

The accreditation period for VCE Classical Studies has been extended and expires 31 December 2024.

# VCE Classical Studies

## 2019–2024

### Written examination – End of year

#### Assessment criteria

Section B will be assessed against the following criteria:

- knowledge of the classical works and their relationships with their sociohistorical contexts
- analysis of the ideas and the techniques used to express these ideas in the classical works
- comparison and evaluation of the ideas and techniques used in the classical works
- construction of an argument based on relevant evidence

#### Expected qualities for the mark range – Section B

Mark(s)	Expected qualities
18–20	<p>Demonstrates a thorough, detailed knowledge of the classical works and all relevant sociohistorical material</p> <p>Selects the best/most appropriate material for the specific question to use as evidence</p> <p>Provides exceptional analysis of ideas and the techniques used to express these ideas based on a sophisticated understanding of classical ideas and techniques, and conveys an understanding of the classical world</p> <p>Provides a sophisticated comparison of the techniques used in both works</p> <p>Presents a sophisticated evaluation of how the techniques are used in the works</p> <p>A clear, convincing and completely supported position is taken on the question</p> <p>All evidence presented is relevant, accurate and used effectively</p> <p>Sustained and focused argument throughout</p>
15–17	<p>Demonstrates a detailed knowledge of the works and sociohistorical material, not all of which may be relevant</p> <p>Provides a convincing analysis of the ideas and techniques used to express the ideas of classical works, although at times the analysis may not be fully sustained</p> <p>A thorough comparison of the ideas and techniques in the works is provided, and demonstrates an understanding of the different viewpoints</p> <p>Presents an evaluation that may not be sustained</p> <p>A substantiated position is taken on the question</p> <p>Usually selects the most appropriate material to use as evidence, and most of the evidence is relevant and accurate</p> <p>The argument is generally sustained</p>

CLASSICAL STUDIES (CRITERIA AND QUALITIES)

Mark(s)	Expected qualities
12–14	<p>Demonstrates a good, although not always detailed, knowledge of the works and their sociohistorical contexts, not all of which may be relevant</p> <p>Demonstrates a good understanding of the main ideas and techniques used to express the ideas of the classical works</p> <p>Attempts, but may not be able to sustain, an analysis</p> <p>Some comparison of the ideas and techniques used, with an attempt at an evaluation</p> <p>A good argument is presented and is supported by relevant evidence</p> <p>May select material that is not always relevant as evidence</p> <p>The argument is consistent but may be lacking complexity and is inconclusive</p>
9–11	<p>Demonstrates a sound general knowledge of the works</p> <p>Some inaccuracies and knowledge of the main features of the sociohistorical contexts, not all of which may be relevant</p> <p>Attempts to analyse ideas and techniques but this is mostly narration</p> <p>Some simplistic reference to the better-known classical ideas</p> <p>Some comparison of the ideas and the techniques used to express these ideas, although this may not be sustained and may be mainly a description of the techniques</p> <p>Little attempt at an evaluation</p> <p>A reasonable argument is presented and is supported by some evidence</p> <p>Argument and evidence may tend more to description and/or illustration</p>
5–8	<p>Demonstrates a basic, general knowledge of the works, but with little detail</p> <p>Sociohistorical material is inaccurate or limited or of little relevance to the argument</p> <p>Describes the ideas and techniques used but provides limited analysis</p> <p>Material may not be exhaustive and there is little comment on its significance</p> <p>Very little comparison of ideas and techniques and little attempt at an evaluation</p> <p>Some attempt at argument is presented, but is poorly supported by limited evidence</p> <p>Argument is lacking in structure and substance</p>
1–4	<p>Demonstrates little knowledge of the works and little or no evidence of knowledge of sociohistorical material</p> <p>Very brief material is presented with little or no explicit analysis of ideas and techniques</p> <p>Describes some of the ideas and techniques used but does not compare and makes no attempt at an evaluation</p> <p>Lack of discernible argument with little evidence and/or limited relevance</p>
0	<p>Demonstrates no understanding of the works or the sociohistorical material</p> <p>No reference to ideas or techniques</p> <p>No comparison of the works</p> <p>No argument presented</p>