

Creativity in the subject Art and Crafts: the weak link between learning and assessment

Eva Lutnæs*

Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

Abstract: This paper explores the assessment of creativity in the Norwegian school subject Art and Crafts. Creativity, or its sibling, originality is frequently used as an assessment criterion in assignments given to pupils at the level of lower secondary education. Written assessment criteria contribute to the public face of the subject, revealing core values to pupils, parents, headmasters and politicians. I have studied the assessment repertoire of teachers when negotiating final grades and legitimising their assessment practice in interviews. The teachers struggle to find words to describe what makes pupils' design creative or original. Creativity seems to be something that just happens or not. Some pupils come up with design solutions that fit the teachers' specifications; others remain frustrated and have to ask for the teacher's help, which they know from previous experience will lower their grade. The teachers find themselves caught in an educational trap: If they aid the pupils, they could end up assessing their own ideas. Without help, some of the pupils would not proceed from the drawing table to the making of objects. In this, I identify a paradox: one of the subject's undisputed diamonds, creativity, has a weak link between learning and assessment.

Keywords: *Assessment, creativity, lower secondary education.*

* Eva Lutnæs: Oslo University College of Applied Sciences | Norway | e-mail: eva.lutnas@gmail.com

Assessment of creativity

This paper explores the assessment of creativity in the Norwegian school subject Art and Crafts. Creativity, or its sibling originality, is frequently used as an assessment criterion in assignments given to pupils at the level of lower secondary education. Written assessment criteria contribute to the “public face” (Eisner 1991, p. 85) of the subject, revealing core aspects and values to pupils, their parents, headmasters and politicians. I have studied teachers’ assessment repertoire when negotiating final grades and legitimising their assessment practice in interviews. The discussion in this paper is a continuation of my PhD thesis (Lutnæs 2011). I revisit the fieldwork with the scope limited to the assessment of creativity. When I trace the teachers’ descriptors of creativity, it emerges as a volatile concept in their assessment repertoire. The teachers struggle to find words to describe what makes designs by their pupils creative or original. Creativity seems to be something that just happens or not. Some gifted pupils come up with spontaneous and unique design solutions that fit the teachers’ specifications. Others remain frustrated and have to ask for the teacher’s help, which they know from previous experience will lower their grade. If they make an object based on an idea by their teacher, they miss the opportunity of being awarded as creative. With assessment criteria such as originality and creativity, the teachers might find themselves caught in an educational trap: If they aid pupils, they could end up assessing their own ideas. Without help, some pupils would not proceed from the drawing table to the making of objects. In this, I identify a paradox: one of the subject’s undisputed diamonds, creativity, has a weak link between learning and assessment.

The public face of connoisseurship

The assessment of pupils’ work is an act of connoisseurship and educational criticism, between which Elliot Eisner (2002) makes a distinction in his book *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*. Connoisseurship is a process that can be carried out in solitude and without uttering a word. Educational criticism is the task of making public what one has experienced as a connoisseur and requires words (Eisner 2002, p. 187). As the silent act of connoisseurship can be elusive as an empirical material, I have studied the “public face” (Eisner 1991, p. 85) of connoisseurship, educational criticism. More specifically, I observed two teams of teachers when negotiating pupils’ final grades and interviewed them regarding their assessment practice. The grade given in the subject Art and Crafts equates with grades given in subjects such as English, Science and Norwegian in the certificate awarded to all pupils when they leave the ten-year compulsory school. The grades that the teachers make use of range from 1 to 6, with 1 the lowest grade and 6 the highest. The current curriculum, “Knowledge promotion” (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2006), provides learning objectives, but does not state expected levels of achievement as is done in e.g. Sweden and England. The development of assessment criteria that echo the complexity of the main subject areas visual communication, design, art and architecture, is part of each teacher’s professional responsibility. In my study, the assessment vocabulary of Art and Crafts teachers came to be a main focus, which grew more relevant due to a reform of Norwegian teachers’ assessment practice.

The tail of underachievers

I started out as a PhD candidate in 2006. At that time, a reform initiated by the Ministry of Education and Research was in its first phase. The aim was to improve the assessment practice in Norwegian schools and the reform had its origin in a governmental vision. That is, education is regarded as a tool to reduce differences in society. A national goal and overriding principle is to provide equal opportunities in education regardless of abilities, age, gender, skin colour, cultural background, place of residence, parents' education or family finances. Everyone should have the same possibility of developing themselves and their abilities (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training 2008). An Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report published in 2005 concluded that the Norwegian compulsory school system produces a tail of underachievers. In comparison with international peers, 15-year-old Norwegian pupils underachieved, and one reason was seen to be a culture in which children are under-challenged:

We believe that one of the reasons for underachievement at age 15 may be the predominance of a culture in which children are under-challenged. We have been impressed by the quality of care provided for children, the emphasis on social development and the priority given to out-door play, but worry that expectations about intellectual development are too low (Mortimore 2005, p. 52)

To know if a pupil falls behind, tools are needed to monitor their learning progress. As a means to change the culture in Norwegian classrooms, the OECD report recommended clearer subject standards in the curriculum and to establish a research project to consider the implementation of age-related subject benchmarks. The portrayal made by the OECD report was supported by research. There was a lack of subject-related feedback in Norwegian classrooms. Stars, smileys and comments such as "good" and "nice work" without subject-related information on progress and achievement were common (Klette 2003; Furre et al. 2006; Dale and Wærness 2006). This was considered to be a threat to the vision of equity in education, as unclear, diffuse and implicit assessment criteria are more easily decoded by pupils with highly educated parents (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research 2006, p. 7).

As a solution, the Ministry of Education and Research launched an assessment reform seeking to facilitate a more subject-related and fair assessment practice. The research project recommended by the OECD report was established with the optimistic title "Better assessment practice". Its mission was to give the Ministry of Education and Research an answer to the question of whether age-related subject benchmarks ought to be implemented or not. The benchmarks were called assessment criteria of goal achievement and surfaced as rubrics articulating expectations at three achievement levels low, medium and high. However, the assessment criteria developed as part of the research project were not applauded as functional descriptors of quality in pupils' performances by the participating teachers. Briefly described, the ambition of implementing national assessment criteria in all subjects was reduced to the development of voluntary criteria of goal achievement in four subjects (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2009, p. 25).

Curricula in terms of evaluation

National assessment criteria of goal achievement were not implemented, but if you visit a lower secondary school today, you are likely to find an extensive use of rubrics similar to the ones tested in the research project. A trend has spread across the

schools of Norway: teachers make rubrics articulating expectations at a low, medium and high achievement level. Rubrics with levels of achievement are used as a tool to meet the new regulations on individual assessment (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2010), and include the following: 1. The pupils shall know the learning objectives and what the teacher will assess, thus the teachers must verbalise their subject-related expectations. 2. The goal of formative assessment is to enhance learning, thus the teachers must explain their assessment and give pupils advice for future learning situations. 3. The pupils shall participate in the assessment of their own work and progress in all subjects, thus assessment must be translated into a vocabulary that pupils can understand and use. The new regulation has put pressure on the assessment vocabulary of teachers in all subjects. In his paper *Political Governing and Curriculum Change*, Ulf. P Lundgren, a Swedish professor in pedagogy, stated, "Curricula are now expressed in terms of evaluation" (Lundgren 2006, p. 12). The current assessment reform challenges all subjects to express their curricula in terms of evaluation. Two sets of assessment criteria published in the Norwegian journal of Art and Crafts teachers, *FORM*, illustrate the change in detail after the reform:

2001				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Assessment criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creativity in design 2. Functionality 3. Craftsmanship </td> </tr> </table>				<p>Assessment criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creativity in design 2. Functionality 3. Craftsmanship
<p>Assessment criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creativity in design 2. Functionality 3. Craftsmanship 				
Andersen, Dagi. 2001. "Noe å sitte på". <i>FORM</i> . 35 (2) p. 24–25, my translation.				
2010				
Local objectives	Criteria of goal achievement			
	Low competence	Medium competence	High competence	
Make a photograph	I can make a photograph of a jump with a pre-adjusted camera	I can adjust the camera and photograph a jump	I can choose adjustments on the camera and make a photograph of a jump that emphasises speed and action	

<p>Manipulate pictures in Photoshop</p>	<p>I can use the lasso tool to separate the jumper from the background put the jumper into an artwork talk about some of the tools that I used in Photoshop</p>	<p>I can combine the lasso tool and the magic wand to separate the jumper from the background with accuracy adjust the size of the jumper, position, colour and contrast to match the artwork describe how the tools that I have used in Photoshop work</p>	<p>I can separate the jumper from the background with great accuracy manipulate the picture of the jumper to underline the visual elements in the artwork explain my choices of tools and adjustments in Photoshop</p>
<p>Talk about elements and principles of design</p>	<p>I can point at some similarities and differences concerning visual elements in the artwork and the manipulated photo</p>	<p>I can describe some similarities and differences concerning visual elements in the artwork and the manipulated photo</p>	<p>I can explain my choices of visual elements in the manipulated photo</p>

Moe, Eivind. 2010. "Hopp – bildemanipulering av kunstbilde". *FORM*. 44 (3) p. 16–17, my translation.

Figure 1 Assessment criteria published in Norwegian journal of Art and Crafts teachers, *FORM*.

In fact, the teachers have ended up developing the rubrics that the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training were supposed to provide. To develop rubrics demands a lot of spare time, not exactly the core characteristic of teachers. As Kajsa Borg points out, "Teachers, of all categories assess what they have vocabulary for, instead of developing vocabulary for those aspects that should have been assessed" (Borg 2008, p. 209, my translation). My fieldwork came to an end before the rubric trend hit and was analysed as the reform evolved. In the thesis, examples of assessment vocabulary available in the field for Art and Crafts teachers to make use of at a critical moment are documented. What was the status quo regarding the assessment vocabulary of Norwegian Art and Crafts teachers? Does the assessment vocabulary demonstrate the vigour needed to cope with the reforms' demands?

Fieldwork amongst best practice teachers

I chose to do fieldwork amongst two teams of best practice Art and Crafts teachers. The concept, best practice, refers to profiled, educated, experienced and admired teachers. My agenda as a researcher was to explore what teachers valued after ten years of compulsory education in the subject Art and Crafts. The fieldwork was limited to the negotiation of the final grade, summing up the pupils' achievements after ten years of compulsory education in the subject Art and Crafts. I was in the midst of the teachers' assessment practice for nearly two months, attending their meetings, listening to their negotiations, conducting interviews and collecting the assessment

tools they used. This combination of methodology was chosen to thoroughly document the challenges and dilemmas of assessment in the subject, and the vocabulary and strategies teachers draw on to solve them. Etienne Wenger's theory (1998) on the negotiation of meaning in communities of practice provided the concepts used in my research questions. I analysed the two teams of teachers as communities of practice, locally negotiated regimes of competence, and focused on their assessment repertoire.

Etienne Wenger makes a distinction between the repertoire the members of a community of practice have produced and the repertoire they have adopted (Wenger 1998, p. 83). When assessing the work of their pupils, the teachers can draw upon the history of their profession, and thereby adopt earlier solution strategies and concepts used as descriptors of quality. They also have their own history of negotiations to reuse as a repertoire when they face similar dilemmas of assessment, e.g. what grade should they give products they suspect to be finished by mom? These histories of interpretation create shared points of reference, but, as Wenger states, "they do not impose meaning" (ibid.). As a resource for the negotiation of meaning, the repertoire remains inherently ambiguous; ambiguity is a condition of negotiability. The teachers negotiate what part of history to make "newly meaningful" (Wenger 1998, p. 137) when assessing pupils' work within their local school context and current national curricula. On the one hand, ambiguity makes the negotiations of quality in pupils' work more difficult, while on the other hand, it legitimises the connoisseur, educated Art and Crafts teachers who know the repertoire of the practice. In the thesis, I discuss the two teams of teachers' assessment repertoire in light of the present curricula and historical texts. In this paper, I revisit the fieldwork with the scope limited to the assessment of creativity.

Creativity as a volatile concept

When they negotiated the pupils' final grades in the subject Art and Crafts, all the teachers valued craftsmanship. They expected the technical conventions explained in class to be repeated in the objects made by their pupils. However, it was not sufficient to demonstrate excellent craftsmanship by copying an idea of the teacher or fellow pupils. In order to achieve the highest grades, the pupils were expected to develop their own, original designs, to add their own creative twist to the objects in question. As I analysed the teachers' assessment repertoire, a distinction became apparent. They all had a well-functioning linguistic repertoire related to the assessment of technical performances, but struggled to find words to describe what made pupils' designs original or creative. Their struggle is an indicator of an assessment repertoire that can cause the teacher problems when giving criticism. How can the teachers promote creativity if they lack words to identify achievements? How can they help pupils see what they otherwise might not have noticed and, if not noticed, not understood (Eisner 2002, p. 187)?

Creativity and originality are described as assessment criteria in both assignments and the rubrics used by the teachers to document their assessment of pupils' work. These concepts appear as a prioritised aspect of pupils' work in the subject Art and Crafts. In the interviews, the words creativity and originality are used interchangeably, directed towards the outcome of making, not the process of innovative problem solving. Their mutual foci point seems to be the following question: Is this object made by my pupil creative/original? In the following section, I will describe two cases from the fieldwork. The point of departure will be the assessment repertoire of the teachers and as I discuss the challenges they face, I will introduce prior research and definitions.

In a group interview, a team of three teachers started an extensive discussion when I asked them to describe what they put value on concerning the assessment criteria for creativity in their assignment on contemporary art. The teacher who first answered linked the assessment of creativity to the subjective preferences of each teacher. Creativity depended on what the teachers liked, identified as “exciting and resilient” (Lutnæs 2011, p. 186). This descriptor makes quite an unpredictable compass for the pupils and I continued by asking the teachers how they explain the assessment of creativity to their pupils. Another teacher stated that creativity is about creating the new, to create something that is new to you. With this approach, creativity depends on the pupils’ earlier achievements. Two seemingly identical works would be given different grades, a low score to the pupil that just replicated a previous success and a high score to the pupil that freshly unpacked the same concept.

My next step as a moderator of the discussion was to reactivate the teachers’ preferences as a compass when assessing creativity by asking the question; what if a pupil made something “new to him or her” and the teacher did not like the design? The third of the teachers participating in the group interview replied, “You do not even need to like it, but you could be surprised” (Lutnæs 2011, p. 187). The moment of surprise as an important aspect of creativity was supported by another teacher as he gave examples from art history of works that had surprised in their time. He explained that new surprising artworks come as a result of previous artworks; it is a twist, a response to history, and he continued by saying, “If you have that skill, then you are creative” (Lutnæs 2011, p. 188). I remarked that it is demanding for pupils in tenth grade to reach this level of performance. The teachers agreed and returned to their “creative for you as an individual” path, but as their discussion evolved, they ended up degrading this as relevant assessment evidence; they claimed to assess the pupils’ products as they are, and not by comparing them to the pupils’ previous design processes.

In summary, creativity emerges as a volatile concept in their assessment repertoire, an unpredictable element of surprise to the pupils. The teachers were not able to identify a robust set of descriptors they could agree upon related to creativity in their joint assignment on contemporary art. With this appearance as nothingness, creativity seems more like a buzz word, an ornament on the subject’s public façade than the public face of Art and Crafts teachers’ connoisseurship. To put it simply: they see creativity in the designs of their pupils and assess it, but when it comes to the task of making their experience public, they lack words to describe it.

Originality in works of pupils

At the other school I visited as a researcher a teacher used the word originality when assessing objects in wood. In the individual interview, she told me that assessment of originality is limited to the varieties within the class and the school, not the whole world. It is not regarded as original if pupils copy an idea they have seen in the previous year’s exhibition or one of the teacher’s examples. To assess whether pupils’ works are original or not, one needs in-depth knowledge about what happened during a project. This criterion makes the pupils’ teacher the sole connoisseur. The teacher is the only one who knows what design solutions she or he made available in class as examples, not to speak of which one of the pupils originated an idea first. One need not be an Art and Crafts teacher for long to discover how ideas drift amongst a group of pupils, especially the ideas that are appraised by a teacher in class. Sharing ideas could be seen as a sign of a sound and dynamic setting for learning, but, as the

awaiting assessment values unique and independent ideas as proof of originality, it could be recognised as a problem. The pupils tend to hide their sketches or to make sure that the teachers keep track of whom to award as the original and whom to discredit as the copycats.

The same teacher revealed doubt about the relevance of assessing originality in pupils' work, as when she appraises an idea of a pupil it usually turns out that the pupil has seen a similar object elsewhere. Then, she said, the idea is not original as first anticipated, and continued, "Maybe it is stupid to put as much value to originality as we do. Most things are already thought of. . . What is the good in always expecting works to be original? Maybe we should return to the practice where pupils replicated the teacher's models?" (Lutnæs 2011, p. 197). The teacher drew my attention to the pupils' works on the wall behind us and stated that all of them are slight variations of the same design —a design developed by the teacher. The pupils have redesigned the teacher's model and her doubt about expectations of originality is reasonable. This contrast between the verbally expressed intentions of originality and the practice of redesigning that goes on in the workshops have been previously discussed by Karen Brænne (2009). Compared to the actual practice of creating documented in her case study ALU 04/05 at a Norwegian University College, originality in student design is overstated by teachers and students. Brænne sees the concept of originality as a signal to the students that their design solution should not be an exact copy. The dominating representation in her case study is the practice of redesign. The objects that are made by the students all have obvious references to visual genres and cultural conventions. The students combine and reuse parts of what others have made before them and stand on the shoulders of earlier generations' experience. Still, this is not explicitly addressed or explored by the students or their teacher. They talk about originality and as Brænne concludes, a gap exists between words and action.

Jan Michl's paper "On Seeing Design as Redesign" is a key reference to Brænne's discussion. Michl's agenda is to adjust the education of designers to the practice that awaits them. He wants to challenge the idea that it is best not to be inspired by others amongst design students: "It is a fact that all designers, the outstanding ones as much as the mediocre or inferior ones, always build on, modify and continue the work of other designers, and that no one can avoid doing precisely this" (Michl 2002, p. 12). To aim for originality is to aim for unachievable goals. He launches redesign as a more appropriate notion to the practice of designing to underline the collective and evolutionary dimensions of designing. Helene Illeris has a similar agenda in her article "Copying – You Just Aren't Supposed to Do That!" related to the field of art. She argues that the ideal of originality in the works of students seems outdated compared to the practice of the contemporary artist, in which:

... originality and creativity are nothing but the question of finding the right forms or objects from art or from just anywhere *outside* yourself to take/buy/copy/sample/reconstruct/emphasize/internalize/transform in some way (Illeris 2000, p. 68)

To claim that originality and authenticity come from the inside of practitioners risks ". . . creating serious feelings of shame in students who do not have a gift for (simulating) 'originality'" (Illeris 2000, p. 68). Michl and Illeris both make the point that the ideal of originality, as creating from scratch, Michl and Illeris both make the point that the ideal of originality, as creating from scratch, is discarded by the professional field of art and design. Why then should art and design education at a compulsory

school level still struggle with expectations of originality? Is not the expected little twist of change blown out of proportion? In my view, originality is a utopian aim for pupils, who are most likely making a first attempt to create within whatever specific field of art and design the teacher has introduced them to. According to the points made by Illeris and Michl, it would also be a misleading approach if one goal of the subject at a compulsory level is to educate knowledgeable and critical consumers of art and design. Still, what concerns me more is that the striving for originality obscures what could be learned by exploring prior objects and professional art and design practices. The ideal to create a product uninfluenced by others is counterproductive to learning. Michl illustrates this by a striking example:

If a student makes his own originality his goal, he will try, logically and naturally enough, to defend his own individual artistic “innocence” against what he sees as harmful external influence. This leads to a fundamental hostility to learning – because learning always implies being influenced by others and acquiring other people’s solutions and approaches. (Michl 2002, p. 12)

In my study, the teachers approach the assessment of creativity by looking at the pupils’ objects and ask if they convey proof of independent or new design. Strange as it may seem, the less you are influenced, the less you build on previous solutions, the less you have learned from others, and the higher the grade you will get. This is not a valid reading of the teachers’ assessment practice. It only appears to be the case due to the unresolved challenges of framing the concepts of creativity and originality in the subject. The pupils’ designs cannot possibly be 100% original. To be considered as a successful object, an answer to the assignment given by the teacher, the design has to repeat conventions from art and design practices. It is the conventions that give an idea wings. As Arnold Hauser put it in plain words:

Completely novel forms devoid of every conventional element are unsuited from the beginning to communicate thoughts and feelings. For if it is their originality which makes them worth communicating, then it is conventions which make them capable of communicating. (Hauser 1982, p. 39)

To be creative is not to do whatever you want – it is to solve a problem in a context. This context provides certain possibilities and hindrances, tools, materials and a history of prior solutions to similar problems, a repertoire to adopt and redesign. Could the assessment of creativity be reframed in ways that acknowledge redesign? What if the focus shifted from the “new” in pupils’ designs to an exploration of the repertoire they have built on? What if the exploration of this repertoire was awarded as creativity?

Don’t give ideas to your pupils

Michl (2002) displays how the ideal of originality makes teachers’ instruction difficult. In my fieldwork amongst Art and Crafts teachers, I found that the period of awaiting assessment further restrains teachers in the first phase of a project. With assessment criteria such as originality and creativity, the teachers find themselves caught in an educational trap: If they aid the pupils, they could end up assessing their own ideas. Without help, some of the pupils would not proceed from the drawing table to the making of objects. This dilemma is acknowledged by the teachers in my fieldwork as part of their daily life. True to a tradition that the initial idea should come from the pupils, the teachers express a fear of giving away ideas. Their strategy is to keep back and try to get pupils started by asking questions. If they have to give ideas

away and a pupil makes a product based on exactly the same idea, the consequences take the form of a lower grade. It is stated as unfair of a teacher to assess such a product on the same level as a product based on an idea developed exclusively by a pupil. In the first phase of a project, the teachers are sidelined, patiently waiting for original ideas to pop up amongst the pupils. Then they could re-enter the stage and aid the pupils in the realisation of their ideas. As mentioned earlier, when it comes to craftsmanship, in a narrow understanding, as skills to make ideas real, the pupils are expected to reuse the technical conventions developed by earlier generations of makers. Strategies of construction and the use of tools to manipulate and transform materials into the intended object are free to copy. The ideal of originality is preserved in form and content. Originality is the assessment evidence of creativity, and seems to be something that just happens or not. Some gifted pupils come up with spontaneous and unique design solutions that fit the teacher's specifications; others remain frustrated and have to ask for the teacher's help, which, from previous experience, they know will lower their grade. This approach makes creativity something you are, an inherent ability the subject allows you to make use of, not something to learn and expand through Art and Crafts classes. The assessment evidence, which the teacher values as creativity, is not a continuum of a learning process planned by the teacher.

Reframing of the concept of creativity

The assessment of creativity in the teachers' assessment repertoire is linked with the assessment of the final object. Seemingly, they look at an object made by a pupil and ask, is this creative? Does this object convey proof of an independent design solution? The framing of creativity as independent ideas makes a weak link between learning and assessment. The teachers wait for unique ideas to surface in the pupils' sketches, while the pupils, caught in a culture that disparages sharing, protect their ideas and their artistic innocence from the repertoire of generations of makers within the fields of art and design. The assessment evidence, independency, is counterproductive to learning and reveals an urgent need for reframing the concept of creativity. It is crucial to identify relevant educational content and develop an assessment vocabulary that would allow teachers to put value on the creative aspects of pupils' designs. Art and Crafts classes ought to be an arena where all pupils are challenged to refine and expand their strategies of creative making. The teachers need to have an answer ready when the pupils ask what creativity is and what the teachers propose as identifiers of creativity across the main areas of the subject: visual communication, design, art and architecture. When answering, the teachers need to ensure that the assessment evidence is a continuum of the learning process they planned for their pupils, a result of their attentive teaching, and not just a bonus to the gifted ones. To the question, "What is creativity?", Rollo May answers, "... the process of *bringing something new into being*" (May 1975, p. 39). In the context of design education, I propose the opposite italics, italics that put the emphasis on the process and to put the word "new" into a parenthesis, "...*the process* of bringing something (new) into being". In my view, a multifaceted repertoire of strategies to solve design problems is the relevant educational content of creativity. As assessment evidence, these strategies could provide the needed shift from awarding the "new" in objects to encourage the process of redesigning. To arrive at this point, further research and joint efforts are needed by researchers and teachers. Again, there is no starting from scratch, rather, a need to draw upon previous research projects (Gardner 1996; Atkinson 2001; Kimbell 2005; Lindström 2005, 2006; Borg 2008; Kreitler & Casakin

2009) and to redesign them in the context of the Norwegian subject of Art and Crafts. The Swedish professor Lars Lindström (2007), approach the challenges of assessing creativity in an exemplary manner by the questions he asks in the article, "Creativity: What Is It? Can You Assess It? Can It Be Taught?". The article is based on a research project (Lindström 1999) that identified four dimensions of creative ability, developed and tested a rubric describing levels of performance related to four process criteria: investigative work, inventiveness, the ability to use models and capacity for self-assessment. In the article, he takes the research project one step further by giving advice on how the four dimensions of creative ability can be taught and thus makes the crucial link between learning and assessment that are weak regarding creativity in my study.

Although this paper seems to be about the assessment repertoire of teachers, the real agenda is to discuss what kind of subject their assessment vocabulary makes possible. Assessment vocabulary is important because it contributes to the "public face" of a subject for pupils, their parents, headmasters and politicians and therefore it paves the way for what is really important: the skills, identity and ambitions the subject seeks on behalf of future generations. There is no return to the replication of the teachers' models from the earliest days of the subject, as we need to prepare the pupils to step into the making and problem solving of tomorrow. The diamond, creativity, calls for grinding to escape its current state as a volatile concept.

Acknowledgements: Thanks to my former supervisors professor Liv Merete Nielsen and professor emeritus Lars Lindström

References

- Andersen, Dagi. 2001. "Noe å sitte på". *FORM* 35(2): 24–25.
- Atkinson, Dennis. 2001. "Assessment in Educational Practice: Forming Pedagogised Identities in the Art Curriculum". *International Journal of Art & Design Education* 20(1): 96–108.
- Borg, Kajsa. 2008. "Kreativitet eller problemløsning – vad bedömer vi i slöjden?". In *Slöjda för livet om pedagogisk slöjd*, edited by Kajsa Borg, and Lars Lindström, 199–210. Stockholm: Lärarförbundets förlag.
- Brønne, Karen. 2009. *Mellom ord og handling: om verdsetjing i kunst og handverksfaget, CON-TEXT. Avhandling; 41*. Oslo: Arkitektur- og designhøgskolen i Oslo.
- Dale, Erling Lars, and Jarl Inge Wærness. 2006. *Vurdering og læring i en elevaktiv skole*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Eisner, Elliot W. 1991. *The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice*. New York, N.Y.: Macmillan Publ. Co.
- Eisner, Elliot W. 2002. *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Furre, Harald, Inger-Johanne Danielsen, Rune Stiberg-Jamt, and Einar M. Skaalvik. 2006. *Analyse av den nasjonale undersøkelsen "Elevundersøkelsen" 2006*. Oxford Research AS [cited 17. November 2006]. Available from http://www.utdanningsdirektoratet.no/upload/Rapporter/elevinspektorene/Elevundersokelsen_2006.pdf.

- Gardner, Howard. 1996. "The Assessment of Student Learning in the Arts". In *Evaluating and Assessing the Visual Arts in Education: International Perspectives*, edited by Doug Boughton, Elliot W. Eisner, and Johan Ligtvoet, 131–155. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hauser, Arnold. 1982. *The Sociology of Art*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Illeris, Helene. 2000. "Copying - you just aren't supposed to do that!". In *The Cultural Context. Comparative Studies of Art Education and Children's Drawings*, edited by Lars Lindström, 59–71. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Klette, Kirsti. 2003. *Klasserommets praksisformer etter Reform 97*. Oslo: Pedagogisk forskningsinstitutt.
- Kimbell, Richard. 2005. "Assessing Design Innovation". In *Technology Education in New Perspectives: Research, Assessment and Curriculum Development*, edited by Lars Lindström, 17–35. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press (HLS).
- Kreitler, Shulamith, and Hernan Casakin. 2009. "Self-perceived Creativity. The Perspective of Design". *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 25(3): 194–203.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. 2006. *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet*. Midlertidig utg. juni 2006. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. 2010. *Forskrift til opplæringslova*. [cited 20. August 2010] Available from <http://www.lovdatabank.no/cgi-wifit/ldles?doc=/sf/sf/sf-20060623-0724.html>
- Lindström, Lars, Leif Ulriksson, and Catharina Elsner. 1999. *Portföljvärdering av elevers skapende i bild, Utvärdering av skolan 1998 avseende läroplanernas mål*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Lindström, Lars. 2005. "Novice or Expert? Conceptions of Competence in Metalwork". In *Technology Education in New Perspectives: Research, Assessment and Curriculum Development*, edited by Lars Lindström. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press (HLS).
- Lindström, Lars. 2006. "Creativity: What Is It? Can You Assess It? Can It Be Taught?". *The International Journal of Art & Design Education* 25(1): 53–66.
- Lundgren, Ulf. P. 2006. "Political Governing and Curriculum Change – From Active to Reactive Curriculum Reforms. The need for a reorientation of Curriculum Theory". *Studies in Educational Policy and Educational Philosophy* 5(1): 1–12.
- Lutnæs, Eva. 2011. *Standpunktutvärdering i grunnskolefaget Kunst og håndverk. Læreres forhandlingsrepertoar. CON-TEXT, Avhandling; 52*. Arkitektur- og designhøgskolen i Oslo.
- May, Rollo. 1975. *The Courage to Create*. New York: Norton.
- Michl, Jan. 2002. "On Seeing Design as Redesign: An Exploration of a Neglected Problem in Design Education". *Scandinavian Journal of Design History* 12(1): 7–23.
- Moe, Eivind. 2010. "Hopp – bildemanipulering av kunstbilde". *FORM* 44(3): 16–17.
- Mortimore, Peter. 2005. *Equity in education. Thematic review. Norway. Country note*. OECD.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. 2008. *Equity in Education for all – understanding central concepts*. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training.
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. 2006. *Summary of Report nr. 16 (2006–2007) to the Storting. Early Intervention for Lifelong Learning*. Oslo: Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research.

- Utdanningsdirektoratet. 2009. *Sluttrapport: Oppdragsbrev nr. 6 - 2007 om tiltak knyttet til individvurdering i skole og fag- og yrkesopplæring*. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.