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Introduction

Syllabus development in Queensland has been influenced by a view that syllabus documents describe learning outcomes and/or criteria and standards of student performance - to provide a framework for learning and assessment - resulting in limited pedagogical advice. This view has prevented overt pedagogical advice being included in Queensland’s syllabuses thus contributing to a missed opportunity to influence change in pedagogical practice through a reform agenda. As a result confused messages are generated about how such change in pedagogical practice can be influenced. Bernstein (1996) recognised the three message systems of schooling – curriculum, pedagogy and assessment should be aligned and not work at cross-purposes. This view is reinforced in The Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (2001: executive summary 14) as it recommends the placement of teacher professional practices – pedagogies – linked to desired student outcomes, at the core of professional communities.

This paper contains the initial thoughts of Queensland Studies Authority (QSA), Key Learning Area Officers2 (KLAOs), regarding the role of pedagogical advice in syllabuses as the organisation begins to review the nature of syllabuses in a P to 12 framework. It will be argued that more comprehensive and explicit advice should be included in syllabus documents. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Queensland Studies Authority.

The Queensland Studies Authority (QSA) and its role in syllabus development

The QSA is an independent statutory authority responsible for services to all Queensland schooling authorities. It was established on 1 July 2002, merging the Queensland School Curriculum Council, Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies and the Tertiary Entrance Procedures Authority, via the Education (Queensland Studies Authority) Act 2002.

Membership of the QSA includes representatives from teacher, parent, union and higher education groups, as well as the State, Catholic and Independent schooling sectors. The governing body of QSA provides advice and direction to the office of the authority under the mandate of the education portfolio.

2 The Key Learning Area Officers (KLAO's) responsibilities include: maintaining an overarching discipline expertise P to Year 12; involvement in the creation, review and rewriting of syllabus documents; engaging in cross-branch research functions; delivering professional development that supports syllabus implementation to teachers, schools and systems; liaising with tertiary institutions, especially in pre-service and teacher education, and providing leadership in P to 10 moderation and consistency of teacher judgment projects.
The syllabus development functions of the QSA include:
- the development, approval and revision of Years 1 to 12 syllabuses and preschool guidelines;
- the development of documents to assist schools to implement approved syllabuses and preschool guidelines; and
- the development of resources and services for teacher professional development programs.

**Education and training reforms for the future (ETRF)**


Under ETRF, QSA will review the nature of P to 12 syllabuses. This review will inform the development of future syllabuses and curriculum materials. As part of this project the Queensland Studies Framework will be developed. The framework will provide the structural and theoretical underpinnings of the QSA’s syllabus development work and inform how schools relate to the suite of syllabus documents from preschool to Year 12.

**Queensland syllabuses**

There are three broad categories of syllabuses in Queensland, differentiated by their approach, structure and band of schooling. Syllabus development in Queensland prior to the establishment of the QSA was marked by differences in frameworks for Years 1 to 10, and Years 11 and 12. These differences have occurred due to legislated responsibilities as much as theoretical approaches. However, there are strong commonalities, one being ‘the valuing of teacher judgement and the relative autonomy of schools in the development of curriculum’ (Maxwell, 1995: 88-102; 2002) from the bases provided by syllabus documents.

The syllabus categories are:

- **Early Years** - The Draft Early Years Curriculum Guidelines provides a framework for the Preparatory Year curriculum. This framework supports teachers as they integrate learning, teaching and assessment and promotes continuity in children’s learning. The guidelines emphasise the learning and espouse particular teaching understandings and ideologies, including articulated pedagogical approaches. The guidelines focus on five cross curricula learning areas, identifying the qualities of these through learning statements.

- **Years 1 to 10** - The Years 1 to 10 Key Learning Area (KLA) syllabuses are based on an outcomes approach. They are structured in three sections - rationale, outcomes and assessment. These documents are intended to be used as part of a suite of materials including the Sourcebook Guidelines, Initial In-Service Materials and Sourcebook Modules. The KLA syllabuses
articulate a continuum of learning and express milestones at typical stages along a student’s learning journey.

- Years 11 and 12 - Year 11 and 12 syllabuses are subject specific and structured with a criterion and standards referenced focus. They contain a subject rationale; course aims, objectives and organisation; conceptual frameworks and possible subject matter; learning experiences and guidelines for assessment. Some information is provided about accountability mechanisms associated with Years 11 and 12, including work program specifications, the criteria and standards for the subject, requirements for verification and exit. These documents are part of a system that culminates in certification.

The issue of pedagogy in syllabus documents

The Draft Early Years Curriculum Guidelines are currently being trialled with a planned publishing date of 2006. The suite of KLA syllabuses is nearing completion, and the final syllabuses (Maths and English) will be published in 2004. As yet, none of the KLA syllabuses have been reviewed. The Year 11 and 12 syllabuses have a planned cycle of revision (either 4 or 6 years). Some of these syllabuses are currently being revised, but the majority of the revisions have been suspended.

In the short term, the opportunity has arisen for QSA to consider the possibilities for future syllabuses - their underpinning approaches, structure and processes for syllabus development. It is in this context that the role of advice regarding pedagogy in syllabuses is considered.

Concurrently, the discourse of pedagogy has ‘regained currency’ in state, national and international forums - in compulsory and post compulsory education, vocational education and training, and teacher pre-and-in service education. It is in this climate and probably because of this climate that an examination of pedagogical advice in syllabus documents is occurring. Inherent in these discussions, must be an exploration of the term, pedagogy.

Notions of pedagogy

Pedagogy and the ideas associated with the term mean varying things to stakeholders. The meaning has changed over time and continues to change as our understandings that surround it develop in complexity (Watkins & Mortimer, 1999: 1-3). Pedagogy has different cultural connotations and is produced and (re)shaped through a variety educational and societal discourses (Bernstein, 1996). Dominant forms of it are perpetuated and reinforce the hegemonic curriculum (Penny, 1999: 136).

Pedagogy is ‘a far more diffuse set of activities than what is most obviously recognised as the technique of imparting knowledge’ (Too, 1998: 8). It is not static and should never be, as it exists in the context of the time and place (Too & Livingstone et al, 1998; Gore, 1993: 3-4).
Pedagogy has been described as ‘any conscious activity by one person designed to enhance the learning in another’ (Watkins & Mortimer, 1999: 3), but this divorces the unconscious behaviours of the teacher and the interactions of the learner at the learning interface and does not acknowledge the reciprocal nature of pedagogy. Pedagogy is not always intentional. It is much more than the notion of the learner as a passive vessel to be filled by the knowledge of the teacher. It is a complex entity.

Pedagogy is not passive. The teacher is involved in an ‘active and interventionist role in the delivery of education’ (McLaughlin, 1987: 171). It is the teacher’s role ‘to motivate and promote their students’ learning’ (Watkins & Mortimer, 1999: 218). Lusted (1986: 2–3) considers pedagogy as both a concept and a process ‘through which knowledge is produced...How one teaches...becomes inseparable from what one is being taught and crucially, how one learns’. Therefore, any definition that defines the role of the teacher as passive or ignores the personality of the teacher does not provide a complete reference.

Pedagogy combines all that is teaching. It is the methodologies of practice, sometimes formally articulated, but most often appearing as happenstance approaches dictated by the knowledge, understandings, experience and personality of the teacher. As Fernandez-Balboa (1998: 127) affirms, ‘the personal is pedagogical, and the pedagogical is personal: the two are inseparable – what happens in one of those areas deeply affects the other’.

Pedagogy is affected, challenged and changed by the interactions with the learner. It is contextualised in the learning environment in which it occurs and is most times influenced by the discourses of the discipline area through which learning is being engaged. It is a product of the social context in which it exists. Johnson & Kress et al (2003) would argue that if a pedagogy is not a response to the social, economic, visual, cultural, ethical or other identifiable environments of the time it is not worthwhile. Johnson & Kress (2003: 12) would further suggest that ‘pedagogies of conformity, joined with curricula that do not engage with the representational world in its existing form cannot hope to foster innovation, creativity, and ease with change’.

Pedagogy is viewed, valued and promoted or dismissed from the ‘reading position’ of the stakeholders. Often the same pedagogy in the same context will receive differing evaluations of its effectiveness, success or worth.

It is the contention of the authors that a pedagogy need not lead to learning to be considered a pedagogy. Some theorists judge a pedagogy on its successes, but these are often value laden judgements from the perspectives of the theorists. A pedagogy may be judged successful if it achieves its goals (intentional or not). A base measure of pedagogical success should be its effectiveness in gaining, maintaining and promoting learning now and in the future or in different contexts and its inclusiveness in doing so.
Pedagogy carries with it a social responsibility, accompanied by moral inferences (van Manen, 1999: 14). However, van Manen (1999) only focuses on the interactions between adult and child, positioning the adult fully in the seat of pedagogical power. This hegemonic positioning of the pedagogic discourses of van Manen (1999) is not supported by the authors.

In some instances, a pedagogy may be promoted that has a sole focus of student control. Pedagogy will contain behaviour management strategies, but a behaviour management strategy should not be viewed as a default pedagogy. Copeland et al. (1994) acknowledges that inexperienced teachers will often separate behaviour management strategies from pedagogy, seeing the behaviour management strategy itself as a pedagogical solution.

Mortimer (1999) and Newmann et al (1996) see pedagogy as a synonym for teaching but not instruction. The exclusion of instruction is an ideological stance that isolates a practice that although not favoured still needs to be considered.

Pedagogy may also be considered as a political tool for the enculturation of students and others (Friere, 1977; Smyth, 1988). However, it is not always a political tool and the examples/methods provided by these authors only seem to provide part of the pedagogical story. Often the political ramifications of pedagogical practice are unintentional. The focus of these authors is the critical theories that underpin certain pedagogical approaches.

Hamilton and McWilliam (2001) also seek to divorce some of what is pedagogic in their definition focussing on student-centred learning and teaching to the exclusion of didactic methods. Again, this exclusion weakens the definition of pedagogy.

Building on previous discussions the authors propose that three levels of pedagogical understandings can be described, which deal with pedagogy from macro to micro interpretations, from broad, systems-wide overarching concepts to personal, context-driven approaches. These are:

1. pedagogy as a synonym for (all that is) teaching and instruction, including the interchangeability of the teacher/learner in the pedagogical process (e.g. the productive pedagogies could be considered to be this form);
2. pedagogy as an approach or lens (a political tool for the enculturation of students and others) through which the learner is engaged in learning (e.g. critical social theory, critical literacy, feminist theory, working technologically, inquiry approach)
3. pedagogy as interactions between the context (community, school, classroom, discipline etc) and the personality and knowledge of the teacher and learner.

For a fuller discussion see Thompson, J. 2003 [Doctoral thesis]
The difficulty with describing a view of pedagogy is that most often it straddles all levels and these operate simultaneously. Hence, to define pedagogy is in itself problematic. Perhaps the closest definition that reflects the thoughts of the authors is provided by MacNeill & Silcox (2003: 2), who summarise pedagogy as ‘reasoned, moral, human interaction, within a reflective, socio-political, educative context that facilitates the acquisition of new knowledge, beliefs or skills’.

Educational change - explicit and implicit pedagogical advice and teacher practice

Identified in the literature is a range of perspectives about pedagogy, its links to curriculum and assessment and the role it has in changing teacher practice. However, many of these are difficult to contextualise to the Queensland context, especially in senior secondary schooling. It is evident that constructs of overarching pedagogical paradigms and frameworks that cannot be readily transferred to teacher practice and disciplinary understandings are of little use. Munro (2003: 1) notes:

The majority of them (pedagogies/learning theories), however, are not teacher-friendly and are not easily contextualised in the world of the 21st century classrooms or even 20th century classrooms. As a result, they are not used to inform regular teaching.

The development of pedagogical advice, or for that matter the development of pedagogies, must consider the voices of the researchers and the teachers, but be conscious of the policy makers (Watkins & Mortimer, 1999: 8–15). The responsibility and the ability to achieve most long-term pedagogical change rest with teachers (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2003:13–15, 40-59). Substantive educational change is slow compared to policy change, which is subject to the whims of government. No matter what policies are operating, it needs to be recognised that pedagogy will ‘always (be) modified and interpreted to fit the local conditions and culture, thus maintaining local effects’ (Watkins & Mortimer, 1999: 15).

Further, if a preferred methodology is to be adopted then sufficient professional development and pre-service education is essential (Ramsey, 2003). Policy makers often fail to realise the necessity for these budget considerations.

It is important to note that a sound pedagogical approach can improve student outcomes. There is a further and equally strong body of research that suggests that student achievement can be additionally enhanced by the consistent and strategic use of specific teaching models (Joyce & Weil, 1996; Calhoun & Hopkins, 2002 in Hopkins, 2003).

Is the enactment of a pedagogical approach founded in sound theory better than those based only on intuitive teacher practice or experience? Have teachers kept pace with the demands of contemporary life and learning, adding to their repertoires of pedagogical methodologies?
Hopkins & Stern (1996) identify six characteristics of high quality teachers as commitment, love of children, the ability to collaborate with other teachers, mastery of subject didactics, a repertoire of multiple models of teaching, and a capacity for reflection. It could be argued that all of these are in fact pedagogical qualities according to the definitions provided earlier.

The argument is extended that curriculum cannot of itself be developed without understanding and knowledge of the teaching required to deliver it. As Hopkins insists:

Models of teaching simultaneously define the nature of content, the learning strategies, and the arrangements for social interaction that create the learning environments of students (Hopkins, 2003: 4).

The threat that is perceived by some educators is that their independence will be undermined in their curriculum delivery at the chalk-face if pedagogical practice is pre-determined and mandated. In the Queensland context, this appears to be the case more for the employing educational authorities and the school administrations than the teachers (Thompson, in press 2003). It also appears to be the case in learning areas or contexts where the curriculum is more defined and stipulated making teachers merely implementers rather than curriculum developers (Thompson, 2003).

Hill (2003) claims that it is not enough for teachers to have discipline or generalised pedagogical knowledge, or even a combination of the two if the teacher does not engage or reflect on the interaction of both. He supports the work and ideas regarding pedagogical content knowledge of Schulman (1986a, 1986b and 1987), Bransford, Brown & Cocking (2000), Turner-Bisset (2001: especially 1–19, 125–142) supporting the ongoing realignment and reassessing of teacher pedagogical practice by systems and more importantly teachers themselves. Hill (2003: 11) proposes that we need to ‘develop [ ] a set of principles and commentary that connects [ ] knowledge about leaning and teaching’.

Anstey (2003) acknowledges that pedagogy needs to be considered in curriculum planning and implementation, but that it has no power until it is implemented and critically reflected upon by the teacher, who is seeking to improve student learning through their own teaching practice. Turner-Bisset (2001: 83-4, 153-4) add that a pedagogy that does not consider and support assessment and assessment methods is a flawed pedagogy. This aligns with Bernstein’s (1996) three message systems of schooling – curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.

Where are teachers expected to get messages about pedagogy? How are teachers expected to incorporate these understandings in their practice? In what

---

3 Schulman [1986] asserts that pedagogical content knowledge is only part of the arsenal a teacher needs to employ to be an effective educator and Turner-Bisset [2001] believes that the teacher’s repertoire needs to be much larger (see Chapter 1: What is expert teaching?).
ways they expected to be self-reflective and self-critical of their practice? Where does advice about assessment linked with pedagogical advice occur?

Various governments and curriculum authorities have endeavoured to provide pedagogical advice as part of a platform for educational reform. National and state perspectives have informed the level of advice included within Queensland syllabuses.

National Perspective
In the early 90’s, the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CURASS) of the Australian Education Council developed a paper on pedagogy that would ‘outline agreed pedagogical principles and establish the place of pedagogy in the national statements and profiles.’ (CURASS, 1994: 28).

The committee at its last meeting in June 1993 discussed the final draft of the paper. Although it was not formally endorsed, CURASS agreed that the KLA statements and profiles was not the place to articulate specific pedagogical advice, stating that, ‘there will be no direct or explicit discussion of pedagogy or preferred approaches to teaching (and) outcomes and pointers in profiles will not offer advice about pedagogy except by implication.’ (CURASS, 1994: 29) The committee proposed that the pedagogical advice should be determined by the states, and more importantly by teachers in the contexts of their classrooms and students’ needs. CURASS identified common ‘Principles of pedagogy’ (see appendix 1), and suggested that these could be used by ‘teachers (to) evaluate their own practice (and as the) basis for professional development programs and for programs of school review.’ (CURASS, 1994: 29) At the macro level, it was considered important to outline some pedagogical advice for both systems and teachers. It was also acknowledged that it was difficult to divorce pedagogy from curriculum and that some pedagogy would be implicit in the outcomes and pointers.

Although, it is almost a decade since these principles were articulated it seems that little pedagogical change has occurred. The Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher education in its recent discussion paper: Young People, Schools and Innovation: towards an action plan for the school sector, supports the need for pedagogical advice to be more explicit. The paper identifies ‘strategies for equipping teachers with the knowledge and skills to create an innovative learning culture amongst their students’ by examining ‘pre-service and in-service programs on the development of teachers’ pedagogic practices’. The paper espouses that the types of thinking (including student dispositions) and ways in which we wish cognitive processes to be developed and delivered ‘need to be made explicit (for example in curriculum designs and modules, pedagogical practice, professional development programs and teacher education). Existing approaches need to be re-evaluated and renewed.’ (2003: 16).

Queensland Context
In 1997, Education Queensland commissioned The University of Queensland to review pedagogical practice in state schools. The research findings were
published as the Queensland School Reform: Longitudinal Study (2001). The focus of the study was how student learning, both social and academic, could be enhanced. The research built on the foundations of the work of Newmann et al. (1996) work on authentic pedagogy and achievement. The recommendations of the study regarding pedagogy have become known collectively as ‘productive pedagogies’. However, many of the recommendations concerned the infrastructures needed to support/facilitate the adoption of the productive pedagogies as practice in schools.

Many syllabus documents, especially those with a practical orientation, have been written with the ideologies of ‘authentic pedagogies’. As Education Queensland is a major stakeholder in the syllabus development processes of the QSA, the systemic initiative of the productive pedagogies is a real issue for consideration in future syllabus frameworks.

Aligned with the production and support for implementation of syllabuses by the Queensland Studies Authority is an expectation that the teaching and learning process will be refined and improved. QSA provides some professional development around the implementation of syllabuses, but the primary responsibility for professional development lives with schooling authority.

What advice on pedagogy already exists in Queensland syllabuses?
Current syllabus documents contain explicit and implicit messages regarding pedagogy. An analysis of syllabuses has identified the ways in which messages about pedagogy, knowledge, practices and dispositions and assessment are presented. The next section will present an analysis of some of the syllabuses in three key learning areas – Health and Physical Education, Studies of Society and Environment and Technology.

Health and Physical Education
The focus for this section will be the senior syllabus documents. In Queensland there are 3 senior subjects dealing with health and physical education. Each has recently undergone revision:

- Physical Education (in press, 2004 release)
- Health Education (in press, 2004 release)
  - Both of these subjects contribute towards certification and tertiary entrance.
- Physical Recreation
  - This subject is more practically orientated and can have vocational education embedded. Students may achieve certificate 2 outcomes. This subject contributes to certification.

These subjects have different focuses and the conceptual frameworks that underpin each are distinctly different.

Health Education
Health Education focuses on the student developing the skills, knowledges and dispositions to be an active promoter of equitable health outcomes. This is
achieved through a socially critical view articulated through a social view of health that uses The Ottawa Charter ideals for health promotion developed through an inquiry approach.

Teachers are also provided with pedagogical advice about the climate of their classrooms that would be conducive to the delivery of this subject.

Learning experience should be presented in a supportive environment where students are encouraged to learn:

- without fear of retribution
- where academic risk taking is supported through the scaffolding of thinking skills
- where open communication is encouraged
- by defining their own directions and setting goals for themselves
- through intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. (19)

Content is not stipulated but is developed through the development and exploration of health issues identified as important by the students.

Physical Education

Physical Education wants students to be intelligent performers achieving this through integrated and personalised studies. This message is conveyed through the articulation of pedagogy and the manner in which the subject matter and processes for learning and assessment are described.

In Physical Education, at the macro level of definition, there is much pedagogical advice provided for example the overarching pedagogical approach akin to the ideologies of authentic pedagogies of Newmann et al (1996). The document further provides a barrage of ‘mini’ pedagogical strategies to help direct the teacher to achieve the course objectives for the learners in particular ways. The physical activity is the medium for all learning and assessment; this involves integrating the subject matter through the physical activity under study and assessing it in real and relevant contexts. Personalisation of subject matter continues this trend where students are given ‘opportunities to acquire, apply, evaluate and appreciate’ (1) through the provision of learning experiences that relate to their personal experiences….(enabling) students to make meaning of complex understandings by providing connections with real-life contexts’ (4). Coinciding with this advice on teacher practice are the goals stated in the rational that want the students have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to become ‘self-directed, interdependent and independent learners’ (4).

Further, in the rationale it suggests the ideology of the student becoming an intelligent performer and this being achieved by the students being ‘not only (…) performers but also (…) analysts, planners and critics in, about and through physical activity (1)’. It further tells teachers that learning experiences must encompass all learning styles. There is information on Arnold’s (1985) concepts

---

4 These are the general objectives and the criteria for the course of study.
on which the syllabus is based and some pointers to Marzano (2001) and his ideas about self-system, metacognitive and cognitive systems and the interactions these have with the development of knowledge and physical performance.

Content information is not expressed as facts to be learnt but as questions to be solved. This investigative approach is merged with authentic pedagogy practice, Arnold’s (1985) ‘in, through and about’, personalisation and integration, concepts that cover the three levels as previously identified. Teachers select material, ideas and approaches that can be contextualised to the student and school context, and the abilities and knowledge of the teacher.

Physical Recreation
Physical Recreation wants students to experience the challenge and fun of active participation in physical activity, while developing the life skills necessary to and beneficial for living.

The pedagogical focus for this subject is inherently simple – students will explore the challenges and fun of physical activity through the medium of physical activity. The students engage in the physical activity in ‘real’ contexts and learn by doing.

The teacher and the students decide upon the content associated with each physical activity. It is developed by the context in which the physical activity will be delivered. It is not stipulated but expressed as four topics with ‘doing’ statements:

1. recreation, you and the community - examining the effects of recreation on individuals and communities
2. physical activity and healthy lifestyle – investigating the role of physical activity in maintaining good health
3. safety, risk awareness and health concerns – evaluating strategies to promote health and safety
4. interpersonal and group dynamics – investigating personal and interpersonal skills to achieve goals (16 – 17)

There is evidence of strong pedagogical advice in each of these syllabus documents. The degree of this advice appears to be in direct relationship to the complexity of the expected pedagogic approach.

Pedagogical practice as encouraged by certification processes in senior secondary schooling
To hold with the authors’ opinion that pedagogy for learning must encompass assessment, it is important when considering senior secondary subjects to examine the effects of moderation on pedagogical practice. The moderation system is concerned with both quality control and accountability that ‘enforces’ some teacher self-reflection of practice. The espoused pedagogies are implicit in the assessment regime. It is a top down model, utilising moderation by peers in

---

5 It is interesting to note though that student work that does not demonstrate ‘favoured’ pedagogical approaches may still match the criteria and standards.
the process. The important stages in this process and the implications for pedagogical practice are:

1. The review and development of syllabus documents with stakeholder input and practicing teachers being the main writers - During this phase advice on pedagogical practice is sought from a range of stakeholders. Current theories of learning in particular areas of study are examined. After evaluation, the some of these are included in the syllabus. The ramification of these inclusions is then traced through the writing of the document in the rationale, the course organisation, the learning experiences, the subject matter advice and the assessment sections.

2. The implementation of the ‘new’ syllabus with professional development support from staff of QSA – This is the first stage of ongoing professional development that is offered by the QSA. Although the focus of these workshops is work program writing and assessment and moderation issues the links with pedagogical advice is implicit. Advice about the ways in which you assess cannot be divorced from messages about learning and consequently pedagogical practice.

3. The writing of work programs for each school by teachers to suit the context of the particular school environment - the teacher is required to interpret the messages of the syllabus and to write a program that demonstrates these understandings.

4. The accreditation of work programs by panels of peers - a work program is accredited if it meets the requirements of the syllabus, including the messages about pedagogy.

5. The monitoring of student work by panels of peers at the end of year 11, with advice for improvement sent back to the schools - the view in this meeting is providing schools with advice about how to improve and includes assessment advice, often couched in the language of pedagogy. It is based on portfolios of student evidence.

6. The verification of student results by panels of peers towards the end of year 12 - this is a similar process to monitoring but provides confirmation of student achievement. The feedback to schools often forces a change in pedagogical practice if the schools are making inaccurate judgements about standards. It is at this juncture where it is sometimes evident that changes in pedagogical practice could have improved student outcomes.

7. The sampling of work from across the state by a panel of peers to maintain consistency of decisions across the state - during this sampling process examples of best practice or new ideas or approaches are identified. These are often used in the professional development cycle.

8. The negotiation with schools where agreement couldn’t be reached with panels - during these discussions pedagogical advice is often given, but expressed in terms of the evidence provided in the student folios.

9. The approval of work by panels of peers.

Throughout this time there are also professional development opportunities for schools where advice can be sought on a range of pedagogical matters, but mostly focused on assessment issues. These include; school visits by staff of QSA,
panel training, syllabus workshops, implementation workshops, assessment and moderation workshops, teacher meetings and Heads of Department meetings.

Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE)
One of the most scrutinised and debated Key Learning Areas in Queensland has been and continues to be Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE). This section will not concentrate on the source of much of this debate - the content described in outcomes or general objectives - what students should learn in history or SOSE or social science subjects generally. It will, however, focus on an area worthy of equal attention - the pedagogical underpinnings of the syllabuses in this area. It is also important to note in this discussion that the relationship between the ‘content’ and the pedagogy is extremely close, thus making it difficult to filter out what may be regarded solely as pedagogical issues.

The syllabus documents that will be examined in this section are the Studies of Society and Environment Years 1 to 10 Syllabus (2000) - a Key Learning Area syllabus - and the Ancient and Modern History Senior Trial-Pilot Syllabuses (2001) - Senior subject syllabuses. This discussion will treat these documents as two categories and attempt to highlight some similarities and differences in the way each category of syllabus articulates explicit and implicit pedagogical advice.

The definitions of pedagogy discussed earlier in this paper and based on Hamilton and McWilliam (2001) are evident in both categories of syllabuses at varying levels. The syllabuses contain details of how to teach the curriculum developed from their frameworks, they contain a political or ideological orientation that blends both the subject matter, and values and dispositions learning ‘outcomes’, and position themselves as student centred.

Years 1 to 10 Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE) Syllabus
The Studies of Society and Environment syllabus is reflective of the continuing discussions around ‘curriculum orientations’ that describe and define the ideological approaches to curriculum, and by implication, pedagogy and assessment. The notions of particular orientations put forward by Kemmis, Cole and Sugget (1987), which identify three orientations as vocational neo-classical, liberal progressive and socially critical has been simplified by Hoepper and Land (Gilbert, 1996: 85). They suggest conservative, liberal and critical as the three orientations. The explanation given of the orientations at first appear to present the notion of curriculum distinct from pedagogy, but a more considered examination reveals some very explicit messages about pedagogy that highlight the role of the teacher in enacting a certain curriculum perspective. The summation of each orientation is as follows:

- ‘Conservative’ classrooms are characterised by the undisputed authority of the teacher, the relative passivity of the students, and the unproblematic transmission of authorised knowledge;
- ‘Liberal’ classrooms are characterised by the teacher’s role as leader and facilitator, active inquiry by students, and an emphasis on understanding the reasons for social phenomena;
• ‘Critical’ classrooms are characterised by more democratic relations between teachers and students, by high levels of collaboration, and by learning that involves ideological critique.

The SOSE syllabus promotes a critical orientation and like the National Statement and Curriculum Profile for Studies of Society and Environment (Australian Education Council, 1994) on which the syllabus is based, there is implicit acknowledgement of the three orientations. However the brief of the Queensland document was to focus on student learning rather than detailing how a teacher should enact a particular curriculum orientation, and this has shaped how pedagogical advice appears or is implied in the syllabus.

The content and structure of the Queensland SOSE Syllabus reflects an implicit ‘critical pedagogy’. The nature of the key learning area discussed in the rationale through key values, processes and concepts certainly signals that a conservative or traditional pedagogy is not intended by the syllabus. The description of the processes of social and environmental inquiries as ‘the essence of Studies of Society and Environment’ (QSCC, 2000: 3) and further exploration of the concepts associated with social and environmental inquiries in the concepts subsection place a heavy emphasis on the student participating in a critical process rather than being a passive receiver of information. This, in turn, points to a particular pedagogical framework.

To establish greater clarity in defining the particular framework implied in the SOSE syllabus, it is useful to consider the view put forward by Gilbert at the recent Social Educators Association of Australia Conference (SEAA, 2003). Gilbert has had a long involvement in the SOSE Key Learning Area and has worked on the National Profile and Statement as well as the Queensland SOSE Design Brief. While his paper continues the debate about curriculum orientations, his views have a certain resonance with the way SOSE in Queensland has evolved and the nature of pedagogy expressed in the syllabus. Gilbert acknowledges the work of Cope and Kalantzis in identifying the spectrum of approaches in curriculum from the ‘traditional to the progressivist’ (Coe, 1986; Cope and Kalantzis, 1990) and suggests ‘a third way’ which he calls an ‘entitlement approach to curriculum’. Entitlement curriculum is defined as students being ‘entitled to be provided with the concepts, processes and skills associated with contemporary institutions and practices, and required for effective participation in society, but students are also entitled to apply these learnings in ways which respect their cultural origins and their personal desires and commitments.’ (Gilbert, 2003: 7) This approach should be developed through ‘authentic pedagogy as close as possible to real social situations’ and that ‘for such learning to be authentic and useful, it must be applied in a collaborative context where decision-making and action skills are developed.’ (Gilbert, 2003: 8) The approach can be summarised as seeking mastery of contemporary (traditional) knowledge but not prescribing unchanging absolutes, and promoting critical assessment of knowledge and active participation in learning.
The Queensland SOSE Syllabus through both its design and the political nature of its development embraces this balance between traditional and progressivist, and conservative, liberal and critical. The design of the syllabus framed by an outcomes approach is, as Willis and Kissane (1997) suggest, influential in shaping a pervading pedagogical alignment. This syllabus, by articulating the key processes of social and environmental inquiries - investigating, creating, communicating, participating and reflecting - espouses a pedagogy which is fundamentally critical in its orientation. To balance this critical approach the syllabus also represents the ‘core’ of what students should know and do in the compulsory years of schooling, and in this respect it details core knowledge. This core knowledge comes from the perspective of the mainstream - students will have the opportunity to develop understandings about Federation, Anzac day, Prime Ministers, primary industries, the legal system and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, to name a few.

To return to the issue of pedagogical advice, the SOSE syllabus rarely refers to teachers. The most substantial pedagogical advice, besides the implications present in the various categories of learning outcomes, is in the Understanding about learners and learning section of the document. Clear though broad pedagogical advice is contained when describing learner-centred approaches in which ‘learning is viewed as an active construction of meaning and teaching as an act of guiding and facilitating learning.’ Examples are given in a list including ‘socio-cultural, socially-critical and metacognitive approaches.’ (QSCC, 2000: 8) The syllabus then states that SOSE promotes learner-centredness through ‘the problem solving and decision-making techniques of various traditions of inquiry.’ (QSCC, 2000: 8) This advice, coupled with the outcomes framework presents some clear signals about pedagogy. However, detailed advice is left to the curriculum support materials - the Sourcebook Guidelines and Initial Inservice Materials, and some modelling of pedagogy is contained in the Sourcebook Modules.

The experience of Queensland teachers implementing the SOSE syllabus has highlighted several issues, many related to adopting an outcomes approach, others related to nature of the schooling authorities’ support for the syllabus implementation, and others significant to this discussion, related to the change in pedagogical approach required to implement the syllabus. While the balance between core knowledge and a critical inquiry approach is generally accepted and understood, many teachers find adopting new pedagogy or modifying existing pedagogy a challenge. Not because they reject the notion of pedagogy as framed earlier by the three levels via Hamilton and McWilliam (2001) but because the syllabus and its supporting documents imply the pedagogy rather than stating it as part of the fabric of the new curriculum. This is partly due to the nature of professional development provided around an Outcomes Approach, which has often tried to ‘cushion the change’ rather than celebrate an evolution of pedagogical practice that began by placing the notion of critical inquiry as a centrepiece of the studying societies and environments. Another reason has been the emphasis of syllabus development authorities, past and present, to promote
syllabuses as frameworks that describe student learning, and focussing on planning for student learning, but failing to highlight the pedagogical understandings that run parallel with learning outcomes.

Ancient History and Modern History Senior Trial-Pilot Syllabuses
The Ancient and Modern History Senior Trial-Pilot Syllabuses (2002) are currently in the final stages of the trial-pilot process. These syllabus documents are structured in the criteria and standards-referenced framework of Queensland Year 11 and 12 syllabuses and contribute towards certification and tertiary entrance. There are many similarities in the pedagogical underpinnings of these documents to the SOSE syllabus, particularly the centrality of the inquiry process. The Histories have moved significantly from the 1995 syllabuses by adopting a thematic approach to content knowledge rather than presenting options linked to certain time periods, locations or historical phenomena (eg. Imperialism). Examples of the themes include Studies of conflict, Studies of power and The individual in history. While using such themes does not preclude the content of previous courses they do represent a broadening of scope to a wider conceptual level. The syllabuses, like the SOSE syllabus, rarely mention teachers, however the rationale of the document clearly expresses the pedagogical emphasis to be placed on a course developed from the syllabus. There is a clear focus on critical inquiry, and the definition of history supplied puts the learner at the centre of learning in the discipline and promotes the use of multiple perspectives to construct historical meanings. This approach to history could be best classified as ‘deconstructionist’, in that it starts in the present and with the learner, it includes a variety of perspectives to look at discourses and it seeks to open up questions and issues that are ignored or excluded by other approaches (Hoepper and Vick, 1996: 238 - 239).

The section of the syllabus that is of particular interest in an analysis of pedagogical underpinnings is the Learning experiences section. This section begins with a concession to more traditional approaches to pedagogy by stating that ‘there is an important place for expository teaching and text-based teaching and learning’ but then proceeds to state that ‘the main approach to learning is through student inquiry.’ (QBSSSS, 2001: 18). These statements imply the balances of curriculum and pedagogical approaches as highlighted in the SOSE syllabus, but provide a greater acknowledgement of more traditional pedagogy. Later in this section a great deal of detailed but implied pedagogical advice appears in the sub-section Developing student abilities in historical understandings and processes. This part of the syllabus is an innovation in Year 11 and 12 syllabus documents and is in the form of a student narrative describing the progress and demands of student learning through the two year course at three junctures - ‘early on, moving right along and well down the track’. The descriptions, in student voice, make many references to the teacher and reveal a definite pedagogy, which could be best called ‘the sage by the side’ – a critical pedagogy with elements of traditional and progressivist curriculum approaches.

The focus on inquiry is further developed in the Themes and inquiry topics section of the syllabuses where structure of student inquiry from the Learning experiences
section is infused in the descriptions of each theme. Sample inquiry topics and sample focus questions are structured under each aspect of student inquiry. The message is very clear – the pedagogical approach adopted must facilitate learning that focuses on student inquiry.

On the whole there is greater clarity of the pedagogical requirements in the Histories than in the SOSE key learning area syllabus, although the level of specific pedagogical advice is comparable. The evaluation progress reports (seven reports at various stages of the trial-pilot process completed for each syllabus) for both the Ancient and Modern History Senior Trial-Pilot Syllabuses indicate that teachers, administrators and students understand that a certain broad pedagogy is required and in some instances that this is a new pedagogy. A telling comment from the latest Modern History report was ‘Teaching using the inquiry process is a difficulty. Getting the balance between ‘chalk and talk’ and student centred inquiry is a challenge.’ (Crabb, 2003: 24).

The evaluation reports for the histories also provide a valuable summary of how teachers feel about syllabuses containing pedagogical advice and what support is needed for developing pedagogical understandings and practices. On the whole these reports support the syllabus containing pedagogical advice but there are comments seeking greater clarity in the articulation of the requirements for teachers. There seems to be an acceptance of both the explicit detail of pedagogy and the implicit pedagogical underpinnings in the syllabuses. The main issue is the support for developing pedagogical understandings and proficiency. This is evident by the frequent mention of needs for professional development around teaching using student centred inquiry and this suggests an issue wider than what is contained in syllabus documents but still relevant to the syllabus development authority.

Some conclusions regarding Studies of Society and Environment Teachers of social sciences in Queensland, whether drawing on the experiences of the Years 1 to 10 SOSE Key Learning Area syllabus or Year 11 and 12 Subject syllabuses, seem to be comfortable with pedagogical advice in syllabuses. Two main conclusions can be drawn. First, given the professional demands and the rapid changes occurring in all sectors of school education, the explicit expression of what to do and how to do it may be viewed favourably by many. This approach has some risks and inherent issues but making the implicit more explicit and, adding clarity can only improve the quality of syllabus documents. The second conclusion is that implementation of syllabuses and the changes in pedagogy that are expected with implementation can only be achieved through appropriate and sustained professional development, and this must be an issue for consideration in the syllabus development process and any future redesign of syllabuses.

Technology
The Technology Years 1 to 10 Syllabus was published in July 2003 and was recently distributed to Queensland schools. As a new learning area, the syllabus has no predecessor in Queensland primary schools. It is expected that the majority of
primary teachers will integrate Technology learning outcomes with learning outcomes from other KLAs. In secondary schools the syllabus is likely to be adopted by teachers of agriculture, business, home economics, industrial technology and design and information and communication technology. Given this context, many Queensland teachers will need to develop new understandings about the Technology KLA and pedagogical practices that support learning in this area.

Technology education has evolved from the industrial arts learning area. An area typically considered to provide opportunities for some students - those who were interested in pursuing trade or vocational pathways. It focussed on students developing technical skills - all students constructing the same project following a plan and set procedures. The teacher adopted the role of expert – a person with sophisticated technical skills.

In recent years, the area has evolved to be part of the core and common curriculum – a learning area for all students in years 1 to 10. Technology education is now considered to be ‘a fundamental curriculum for all students, regardless of learning levels, career choices, or life aspirations’ (www.techedlab.com/define, 2001)

The pedagogical shift in technology education can be identified in the syllabus rationale. Students are challenged to respond to design challenges by working technologically. Students:

- design and develop products in response to needs, wants or opportunities
- apply technology practice and use information, materials and systems
- consider appropriateness, contexts and management as they initiate, design, use, modify, and reflect on products of technology. (QSA, 2003, 2)

Technology practice consists of four key concepts – investigation, ideation, production and evaluation. Advising teachers to incorporate Technology Practice and the outcomes of this strand into their planning encourages teachers to provide opportunities for students to work technologically and therefore suggests a preferred pedagogical approach.

This description of technology education suggests that all students may create a different response to a design challenge or brief, using plans and procedures that they have developed themselves or collaboratively with others.

Therefore, there is evidence that the rationale espouses the first two notions of pedagogy discussed earlier – pedagogy as a synonym for all that is teaching and as a lens through which the learner is engaged. In particular the rationale frames a critical lens for viewing the practices and products of technology.

To respond to this curriculum evolution, teachers may need to adopt new or modify existing learning, teaching and assessment approaches that reflect the change. Although technology curriculum has evolved significantly in recent years, change in teacher practice has not always been as significant.
The Technology Years 1 to 10 Syllabus provides both implicit and explicit pedagogical messages in the rationale, outcomes and assessment sections. The way pedagogical messages are articulated throughout the syllabus varies across these sections. Although the syllabus has not yet been widely implemented in Queensland schools, it is useful to consider:

- How effectively does the syllabus encourage teachers to develop understandings about pedagogies that support learning in the Technology KLA?
- How explicit are the messages are about the role of students and the role of teachers in the teaching learning process?

In adopting an outcomes approach for KLA syllabuses, the syllabus writers endeavoured to keep the focus of the syllabus on learners. This strategy was a conscious attempt to shift teacher practice from an inputs model to an outcomes model and promote the learner-centred approach.

It is interesting to consider how the syllabus positions students/learners and teachers in each of the sections of the syllabus. Identifying the references to each in the text can assist in determining the implicit and explicit messages for teachers. This language identification assists in understanding how teachers may or may not be encouraged to engage with the discourses of pedagogy in the syllabus. The results of a word search are provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus word</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this analysis, it could be inferred that students or learners rather than teachers are the focus in the rationale and outcomes sections. As learning is an active partnership between students and teachers, does the text give sufficient attention to the equilibrium required in the teacher student partnership? Are teachers considered the silent partners?

Of interest is the increased occurrence of ‘teachers’ in the assessment section. In relation to Bernstein’s (1996) three message systems of schooling, the syllabus seems to be imbalanced in the level of advice it provides for teachers.

It could be argued that if a syllabus is primarily a document for teachers, one could assume that the role of the teacher is foremost for the reader. The absence of ‘teachers’ from the text in rationale and outcomes may of itself indicate the pedagogical approaches that promote learning in an outcomes approach that is learner-centred approaches. However, it is the author’s opinion that this marginalises the role of teachers in the learning process.
The following are examples from the rationale, where it could be considered that teachers are required to infer their role from an explicit description of what it is that students would be doing within a learning context.

Students consider many perspectives before making judgments about the appropriateness of design ideas, processes and products, (and) the possible impacts of these on users or environments (QSA, 2003: 2).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that when planning programs and units of work that the majority of teachers rely on the outcomes section of the syllabus, referring only occasionally, if at all to the rationale. Some guidance for planning is provided in the outcomes section, ‘...teachers should consider ways of associating outcomes from the Technology Practice strand with outcomes in one or more of the other strands’ (QSA, 2003: 14).

Syllabus documents that hint at pedagogy require teachers to work too hard to identify what the text means to them, and for their role. Implicit messages may fail to engage teachers in considering or reflecting on the demand the syllabus places on them. If teachers must infer how to carry out their work, rather than engage with explicit pedagogical messages, the clarity of intent and therefore the potential of the syllabus to effect change in teacher practice may not be realised.

Some conclusions regarding Technology
To effectively implement the Years 1 to 10 Technology syllabus teachers must identify the implicit messages and infer, What does the syllabus demand of me? With a reduction in the professional development activities provided by systems in recent years, teachers have had few opportunities to engage in professional development or professional discussions related to technology education – reducing the likelihood that teachers will identify implicit messages and enact the curriculum in the way in which it was intended.

As the Years 1 to 10 Technology Syllabus is a new syllabus, further research about how the syllabus encourages teachers to engage in pedagogical change is worthy.

Conclusions across the key learning areas
The following conclusions represent the common observations regarding QSA syllabuses and the syllabuses specifically within the case studies. These conclusions may inform future developments in QSA syllabuses. It should be noted that differing levels of pedagogical advice already exist in Queensland syllabuses.

Is there evidence of pedagogical advice in Queensland syllabuses?
Each of the syllabuses examined in the case studies contain some pedagogical advice. The level of advice varies in depth and scope. Even though previous statutory authorities with the view that schooling authorities and schools were
primarily responsible for pedagogy developed the syllabuses, examples of both implicit and explicit advice can be found in these documents.

Do teachers want pedagogical advice included in syllabuses? External evaluation reports and anecdotal evidence suggest that teachers would like advice about pedagogy included in syllabuses. These findings are supported by the results of a recent survey of teachers using both Years 1 to 10 and Years 11 and 12 syllabus documents. The survey results indicated that 89.2% of teachers felt it was necessary to include advice on pedagogy in syllabus documents. The majority of those who did not support this view commented that no matter how much advice was articulated in syllabuses it would not (by itself) effect change in teacher practice.

Teachers responded that the rationale and the learning experience sections of a syllabus were the two most favoured places for inclusion of pedagogical advice, while the assessment section was also noted as a suitable section to include advice.

What pedagogical advice do teachers want included in syllabuses? In the aforementioned survey 66% of respondents stated that pedagogy should be comprehensive, overt and explicit in syllabuses. Another 6% indicated that pedagogical advice should be limited, but overt and explicit. 91.8% of respondents thought that pointers should be provided in the syllabus for any pedagogical approach that underpins the syllabus or particular areas of the syllabus.

Although this paper has explored some of the territory in relation to the inclusion of pedagogical advice in syllabuses, to determine the exact nature of pedagogical advice in future syllabuses further research and debate should be undertaken. However, this paper suggests that syllabuses should provide comprehensive pedagogical advice. Syllabuses should offer insights into the ‘how’ of pedagogical practices that are specific or favoured in certain contexts or study areas. Teachers should not have to decode the pedagogical messages in syllabuses.

Can syllabuses be helpful in the empowerment of teachers to construct, support and push forward learning for themselves and students? Reflecting on the description offered on pedagogical understandings earlier in this paper – pedagogy as a synonym for all that is teaching, pedagogy as a lens for learning and pedagogy as the interactions between teacher and learner, the following comments can be made:

- explicit pedagogical guidance can be effectively offered at an overarching level and as a lens for learning
- at a micro level, syllabuses should suggest that teachers utilise a repertoire of pedagogical practices rather than mandate specific practices
- advice about teacher/learner interactions should be determined by local contexts and are not considered to be the role of a syllabus
- the syllabus should not be the only source of pedagogical advice
ongoing professional development and dialogue is necessary to effect substantial and sustained change in pedagogical practice.

overarching pedagogical frameworks in syllabuses although useful need to be supported by assessment regimes, schooling authorities and school structures to be successfully implemented.

Advice about learning, pedagogy and assessment should be more explicit in future syllabuses if Queensland teachers are to understand the demands that syllabuses place on them in terms of providing quality learning for students. The authors suggest that all of these elements already exist in syllabus documents and that the identification of appropriate pedagogical advice in syllabuses for the enactment of curriculum is not only justifiable but also preferable.
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Appendix 1


Principles of pedagogy

It is the responsibility of the States and Territories and schools to develop programs of study and the professional responsibility of teachers to use an appropriate range of teaching and learning approaches. Teachers and schools will approach the task of teaching in a variety of ways. Teaching will be subject to variables such as differences in student populations and backgrounds, experience in the learning area, abilities, external course requirements, teaching philosophies and teacher personalities. Diversity of approaches is both inevitable and desirable.

There are also, however, general principles of pedagogy on which there is widespread agreement within the educational community, and which are reflected in curriculum policy documents developed by States and Territories. The principles suggest that no one approach is sufficient and that there are criteria by which teachers can evaluate their own practice. These principles might be useful as a basis for professional development programs and for programs of school review.

The national statements and profiles are based on the assumption that teachers will:

• use a range of teaching approaches appropriate to different subject matter

• use a range of teaching approaches appropriate to differences among students by acknowledging culture and background, race and ethnicity, and gender

• use approaches appropriate to the range of student learning styles

• design learning experiences that take account of student knowledge, experience and interests

• recognise the central role played by language in learning by focusing on language in all learning areas and by providing opportunities for students to communicate about the knowledge and skills which are the purpose of learning

• assist students in developing their own understanding of the world by discussing and challenging their ideas and by introducing them to new ideas

• enable students to use knowledge and skills to deal with unfamiliar situations and problems
• encourage challenge and risk-taking as means to improved understanding

• ensure that students use activity and practical application as a basis for theoretical learning and understand the conceptual basis of knowledge and skills

• relate knowledge from each area of learning to its social context and to other learning areas

• relate learning to the world of work

• use technological resources to broaden learning possibilities

• establish and maintain supportive learning contexts

• make the expected outcomes of learning explicit to students

• use a range of assessment methods appropriate to the variety of valued learning outcomes

• provide regular feedback to students about their progress towards outcomes.
Appendix 2

Form by the Queensland Studies Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Pedagogy and syllabus documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form title</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Where do you gain information and understandings about pedagogy?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Do you think that syllabuses should contain advice on pedagogy?

☐ YES ☐ NO

3. Is there already enough advice?

☐ YES ☐ NO

4. If not in syllabus documents where should teachers obtain pedagogical advice?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. Do you think advice on pedagogy in syllabus documents should be: [circle your choice]

*Comprehensive or limited*

*Overt or covert*

*Explicit or implicit*
6. Where in syllabus documents should pedagogical advice be placed? [list in order of importance from 1 – 5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>throughout</th>
<th>rationale</th>
<th>learning experiences</th>
<th>assessment</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. What sort of pedagogical advice is missing from the current syllabus?

8. Who should be responsible for identifying the type of pedagogy that should be advanced in syllabus documents? [list in order of importance from 1 – 6]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>all teachers</th>
<th>schooling authorities[eg Ed. Qld.]</th>
<th>academics</th>
<th>QSA</th>
<th>syllabus writers</th>
<th>leading teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. This should be achieved by: [list in order of importance from 1 – 6]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evaluating current practice</th>
<th>mapping of leading practice</th>
<th>research</th>
<th>consensus of practicing teacher opinion</th>
<th>new academic findings</th>
<th>consultation with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Should syllabuses contain advice about: [tick the one you choose]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>one overarching pedagogical practice</th>
<th>all favoured pedagogies in the context of the learning area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Thank you for making these comments. Please return the FORM to:

Jeff Thompson, Key Learning Area Officer, Syllabus Services Branch