *Second interim formative evaluation report of the New Basics Research Program*
- 12 Jul 2003 Evaluator attends FRAG meeting
- 14 Jul 2003 Briefing note to Minister from Director of the Branch: *Response to second interim evaluation of the New Basics*
- 16 Aug 2003 Meeting in Brisbane of DDG, Director of Branch and Chair of FRAG
- 18 Aug 2003 Teleconference DDG, Director, Evaluator (Chair of FRAG invited but unavailable to participate) to discuss second interim evaluation
- 23 Dec 2003 Meeting in Brisbane of DDG, Director, Evaluator, Chair of FRAG
- 5–8 Feb 2004 Correspondence between Evaluator and Director regarding ACER proposal to vary procedures for data gathering
- 22 Feb 2004 Evaluator attends FRAG gathering
- 23 Feb 2004 Evaluator working within New Basics Branch
- 24 Feb 2004 Evaluator visits Kenmore SHS
- 25 Feb 2004 Governance of evaluation transferred to Office of Strategic Policy and Future Directions (SPEF) from the Office of DDG Curriculum, Learning and Strategy
- 3 Mar 2004 Receipt of *Third formative evaluation report of the New Basics Research Program*
- 8–9 Mar 2004 Evaluator working within New Basics Branch
- 12 Mar 2004 Briefing note to Minister from Director of the Branch: *Response to third interim evaluation of the New Basics*
- 29–30 Mar 2004 Evaluator working within New Basics Branch
- 1 Apr 2004 Meeting of DG and Project Officer (SPEF)
- 29–30 Apr 2004 Evaluator working within New Basics Branch
- 12 May 2004 Evaluator presents draft report to meeting of senior officers
- 7 June 2004 Final evaluation report presented to Director-General
-

APPENDIX 9

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATOR

PART I: THREE CENTRAL QUESTIONS

The External Evaluation of the New Basics Research Program is designed to focus on exploring three central questions, on the basis of evidence from the trial. These questions are presented below, together with some areas of investigation that the Evaluator might choose to consider in coming to terms with the central questions.

1 What are the strengths and weaknesses of New Basics in improving student outcomes and teacher practice?

Potential areas for consideration

To what extent does evidence from the trial point to substantive differences between (like) trial and non-trial schools, and among trial schools, in:

- the nature of what students know and can do;
- the quality of student achievement (as per the Futures Premise)?

What evidence is there that any such differences in student outcomes can be explained in terms of the implementation of the New Basics Framework?

Are there substantive differences in teaching practices in (like) trial and non-trial schools, and among trial schools, that harmonise changes in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment (as per the Pedagogy Premise)?

What evidence is there that any such differences in pedagogy can be explained in terms of the implementation of the New Basics Framework?

To what extent do any differences in student outcomes and teacher practices arising from the trial of New Basics support the Equity Premise?

In what ways and to what extent has New Basics supported, and been seen to support, teacher's intellectual work and professionalism?

To what extent has New Basics reduced alienation in the middle years of schooling?

2 How viable is the New Basics Framework for extending implementation beyond the Trial and the trial schools, and should any such extension be system-wide or restricted?

Potential areas for consideration

To what extent does evidence from the trial point to substantive differences, between (like) trial and non-trial schools, and among trial schools, in the capacities of the different ways schools are organised to support the Professional Learning Community Premise?

What attributes might a non-trial school already have that are likely to make implementation of New Basics more viable?

What attributes of a non-trial school that are needed for successful implementation of the New Basics Framework are likely to develop as a result of schools' implementing New Basics?

In what ways does the available evidence indicate that New Basics has been or should be transmogrified?

If the New Basics is generalisable, how much would its implementation cost (this includes professional development for teachers, cycles of Rich Task development, moderation etc.)?

3 What are the areas of New Basics and its implementation that require further research by means of supplementary research projects?

The Evaluation also involves critical review and commentary of the research program undertaken by [the] New Basics Branch, including providing advice on:

- methodology and datasets;
- procedures and interpretations;
- meta-analysis of all data associated with the trial (as per Research Premise).

Potential areas for consideration

What contributions have the seven individual research projects made to exploration of the three central questions?

How effective has the institution of FRAG been in steering the New Basics Research Program, in terms of both the individual projects and the research program as a whole?

In what ways and to what extent do the findings of the seven individual research projects cross-validate each other?

To what extent do the critical interpretations of the data from the individual projects made in the New Basics Research Program align with those made by the Evaluator?

What supplementary research activity in the future, if any, would consolidate the research findings? (A supplementary activity might relate directly to individual projects or establish new linkages between them.)

PART II: POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES

Data sources the Evaluator might choose to access include, but are not limited to entries in the lists below.

Documents and data

- documents of Education Queensland, especially Queensland State Education – 2010 and the New Basics Technical Paper;
- published documents of the New Basics Branch, especially the booklet series (Theory into Practice, Curriculum Organisers, The Why, What, How, When of Rich Tasks) and the spirally bound set of Rich Tasks with associated desirable features;
- research documents and data held by the New Basics Branch, including papers written in-house, research summaries, research snapshots, papers from external research consultants, survey data;
- project reports, briefings, and other such documents composed for the Minister, the DG, the DDG, or the (former) EMG (now SMI);
- records of FRAG deliberations;
- messages posted on the framework website's discussion lists;
- business unit plans, budget bids etc.

Personnel

- current and former staff of Education Queensland, especially of the New Basics team in its various manifestations;
- district directors and education advisers of districts covering trial schools;
- principals, staff and students in trial schools;
- parents in trial schools and other members of the community;
- critical friends;
- members (former and current) of FRAG;
- members of the steering committee for the early stages of the project;
- researchers from Marketshare;
- directors of the statutory authorities, especially QSCC.

APPENDIX 10

NEW BASICS PHASE II SCHOOLS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Belmont State School |
| | Boonah State High School |
| | Dalby State School |
| | Eatons Hill State School |
| | Gladstone State High School |
| | Healy State School |
| | Taabinga State School |
| | Varsity College |
| | Woree State High School |
| Multi-campus College | Western Cape College |
| Biloela Cluster | Biloela State School |
| | Goovigen State School |
| | Jambin State School |
| | Thangool State School |
| | Mount Murchison State School |
| | Prospect Creek State School |
| Calamvale–Algester Alliance | Algester State School |
| | Calamvale Community College |
| Western Downs Rural School Alliance | Brigalow State School |
| | Condamine State School |
| | Dulacca State School |

Note: The 38 schools involved in the Trial became known as Phase I schools following a Government decision to expand the New Basics Program to another 21 schools in 2001. These 21 schools became known as Phase II schools. While they are supported in implementing the New Basics, they were not part of the Trial proper.

APPENDIX 11

CONCEPTUAL AUDIT

An independent and confidential reconciliation of the New Basics Branch activities against the foundational technical paper was commissioned by the Director of the Branch as the New Basics Trial approached the end of 2001, its second year (but the first year for students). An external researcher was asked to base the audit on available documents and files and informal discussions with branch personnel and senior EQ personnel.

The resultant comprehensive report provided:

- a point-in-time snapshot of the Branch's activities;
- insights into the nature and extent of alignment between Branch activities and the technical paper (e.g. role of Critical Friend not understood or developing as intended);
- suggestions about how any disjunctions might be corrected (e.g. undertake principled research into the role of Critical Friend);
- additions to the Branch's understanding about the effectiveness of the strategies from the technical paper per se in improving student outcomes;
- identification of issues worthy of further professional dialogue (e.g. interrelating the discrete elements of the research paradigm);
- pointers to ways for refining formal evaluations of the project's outcomes (e.g. providing guidelines for an evaluator);
- considered options for future action by the Branch (e.g. "take on additions to the NB Project through osmosis" or "return to core business ... [as] in the technical paper");
- a raft of issues considered by the researcher to be key (e.g. the changed role of District Director impacting on the core business of the New Basics Branch).

The report contained recommendations flowing from the above (e.g. re-establishing the role of the Branch in relation to Productive Pedagogies) and other embedded findings, such as:

- "the work in the [Branch] is focused and of a high quality";
- "the New Basics Project has been dogged by lack of complete attention to communication protocols between key players";
- "[while] data gathering is running along parallel tracks ..., there is no clear indication of how the interconnectedness will be shown";
- "the specific aim of the New Basics Branch Business Unit Plan relating to middle schooling and Year 12 retention should be added to the evaluation parameters for the project as a secondary consideration".

Those findings were reported upwards in January 2002.

APPENDIX 12

MINISTERIAL PORTFOLIO STATEMENTS

The annual Ministerial Portfolio Statement for the Department of Education (Department of Education and the Arts from February 2004) provides the primary source of information to the Parliamentary Estimates Committee on the funding provided in the State Budget for key strategies and prospective outcomes and financial performance of the education portfolio. The Ministerial Portfolio Statements over the period of the New Basics Trial documented the Government's support of the New Basics through commitment of resources for:

- In 2000–2001
 - thirty-eight schools (primary, secondary and special) to trial the New Basics framework.

- In 2001–2002
 - the expansion of the New Basics Program to another 20 schools at the cost of \$1 million per year, supplementing existing funding arrangements for school curriculum.
 - schools to develop 3-year curriculum plans.
 - alignment of school organisation and curriculum planning with the New Basics Framework.
 - special schools to develop a process to ensure consistency in assessment and reporting of student performance on Rich (real-life) Tasks.

- In 2002–2003
 - the continuation of the New Basics trial.
 - development of trial moderation processes.
 - finalisation of standards of performance against Rich Tasks.

- In 2003–2004
 - Phase I schools in the trial to build upon their successes.
 - extension of moderation to Phase II schools.
 - maintenance of currency and futures orientation of the set of Rich Tasks.
 - continuation of the evaluation of the trial of the New Basics.
 - reporting to parents of students in Year 3, 6 and 9 on their performance on the Rich Tasks assessed against State-wide standards.

APPENDIX 13

THE NEW BASICS IN JOURNALS, MAGAZINES AND BOOKS

(SAMPLE ONLY)

- Bagnall, D. (2003, October 28). In praise of reading and righting. *The Bulletin*, pp. 86–87.
- Green, B. (2003). Curriculum inquiry in Australia: Toward a local genealogy of the curriculum field. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Illing, D. (2003, 11 July). Pedagogical change: Out of their boxes. *The London Times Educational Supplement*, pp. 12–13.
- Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & Harvey, A. (2003). Assessing multiliteracies and the New Basics. *Assessment in Education: Principles, policies and practices*, 10, 15–26.
- Macdonald, D. (2003). Rich Task implementation: Modernism meets postmodernism. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 24, 247–262.
- Matters, G. (2002). The Rich Task: A new assessment species for new times. In C. Richards on (Ed.), *Assessing Gifted and Talented Children* (pp. 35–49). London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Page, J. S. (2003). Towards a critical appraisal of the Queensland New Basics Project. *Perspectives on Educational Leadership*, 13 (6), 1–2.
- Sefton-Green, J. (2002, Winter). It does n't have to be this way: Literacy and curriculum change down under. *The English & Media Magazine*, 47, 46–48.
- Yates, L. (2002). Effectiveness, difference, and sociological research. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 23, 329–338.

APPENDIX 14

NEW BASICS PROJECT DELEGATIONS

- pre-2002 Incomplete data
South African Parliamentary Committee
Associate Professor of Pedagogy, University of Japan, Osaka
David Hanlon, Department of Education, Tasmania
- 2002 Executive Director, Philadelphia Education Fund, USA
Blackmore Primary School Girrawheen, WA
Curriculum Planning and Development Division, Singapore Ministry of Education
Baron South Western Principals, Victoria
Vincent Greaney, World Bank, USA
Rangitoto College, New Zealand
St Cuthbert's School, New Zealand
Marist Primary School, New Zealand
Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning, USA
Principals Leadership Centre, Western Australia
Kyowa Town Board of Education, Japan
Corran School, New Zealand
East Counties Manuka TEAM Solutions, New Zealand
Beijing Daxing District Education Committee, China
Schools in Diocese of Broken Bay, NZ
- 2003 Ryde District Principals, New South Wales
Papatoetoe Central School, NZ
Skipton Primary School, Lavers Hill P-12, Birregurra Primary School, Colac College,
Colac Primary School, Colac Specialist School, Wodonga, Victoria
Scotch College, Victoria
District Coordinator, South Australia
Pasadena Intermediate School, New Zealand
Growth & Innovation Advisory Board, NZ Government New Zealand
National Department of Education, Papua New Guinea
Kenakena School, New Zealand
Plumpton Primary, New South Wales
St Cuthbert's School, New Zealand
Wedge Park Primary School, Victoria
Discovery School, New Zealand
Gavin Brown, University of Auckland, NZ
Gavin Patterson Department of Education and Training, NSW
Stephen Crump, University of Sydney, NSW
Jim Ridgway, University of Durham, UK
Pamela Macklin, Curriculum Corporation
Bayview ICTPD Cluster of Schools, New Zealand
Rosehill College, New Zealand
Diana Rees, Department of Education and Training, WA
Val Klenowski, The Institute of Education, University of London
Hiro Tenaka, Department of Education Osaka Kyoiku University, Japan
Seaford 6-12 School, SA

ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|--|
| ACER | Australian Council for Educational Research |
| ADG | Assistant Director-General |
| ANOVA | Analysis of Variance |
| ANSN | Australian National Schools Network |
| ATSI | Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander |
| CORS | Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools |
| DDG | Deputy Director-General |
| DEETYA | Department of Employment, Education, Training & Youth Affairs (Commonwealth Government) |
| DG | Director-General |
| EDS | Executive Director (Schools) |
| EMG | Executive Management Group |
| EOSD | Education Officer (Special Duties) |
| EPA | Enacted Pedagogical Assessment |
| EQ | Education Queensland |
| ETRF | Education and Training Reforms for the Future |
| FRAG | Framework Research Advisory Group |
| IDEAS | Innovative Designs for Enhancing Achievements in Schools |
| IP | Intellectual Property |
| IRSED | Index of Relative Socioeconomic Disadvantage |
| ISA | International Schools' Assessment |
| KLA | Key Learning Area |
| MCCC | Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum |
| MPS | Ministerial Portfolio Statement |
| NASA | National Aeronautics and Space Administration |
| NBRP | New Basics Research Program |
| OBE | Outcome-based Education |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PISA | Programme for International Student Assessment |
| QBSSSS | Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies |
| QCPCA | Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens' Associations Inc. |
| QCS | Queensland Core Skills |
| Q-Q | Quantile-Quantile |

The New Basics Research Report

| | |
|------------|--|
| QSA | Queensland Studies Authority |
| QSCC | Queensland School Curriculum Council |
| QSE – 2010 | Queensland State Education – 2010 |
| QSPA | Queensland Secondary Principals' Association |
| QSRLS | Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study |
| QTU | Queensland Teachers' Union |
| QUT | Queensland University of Technology |
| SDE | School of Distance Education |
| SECC | Special Education Curriculum Cluster |
| SMT | Strategic Management Team |
| SQL | Structured Query Language |
| TEPA | Tertiary Entrance Procedures Authority |
| TROP | Targeted Repertoire of Practice |
| TRS | Teacher Relief Scheme |
| UQ | University of Queensland (The) |
| WCT | World Class Test |

GLOSSARY

This glossary contains terms that are specific to the New Basics, and terms that are used in a specific way in this report. It does not include statistical terms or technical jargon from educational measurement.

Achievement: Something accomplished or done as opposed to level or standard attained. Not to be confused with ability or aptitude. Achievement is what you did, ability is what you might have done, and aptitude is what you might be able to do.

Assessment (educational): Measurement of student achievement through a process of identifying, gathering and interpreting information about student learning. Can be normative, criterion-referenced (including criteria-based) or ipsative.

Authentic assessment: Involves students in using relevant and useful knowledge, thinking and practical skills. Has the following characteristics: the assessment task is real (i.e. students experience the task as it could be carried out in a non-school environment); the range of response modes is broad; and the skills developed in other subject areas are enhanced.

Available grades (first, see **grade**): number varies from two to five (depending on outcomes of the panelling process and on the feasibility of making that many distinctions) and range from commendable to excellent.

Backwash effect: Unintended effect of something as the result of certain actions being carried out on something else. Often used in the sense of assessment having a backwash effect on curriculum.

Criteria (criterion, sing.): Those properties, dimensions or characteristics by which student performance is appraised.

Criteria-based: In Queensland refers to a system of assessment whereby a student's achievement in an area of learning is interpreted in terms of pre-determined criteria and standards. Focuses on the specific nature of a student's actual achievements in relation to specific criteria.

Critical friend: In the New Basics, a person funded by Education Queensland and appointed by a school with the specific role to: assist school teams in writing school-specific documentation; assist school management teams in the process of pedagogical reform; undertake school-level research; and provide advice and strategic recommendations to the New Basics Branch on a wide range of implementation issues.

Curriculum organiser: In the general sense, any expression of a structure for the content of a curriculum. In the New Basics sense, there are four categories (clusters of practice)—the New Basics—Life pathways & social futures; Multiliteracies & communications media; Active citizenship; and Environments & technologies.

The New Basics Research Report

Curriculum: The collection of learning experiences at school, including subjects taught and knowledge and skills acquired. The “selective traditions” (Luke, 1988) of knowledge and texts, skills and competences, processes and practices that educational systems deem to be of value for construction and transmission to successive generations of learners.

Desirable feature (of high-quality performance): One of the task-specific properties or characteristics of student work that is evidence of the achievement aspired to in the targeted repertoires of practice and/or in other aspects signalled within the diagrammatic representation of the Rich Task. The desirable features form the basis for awarding grades for that task.

Evidence-based assessment: Using primary data (i.e. actual student work, as opposed to test scores or perceptions of intent) as the evidence upon which judgments are made about the standard achieved.

Exhibition: An occasion of public inspection when some substantial portion of a school’s constituency shows up to hear students recite, declaim or otherwise perform (as in 18th century academic life).

Grade: A code representing the standard of student performance on a Rich Task. Grades are denoted by consecutive letters, with A denoting the grade pertaining to the highest standard of performance. The lowest available grade identifies the threshold for acceptable performance. The number of grades varies from task to task. Grade is used to mean the single result for reporting.

Grading master: A task-specific visual display incorporating verbal descriptors used to plot a student’s performance, for each of the desirable features, on a vertical axis (“pole”), before making an on-balance holistic judgment to arrive at a final **grade**. Teachers are required to take into account designated “non-discountable” features to ensure balanced and comprehensive coverage of the four New Basics clusters of practice in reporting.

High-stakes assessment: Has two senses—one is associated with the important consequences for the student (e.g. being promoted or receiving a certificate); the other is associated with consequences for instruction quality (e.g. school rankings).

Juncture year: There are three 3-year spans covered by the New Basics: Years 1–3, 4–6, and 7–9. The final year of each span is known as the juncture year—it is the year in which the Rich Tasks undertaken during that span are reported on.

Moderation: A set of processes designed to achieve comparability of grades assigned to student work, across judges (teachers) and across sites (schools or regions). Comparability, in turn, means that standards are applied consistently across the State so that student performances of equivalent standard are recognised as such. Moderation involves contextualised teacher judgments and a system of verification of school decision-making. Moderated assessment enhances teacher and community confidence in the reliability of reported results.

New Basics: In a specific sense, the New Basics is the term for the four clusters of practice that act as curriculum organisers within the New Basics Framework. The four clusters are:

- Life pathways and social futures
- Multiliteracies and communications media
- Active citizenship
- Environments and technologies.

New Basics referents: These are the 16 clusters of practice that are sub-categories of the four New Basics categories. A subset of the New Basics referents appears in the top left-hand corner of the diagrammatic representation of each Rich Task. Students must master these in order to undertake that Rich Task.

New times: The term describes the combined phenomena of globalisation, the shift towards local and service-based economies, new and constantly changing technologies, complex transformations in cultural and social relationships, fluid demographics, and a sense of uncertainty about the future.

Operational fields of knowledge: Discourses that enable students to solve problems and to understand, research and interpret their worlds. Include the New Basics categories and other disciplinary, KLA, and/or transdisciplinary fields of knowledge that are brought into play in order to complete Rich Tasks.

Pedagogy: The art (craft) of teaching.

Product: In the New Basics, the output from the student's engagement with a Rich Task; could be a folio, exhibition, artefact, performance, etc.

Productive Pedagogies: The research team responsible for the QSRLS coined the term "Productive Pedagogies" to describe a construct of 20 observable teaching strategies that are useful for focusing instruction and that have been linked to improved student outcomes. Within the Productive Pedagogies framework, these strategies are organised into four categories: Intellectual quality, Connectedness, Supportive classroom environment, and Recognition of difference.

Ratification: The fourth stage of moderation. The confirmation by the system of a particular school's ability to make decisions about grades that are consistent with statewide standards. Ratification is carried out at any time after sufficient Rich Task demonstrations have been completed by students of the school and been graded by teachers to provide samples of the varying quality of students' achievements.

Reliability: The degree to which the results of assessment are consistent, dependable, or repeatable.

Repertoire of practice: The skills—cognitive and cultural, linguistic and social—that students need to develop in order to do the Rich Tasks (i.e. for “new times”).

Rich Task: Rich Tasks are specific activities that students undertake that have real-world value and use. Rich Tasks are the assessable and reportable outcomes of an enacted three-year curriculum plan that prepares students for the challenges of life in new times. Each Rich Task is a culminating performance or demonstration or product that is purposeful and models a life role. It presents substantive real problems to solve. The **set** of Rich Tasks is all the Rich Tasks available across the three 3-year spans (Years 1–3, 4–6, and 7–9); the Rich Tasks within a 3-year span are collectively referred to as a **suite** of Rich Tasks. For the New Basics Trial there were 5 Rich Tasks for Years 1–3; 7 for Years 4–6, and 8 (with two forms of one) for Years 7–9.

Set (of Rich Tasks): see **Rich Task**

Social moderation: The process of validating teacher judgments of the standard of student work by having those teachers' judgments reviewed by their peers, internally within the same school and/or externally from a different school. This form of moderation most empowers teachers and is generally known and supported by Queensland educators. In the Queensland model, moderation involves contextualised teacher judgments and a system of verification of school decision-making. Consistent and valid moderation possesses three essential features: standards (explicit and a priori); evidence (student work); and consensus (between teachers judging standards of student work).

Standard: Fixed point along the criterion describing/representing qualitative (and discernible) differences in student performance. Standards are the referents that underlie judgment of success or level of merit in a performance. Assessment involves judging which of several designated standards best represents the characteristics of a student's performance; that is, what label to attach to the performance or what category (such as A, B/A, U) to place it in.

Standards descriptor: Statement or list of statements that succinctly conveys the required quality of, or features in, student work in order to be awarded the corresponding grade on a particular task.

Student work: For trial schools, a collection of the products of student learning completed in response to assessable features of a Rich Task; for non-trial schools, a collection of the substantive products of student learning across various curriculum areas.

Suite (of Rich Tasks): see **Rich Task**.

Targeted repertoire of practice: Those **repertoires of practice** targeted within a specific Rich Task.

Trade-off: The property of a judgment about the overall standard of student work that ensures that good performance on one feature can compensate for poorer performance on another; and that performance on several features contributes to the grade assigned to student work in a manner reflective of their hierarchical positions (weighting). As well as trading off between features to assign an overall grade (possibly based on a rule), trading-off can occur within a desirable feature if it is multifaceted (no rule).

Ungraded: A code (U) assigned to student performance on a Rich Task when the student did not comply with major specifications of the task.

Validity: The degree to which an assessment instrument measures what it purports to measure. Validity is a multifaceted concept, traditionally defined in many different ways, each one emphasising one particular aspect and named accordingly; for example, concurrent, construct, content, convergent, criterion, discriminant, ecological, face, nomological, population, predictive.

REFERENCES

- Education (Queensland Studies Authority) Act 2002, (2004).
- Allen, J. R. (2003). Personal communication with Director, Assessment & New Basics Branch.
- Australian Labor Party. (2001). *A safe and supportive schooling environment* (Policy paper). Brisbane: Australian Labor Party.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse* (Vol. 4). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique* (Rev. ed.). Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bowe, R., & Ball, S. J. with Gold, A. (1992). *Reforming education and changing schools: Case studies in policy sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Melbourne, Vic: Macmillan.
- Cranston, N., & Jarzabkowski, L. (2000). Shifting the goalposts during the game: the changing roles of district superintendents in a state government department. *Change: Transformations in Education*, 3 (2), 39–52.
- Dahl, R. (1970). *Who governs?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deakin Crick, R., Broadfoot, P., & Claxton, G. (2002). *Developing an effective lifelong learning inventory: The ELLI project*. Bristol, UK: Lifelong Learning Foundation.
- Department of Employment, Education, Training & Youth Affairs, & Children's Literacy National Projects Programme (Australia). (1997). *Digital rhetorics: Literacies and technologies in education: Current practices and future directions*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Department of Employment, Education, Training & Youth Affairs, & Griffith University, (comp. by Peter Freebody, Christine Ludwig & Stephanie Gunn). (1996). *Everyday literacy practices in and out of schools in low socio-economic urban communities. Vol. 1*. Nathan, Qld: Griffith University (Faculty of Education).
- Dewey, J. (1958). *Art as experience*. New York: Putnams.
- Education Queensland. (1997). *Leading schools* (Information kit). Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2000a). *New Basics Project Technical Paper*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2000b). *Queensland State Education – 2010 (QSE – 2010)*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2001a). *Building school capacity for curriculum leadership*. Brisbane: Department of Education.

- Education Queensland. (2001b, 19 January). Key Learning Areas and New Basics. *Education Views, 10*, liftout.
- Education Queensland. (2002). *The Report of the Assessment and Reporting Taskforce*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2003a). *The Department of Education Strategic Plan 2003–2007*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2003b). *Destination 2010: The action plan to implement Queensland State Education – 2010*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2003c). *The middle phase of learning state school action plan*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- Education Queensland. (2003d). *What is the Smart Classrooms vision?* Retrieved 5 April, 2004, from <http://education.qld.gov.au/smartclassrooms/vision.html>
- Education Queensland, & University of Southern Queensland. (1998). *IDEAS: A research-based framework for enhancing school outcomes*. Retrieved 24 March, 2004, from <http://education.qld.gov.au/staff/learning/ideas/html/what.html>
- Education Queensland, & University of Southern Queensland. (1999). *IDEAS*. Retrieved 24 March, 2004, from <http://education.qld.gov.au/staff/learning/ideas/>
- Ford, J. E. (1990). *Are there new basics? Essential learning for contemporary schooling*. Brisbane: Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). London: Penguin.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Fullan, M. G. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1999a). *The disciplined mind: What all students should understand*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gardner, H. (1999b). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st Century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gipps, C. (2001). Personal communication to Director Assessment & New Basics Branch as part of the Assessment and Reporting Taskforce deliberations.
- Kramer, L. (2000, 11 April). Beware agenda of false basics. *The Daily Telegraph, Sydney*, p. 33.

- Lingard, B. (1993). Corporate federalism: The emerging approach to policy-making for Australian schools. In B. Lingard, J. Knight & P. Porter (Eds.), *Schooling reform in hard times* (pp. 24–35). London: Falmer Press.
- Luke, A. (1988). *Literacy, textbooks and ideology*. London: Falmer Press.
- Lundin, S. C., Paul, H., & Christensen, J. (2000). *Fish! A remarkable way to boost morale and improve results*. New York: Hyperion.
- Marceau, J. (1991). *Steering from a distance: International trends in the financing and governance of higher education*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Middleton, M. (2003). *Kenmore High School curriculum review: Situational analysis, issues and options* (A working document). Brisbane: Kenmore State High School.
- Muncey, D. E., & McQuillan, P. J. (1993). Preliminary findings from a five-year study of The Coalition of Essential Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74 (6), 486–489.
- Newmann, F., Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1995). *Authentic pedagogy: Standards that boost student performance (Report No. 8, Issues in restructuring schools)*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- Newmann, F., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- Pinar, W. F. (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Pitman, J. A. (2002). *The Senior Certificate: A new deal* (Review requested by the Minister for Education). Brisbane: Education Queensland.
- Pitman, J. A., O'Brien, J. E., & McCollow, J. E. (1999, May). *High-quality assessment: We are what we believe and do*. Paper presented at the IAEA Annual Conference, Bled, Slovenia.
- Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet. (2002). *Queensland the Smart State: Education and training reforms for the future* (White paper). Brisbane: The State of Queensland.
- Sadler, D. R. (1986). *Subjectivity, objectivity, and teachers' qualitative judgements* (Assessment Unit Discussion Paper 5). Brisbane: Board of Secondary School Studies.
- Sadler, D. R. (2003, January). *Specifying and promulgating achievement standards*. Paper presented at the Assessment and Reporting Framework Implementation Committee meeting, Brisbane.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Sizer, T. R. (1992). *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sizer, T. R. (1996). *Horace's hope: What works for the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, R. A., Matters, G., Cosier, I. L., & Watson, D. J. (1999). *Reinventing Years 10–12 in state schools: A model of multiple learning pathways for new times* (Report to the Strategic Policy Branch, Education Queensland).
- Spady, W. (1993). *Outcome-based education*. Belconnen, ACT: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- The New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66 (1), 60–92.
- The University of Queensland, School of Education. (2001a). *The Queensland school reform longitudinal study*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- The University of Queensland, School of Education. (2001b). *The Queensland school reform longitudinal study: Supplementary material*. Brisbane: Department of Education.
- van Hoof, A. (2004). [Development of Rich Tasks]: Unpublished raw data.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Willingham, W. W., & Cole, N. S. (Eds.). (1997). *Gender and fair assessment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wilson, B. (2003, June). *How we got the curriculum wrong ...* Paper presented at the Queensland Secondary Principals' Association (QSPA) Conference, Gold Coast.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.