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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10 was the subject of national consultation from 9 July to 25 September 2012.

The draft curriculum for Foundation to Year 10 comprised a rationale, aims and introduction for the Arts learning area; a rationale, aims and introduction to each of the five subjects – Dance, Drama, Media Arts, Music and Visual Arts; and for each subject, band descriptions, content descriptions, content elaborations and achievement standards for each band: Foundation to Year 2, Years 3 and 4, Years 5 and 6, Years 7 and 8, Years 9 and 10.

Purpose of the report

This report presents the key findings from the consultation feedback on the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10. It outlines the methodology used to collect and analyse consultation data, and summarises the qualitative and quantitative data. This report will inform decisions on revisions to the draft Arts curriculum.

The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) is responsible for a national curriculum from Foundation to Year 12 in specified learning areas.

In August 2011, ACARA published online the Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts. During 2011 and 2012, ACARA began the process of developing curriculum for The Arts in the five subjects: Dance, Drama, Media Arts, Music and Visual Arts for Foundation to Year 10. In July 2012, draft curriculum content for The Arts learning area was released for consultation.

Consultation processes and participants

Two main avenues for consultation feedback were through an online survey on the consultation portal of the Australian Curriculum website, and through written submissions sent directly to ACARA.

Feedback was sought on the rationales and aims for the learning area and subjects, the structural coherence of each subject, the coverage and clarity of content, and the clarity, coherence and appropriateness of achievement standards.

Responses were received from a range of stakeholders including:

- 608 online survey respondents (Dance 16; Drama 44; Media Arts 24; Music 248; Visual Arts 142; The Arts learning area 134) including feedback collected from teachers across the states and territories who engaged directly with the draft Arts curriculum
- 111 written submissions from individual, school, curriculum and school authorities and representative bodies
Key findings

Overall the findings suggested there was continued support for the development of an Australian Arts curriculum for all Australian students in Foundation to Year 10. There was general agreement with the draft Dance and Drama curricula. There was a mix of views about the Media Arts curriculum from the small cohort of respondents. There was most disagreement with the draft curricula for Music and Visual Arts. As with the consultation between October 2010 and January 2011 on the Draft Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts, primary generalist teachers and secondary specialist teachers held opposing views about the strand organisers, Making and Responding.

Strengths

The following strengths were identified:

- the inclusion of the five Arts subjects
- the two strand structure, Making and Responding, is clear for primary teachers
- the emphasis on students becoming innovative, critical and imaginative
- catering for student diversity.

Concerns

Key issues across the learning area and the five Arts subjects have been identified as requiring specific attention through the revision process. These included:

- too much content in the primary bands. The collective content across the five Arts subjects in the three bands of primary school is greater than a generalist teacher can reasonably manage
- Foundation to Year 2 is considered too broad a range of years for one band
- Making and Responding strand organisers are perceived by secondary specialists as limiting
- the place of historical context and critical analysis needs strengthening across the five Arts subjects
- references to ‘play’ in the Foundation to Year 2 band should be intentional and purposeful
- the cross-curriculum priorities need to be better developed and integrated across the five Arts subjects
- references to general capabilities are too general
- connections to other learning areas and subject as discussion in ‘Links to other learning areas’ in the Organisation section and in the sixth Making content description considered unnecessary
- band descriptions need to be specific to the particular Arts subject without repetitive generic content
- language needs to be consistent across the Arts and terminology specific within each Arts subject
- the distinction between techniques and skills needs to be clarified and clear in each Arts subject
- elements need to be clearly defined in each Arts subject for introduction in the primary years
• each Arts subject should have a clear sequential developmental continuum
• rationales and aims are vague and need to clearly identify the importance of knowing practically and conceptually in each Arts subject
• achievement standards are too generic and need to clearly identify the knowledge, understanding and skills students are expected to demonstrate by the end of the band.
1. INTRODUCTION

Background

The draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10 was the subject of national consultation from 9 July to 25 September 2012.

The draft curriculum for Foundation to Year 10 comprised a rationale, aims and introduction for the Arts learning area; a rationale, aims and introduction to each of the five subjects – Dance, Drama, Media Arts, Music and Visual Arts; and, for each subject band descriptions content descriptions, content elaborations and achievement standards for each band: Foundation to Year 2, Years 3 and 4, Years 5 and 6, Years 7 and 8, Years 9 and 10.

The draft curriculum was developed according to a set of design specifications that were approved by ACARA’s Board following consultation with state and territory curriculum, assessment and certification authorities and are published in ACARA’s Curriculum Development Process Version 6 (2012).

The draft curriculum specified content and achievement standards for each Arts subject to provide the basis for greater consistency in what is to be taught in Foundation to Year 10 of schooling. Content refers to the knowledge, understanding and skills to be taught and learned in each subject. Achievement standards refer to descriptions of the quality of learning (the depth of understanding, extent of knowledge and sophistication of skill) expected of students who have studied the content for the subject.
2. CONSULTATION PROCESSES AND METHODOLOGY

Consultation processes

The draft curriculum was made available for nationwide consultation from 9 July to 25 September 2012.

The two main avenues for feedback were through an online survey on the consultation portal of the Australian Curriculum website, and through written submissions sent directly to ACARA.

Feedback was directly sought on rationales and aims, structural coherence, coverage and clarity of content, clarity and coherence of achievement standards, and representation of general capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities.

Opportunities to provide feedback either via an online survey or by written submission were promoted on the ACARA website and through education authorities, professional associations, and academics in the field of education. Reminders were regularly provided to subscribers to ACARA’s e-newsletter ACARA.

Online survey

The online survey comprised a mixture of rating scale questions (four-point Likert scale) and space for comments that focused on suggestions for improvement. Feedback on the Arts learning area was sought on the:

- rationale, aims and coherence of the structure of each subject
- coverage and clarity of curriculum content
- clarity and coherence of the achievement standards
- representation of general capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities.

All online survey questions are included in Appendix 1. A breakdown of respondents to the survey is provided in section 2.7 of the report.

Written submissions

Written submissions were received from state and territory education authorities, professional associations and bodies and other stakeholders. These typically offered more detailed feedback than was possible via the online survey. Respondents were asked to complete a cover sheet which contained space to record basic demographic information that would assist in collation and analysis of responses.

Intensive engagement activity

As part of the consultation, 24 schools participated in intensive engagement activities using the draft curriculum. This involved teaching and/or assessing a section of the draft curriculum and collecting student work samples and considering the manageability of the
They also complete the online survey drawing on their experiences with teaching the draft curriculum.

Detailed information regarding this activity is outlined in the Report on Intensive Engagement Activity at Appendix 3.

**Methodology**

Quantitative data from the online survey are presented in charts and tables throughout this report. All quantitative data were collated and analysed in spreadsheets from which charts and tables were produced. The quantitative data are drawn from the online surveys while the qualitative data include commentary from the online surveys and written submissions.

For questions in the online survey, the response for each rating (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree) was assigned a numeric value (for example, strongly agree – 4; agree – 3). Values were totalled and a percentage calculated for each category and displayed as a column graph.

Data analysis included breakdowns according to state and territory for each question.

Qualitative data were outsourced to experts in research and data analysis. The qualitative data was analysed using NVivo10 software. From responses to each question in the online survey, comments were categorised as strengths, concerns and suggestions, with specific topic nodes developed within these three categories. Content was analysed for recurring themes and general trends.

An identical coding procedure was used for the formal submissions.

For reporting purposes, the analysed data were organised according to the broad structural organisers for the survey, that is, for the Arts learning area:

- Rationale and aims
- Organisation of the learning area
- The Arts across Foundation to Year 10
- Achievement standards
- Diversity of learners
- General capabilities
- Cross-curriculum priorities
- Links to other learning areas

For each subject (Dance, Drama, Media Studies, Music and Visual Arts) feedback was sought based on the following areas:

- Rationale and aims
- Learning in the Arts subject
• Foundation to Year 6 content
• Foundation to Year 6 achievement standards
• Years 7 to 10 content
• Years 7 to 10 achievement standards
• Perspectives by state and territory

Findings are reported using the headings of strengths, concerns and suggestions.

**Respondent demographics**

Across the Arts learning area (The Arts, Dance, Drama, Media, Music and Visual Arts), ACARA received 608 responses to the online survey – 111 written submissions.

Single responses often incorporated the views of many respondents. Organisations which made written submissions are listed in Appendix 2. The breakdown of respondents by state, group and individuals are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder type</th>
<th>No of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State and territory authorities (Education and Arts)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative bodies (Arts organisations, professional teacher Associations)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, universities and individuals</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>743</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Online survey responses**

The online survey and breakdown of respondents is shown in figures 1 to 3.

All states and territories provided feedback on the draft curriculum either through the online survey or via detailed written submissions.

Feedback was submitted by key stakeholders throughout Australia including:

• state and territory curriculum and school authorities
• representative bodies (such as teacher professional associations, government agencies and non-government organisations)
• schools
• individuals (teachers, academics, parents, members of the community).

A total of 632 responses were received from the online survey. Table 2 shows the number of responses from each state and territory.

Table 2. Number of online survey responses by State/Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>No of responses</th>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>No of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. % Respondents by state/territory

Figure 2. % Respondents by group
Table 3 shows the number of responses from schools that participated in the intensive engagement activity. In total, 43 out of 68 (63.2%) of intensive engagement school participants provided feedback on the draft F–10 Australian Curriculum: The Arts via the online survey. Detailed information regarding the intensive engagement activity is outlined in the Report on Intensive Engagement Activity: The Arts (Appendix 3).

Table 3. Intensive engagement schools and teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts subject/ Learning area</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>Total by Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning area</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. CONSULTATION FINDINGS – THE ARTS LEARNING AREA

The table below summarises the percentages of respondents to the online survey who strongly agreed or agreed with each statement. An analysis of feedback on each section of the survey is presented in the following pages.

**Responses to survey questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Submission: Respondents 134 (324 participants)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Arts Rationale and Aims</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The rationale for the Arts learning area is clear about the nature and importance of learning in The Arts for all Australian students.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The aims for the learning area clearly state the intent for the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation of the Arts Learning Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content structure; The Arts across Foundation to Year 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The organisation of the learning area provides a coherent view of the key components and features of the Arts curriculum.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Content Structure for the learning area is appropriate.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The interrelated strand structure of Making and Responding is appropriate for organising the curriculum content.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The description of learning in The Arts across year groupings is appropriate.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Standards and Diversity of Learners</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The explanation of the nature of achievement standards in The Arts is clear.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The explanation of the ways in which the Australian Curriculum caters for the diversity of learners is clear.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: Literacy</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: Numeracy</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: ICT</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: CCT</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: EB.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: PSC</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content: ICU</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-Curriculum Priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following cross-curriculum priorities is evident in the curriculum content: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following cross-curriculum priorities is evident in the curriculum content: Asia and Australia’s engagement with Asia</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following cross-curriculum priorities is evident in the curriculum content: Sustainability</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links To Other Learning Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The links between the Arts and other learning areas are appropriate</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications For Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The ways in which teachers can implement the Arts curriculum to support student learning are clear</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The ways in which teachers can implement the Arts curriculum to support assessment of student learning is clear</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Arts Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Cover the important content of the learning area</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Are coherent as a set</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Are manageable in terms of implementation</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Provide flexibility for implementation</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Provide opportunities to explore connections between the art forms</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Enable teachers to cater for needs of all students</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Together with the achievement standards provide clarity about the depth of teaching and learning required.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Set challenging but realistic standards</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Are consistent in pitch or level of expectation at each band level</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glossary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The Glossary is comprehensive</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The Glossary definitions are helpful</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 134 respondents to the Arts section of the survey which is representative of 324 participants.

**Rationale and aims**

**Strengths**

Respondents indicated that the strength of the Arts learning area related to recognition of the arts in the Australian Curriculum and the broader benefits of the arts in students’ learning experience.

*In general this is a very well-reasoned expression of the significant place of the arts in both individual and community development within the school context. (Secondary teacher, NSW)*

*The importance of engaging, enriching and inspiring all students through the arts is clear. The rationale’s aim is to create functional global citizens through critical thinking, cultural awareness and applying emerging and existing technologies to their aesthetic practice. (Survey respondent, NT)*

One education authority noted particularly the inclusion of a learning area and subject-specific rationales and aims to highlight the academic importance of learning in the Arts:

*The rationale for The Arts curriculum clearly articulates the nature, purpose and importance of learning in the Arts for all Australian students. The positioning of the Arts to engage, inspire and enrich across learning areas and within communities and cultures is very welcome. The curriculum outlines a clear, student-centred approach which is congruent with current pedagogical development providing excellent creative, engaging and challenging opportunities for students.*

*The inclusion of an overall rationale for the Arts learning area as well as individual rationales for each of the five subjects is viewed as appropriate.*

*The Aims are succinct, well-articulated and acknowledge the academic importance of the learning area. (Queensland Catholic Education Commission)*

**Concerns**

Concerns related to perceptions of the Arts having a diminished place relative to other subjects in the Australian Curriculum. There was some concern about the Arts being ‘clumped together’, which for some respondents provided evidence of this supposed diminution of prominence.

**Suggestions**

Suggested improvements in survey comments mainly related to emphasising the importance of the Arts and giving the Arts greater prominence. Comments about the importance of the Arts related both to their place in history and society, and their critical role in contributing to
student learning and development. There were also a number of suggestions about better linking the Arts to other learning areas.

**Organisation of the learning area**

Feedback on the Arts as a learning area indicated there was some support for (56% agreement) and some concern (43% disagreement) regarding the common strand organisers, *Making* and *Responding*, across all five Arts subjects.

**Strengths**

The majority of primary teachers supported the strand organisers, *Making* and *Responding*, as the common organisation structure across the five Arts subjects.

*Making and Responding strands are a big improvement on the three strands proposed within the [draft] Shape Paper. (ACT Education and Training Directorate)*

![Agreement with Making and Responding strand organisers](chart)

**Concerns**

Concerns expressed through survey responses frequently raised similar issues.

The discussion and figures used to represent the *Making* and *Responding* strand organisers and the discussion of ‘Learning in’ and ‘Learning through’ the Arts were seen as unhelpful by secondary teachers.

*The relationship between learning IN and learning THROUGH the arts needs to be more coherent. Figures 1 and 2 need to provide a clearer overview of each concept; the differing visual segmentation is confusing. Currently ‘learning in’ is addressed within the Making section (p. 5) and ‘learning through’ appears within the Responding section (p. 6). Learning IN and learning THROUGH the arts would be clearer as a separate section. (Academic, SA)*

Some respondents indicated a preference for ‘performing’ in Dance, Drama and Music rather than the term ‘Making’, with ‘Making’ not seen as suggesting creativity. Many respondents
DRAFT AUSTRALIAN CURRICULUM: THE ARTS CONSULTATION REPORT

were not convinced that these terms encompass the breadth of the two main areas of study in the performing arts subjects: Dance, Drama, and Music. As one respondent noted, ‘it is difficult to devise an all-encompassing terminology which does justice to each art form’. (K–12 Music Coordinator, NSW). Some respondents questioned if the grouping of these five subjects within the learning area of ‘The Arts’ was logical. There were various comments about lack of coherence or logic in the structure of the Arts curriculum.

Several respondents stated that the exclusion of graphic or visual communication as a subject was disappointing and meant an absence of a design-based subject. An indicative comment was that ‘this needs to be a subject area and it is not sufficient to include it under the banner of visual arts’. (Arts educator, Independent Schools Victoria)

The apparent difficulty in striking a balance between the needs of generalists and specialists was expressed through a number of comments. As one respondent observed, the draft was too large and cumbersome for primary school teachers who are not specialists:

There are far too many descriptors. Far too large and cumbersome for Primary teachers who are not specialists and who will combine areas.
(Primary teacher, SA)

Another mused that it was ‘uninspiring for a specialist and unapproachable for a generalist’. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

Suggestions

Many suggestions were made related to alterations in the text. By way of overview, feedback that featured relatively often included the suggestion that design should feature more strongly.

A number of respondents asked that ‘making’ be replaced by ‘creating’. Another suggestion was to replace ‘responding’ with ‘interpreting’. These suggestions were made in several comments.

Several comments emphasised that the curriculum should be more clearly based on sequential progression through the year levels based on a defined level of progress each year.

The Arts across Foundation to Year 10

Strengths

Strengths observed by survey respondents included that the descriptions ‘appear to be reasonably cumulative and sequential, as they should be’.

There was also support for the flexibility afforded by two-year bands and for the focus on the early years.

The implementation of year groupings will allow schools far greater flexibility in being able to meet the demands of the Australian Curriculum: Arts. It provides schools with the opportunity to program Arts subjects as discrete
units of work or as continuous study to suit the subject area and school community. (ACT Education and Training Directorate)
Concerns

There was concern among survey respondents that, as the primary school curriculum was so flexible, there was insufficient assurance that students would be prepared for the requirements of Arts subjects in secondary school.

Some feedback indicated a preference for year levels rather than two-year bands. This was closely related to the view that the requirements for progression through year levels should be clearer and more specific. Forty-seven percent of respondents suggested a preference for the curriculum to be divided into individual years.

There were concerns about the language being too vague and the document including excessive repetition. Related to this, there were concerns that the curriculum did not represent sequential development.

A concern was raised that the curriculum would not guarantee enough Arts subjects would be studied in secondary school. In particular the reference to ‘one or more’ subjects needing to be studied was of concern as this may result in only one being taught.

Suggestions

Suggested improvements included expanding the band descriptions to demonstrate the breadth of students’ potential for learning in the Arts.

Other improvements corresponded to the concerns outlined above. For example, several respondents called for individual year level descriptions rather than two-year bands. This occurred particularly in the Foundation to Year 2 band which contains the first three years of schooling.

Size of bands – F–2 band is too broad. Social, cognitive and motor development over this three-year period cannot be met by a common set of band and content descriptions and elaborations. (WA School Curriculum and Standards Authority)

Why is it that other curriculum areas are assessed annually but the Arts is assessed at the end of a two- or three-year band. I expect students to be assessed and reported on annually. (Teacher, QLD)

A scope and sequence is needed to break down into K (Foundation), 1 & 2. (Primary teacher, WA)

There is a need for work samples that include audio and visual – for every year group. (Association of Independent Schools, WA)

The achievement standards need to be teased for each year level so there is a statement for each individual year from Foundation to Year 10. (Teacher, VIC)

It would be more helpful to teachers to have year-by-year level descriptions, rather than an overly general category or band of ages. The current proposal allows for a vague and unfocused approach to content delivery. Further
comments regarding groupings of years into bands of learning is identified in individual Arts subjects. (Kodály Music Education Institute of Australia)

The body of musical knowledge is not different to any other subject area and to write a document across two- and three-year levels rather than at every year level suggests this is not the case. (Music specialist teacher, VIC)

The three or two year durations of the bands make it difficult to specify expected progress and outcomes. There should be annual achievement standards and assessments as in other subjects. (Music Council of Australia)

Achievement standards

Strengths

Feedback from a number of respondents suggested that explanation about the achievement standards was clear and appropriate.

Concerns

A number of the concerns regarding achievement standards match those already summarised in section 3.4 above. Further concerns included a view that the distinctive practices of each subject were not reflected in the document. A number of comments expressed a view that the standards were too generic and not sufficiently detailed.

Suggestions

Many of the suggested improvements picked up on concerns and suggestions summarised above. One respondent recommended improvements towards making the text more specific in the context of social inclusion objectives:

There is a positive opportunity for this Australian Arts curriculum to undertake innovative work in developing staged achievement standards in each art form. These must not be generic and [should] provide opportunities for those less advantaged (e.g. marginalised groups of students who are not able to access the arts outside school such as refugees, recent migrants whose first language is not English, students dealing with poverty) to actually demonstrate their achievements in arts making and responding. (Academic, School of Education, University of SA)

Some respondents indicated preference for a rubric style of standard rather than the prose achievement standard. Commentary also indicated confusion about the use of the A–E grading scale for Phase One learning areas and were not specifically identified in the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts.

Diversity of learners

Strengths

Several survey respondents commented that the draft curriculum was clear and gave appropriate acknowledgement to the diverse needs of learners throughout Australia.
The recognition and discussion of the diversity of learners is applauded. (Academic, VIC)

I like that the curriculum allows teachers to be flexible and autonomous in their planning, but this brings its own challenges which can only be met by ensuring the high calibre of people entering the teaching profession, and the high quality of pre-service training and professional development. I am also pleased about the inclusion of adjustments for students with a disability. (Music teacher, specialist school, QLD)

The description of working with the diverse needs of students provides clear guidelines for implementation. (Brisbane Catholic Education Office, QLD)

We believe this is a strong and inclusive section of the document which is clear and easily understandable. (Drama Queensland)

Concerns of survey respondents often related to how teachers will cater for diversity of learners in practice. It was felt that the curriculum did not provide sufficient guidance on the practicalities of implementing the curriculum among a diverse cohort of learners.

There is no guidance or direction indicated for differentiated learning. (Secondary teacher, WA)

Suggestions

Improvements suggested by survey respondents mainly related to providing additional guidance and support to teachers to assist them in implementing the curriculum and ensuring its objectives regarding diversity of learners were achieved. Suggestions included providing practical examples and support materials.

General capabilities

Generally more than 60 per cent of the survey respondents agreed with the explanations of the seven general capabilities. Regarding the literacy component, a survey respondent commented that:

...each Arts strand has their own literacies which need to be respected. It is not just about written literacies which is highlighted here. (Arts educator, Vic)

Regarding the numeracy component, a respondent noted that while, ‘numeracy can help to plan, design, create, analyse and evaluate artworks, it is not required to do this effectively’. (Secondary school leader, WA)

Survey respondents made a number of comments which suggested that each general capability could have been worded more distinctly to suit the Arts. Several comments also suggested that the general capabilities did not include adequate subject-specific references or example:

the value of subjects such as Music and Dance which have their own language is not mentioned. (Secondary school teacher, SA)
Cross-curriculum priorities

For each of the cross-curriculum priorities there was feedback from survey respondents questioning if the level of detail provided was sufficient to demonstrate that the inclusion of this content was of substance, and not merely symbolic or tokenistic.

_The first paragraph is essential in outlining the varying presence of each of the cross-curriculum priorities in each subject. It is important to maintain the integrity of each subject whilst exploring the cross-curriculum links._

(Secondary teacher, NSW)

Survey respondents also commented that the link between these cross-curriculum areas and classroom practices was not necessarily clear.

_Whilst it is important to understand these issues again it is more important to address and present these issues in a meaningful way in the curriculum._

(Secondary teacher, QLD)

_The relationship between Sustainability and the Arts is by no means clear from this description. As a mature classroom teacher I cannot see how this would look in my classroom._

(Secondary school teacher, SA)

_Inclusion of cross–curriculum priorities are not always contextually relevant and don't clearly express a valuable purpose or relevance to the learning context._

(Secondary teacher, QLD)

Links to other learning areas

56 per cent of survey respondents agreed that the links to other learning areas were appropriate.

**Strengths**

One education authority felt that this section ‘actively encourages teachers to use arts pedagogies in other subject areas’. (ACT Education and Training Directorate) Primary teachers were more supportive than secondary teachers, reflecting the generalist primary teacher’s work across learning areas.

**Concerns**

A number of survey respondents, secondary teachers in particular, felt that links to other subjects were either superficial or inadequately explained. Additional commentary within feedback for each Arts subject indicated the specific content description about linking to other Arts subjects and other learning areas was perceived as unnecessary.

_It is not appropriate to include only phase 1 subjects in the links to other learning areas. This misrepresents these subjects as more important in the curriculum. If this section is included, it should include all Australian Curriculum subjects._

(Secondary teacher, WA)

Several respondents also felt the section added little and was unnecessary. Some of these respondents felt that the inclusion of the section diminished the value of the Arts, because it
was seeking to explain its position as a learning area through reference to other disciplines, which did not necessarily reciprocate in their own curriculum by referring to the Arts.

**Suggestions**

A number of survey respondents suggested that the links to other learning areas required additional detail to be made more useful and meaningful.

*These are linked by concepts, knowledge, skills and techniques; however, only some Arts subjects are referred to in each link. These should be provided across all content descriptions and elaborations.* (Secondary teacher, WA)

*These links, as with those of general capabilities, need more specific embedding in the subject-specific areas of the document once again to provide advocacy for the integral nature of our subjects and to survive the push for the dominance of English, Maths, Science and History in the National Curriculum.* (Australian Society for Music Education)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>States/ Territories/ Professional Teacher Associations (as listed in Appendix 3)</th>
<th>Specific matters needing attention</th>
<th>ACARA’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Primary years</td>
<td>NSW, NT, QLD, SA, TAS, VIC, WA APPA, Drama Australia, VADEA/AEA,</td>
<td>Too much content to cover across the five Arts subjects and content detail not always clearly articulated</td>
<td>Revised content descriptions to four in each band (F–2, 3–4, 5–6) in each Arts subject: three focusing on Making and one focusing on Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>References to ‘play’ in F–2 should be changed to ‘intentional’ or ‘purposeful’ play</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit content descriptions to ensure play is clearly seen as ‘purposeful’, as per EYLF definition of play-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and responding strands</td>
<td>ACT, NT, QLD, SA, WA Drama Australia Note: TAS DET did not have a concern with the organising strands</td>
<td>Use of the Making and Responding strands creates unnecessary duplication and contributes to the perception of too much content</td>
<td></td>
<td>While maintaining the Making and Responding strands, rework the organisation around Making and Responding to explain links between the strands in obvious ways, emphasising that the processes associated with each are interdependent. Refer to specific connections between Making and Responding on ‘Learning in &lt;subject” section in each Arts subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other learning areas</td>
<td>VADEA</td>
<td>Descriptions in Links to other learning areas section are superficial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review digital layout and use hyperlinks to content descriptions in other learning areas where relevant. Work more specific summary of potential relationships with other learning areas and Arts subjects into ‘Implications for teaching’ and/or ‘Links with other learning areas’ sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement standards</td>
<td>VIC, Drama Australia, WA, NSW</td>
<td>The expectations in the achievement standards are realistic but are too</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review achievement standards for more specificity in keeping with the agreed model (understanding and skills). A framework for achievement standards is being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>States/ Territories/ Professional Teacher Associations (as listed in Appendix 3)</td>
<td>Specific matters needing attention</td>
<td>ACARA's response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-curriculum priorities</td>
<td>Cross-curriculum priorities</td>
<td>NT, WA, VIC, ACT, NSW VADEA/AEV</td>
<td>Cross-curriculum priorities need to be better developed and integrated across the five subjects</td>
<td>While references to all cultures are apparent, include specific references to cross-curriculum priorities, i.e. dance content elaborations discussing specific Asian and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander dance practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about cultural appropriateness or sensitivity for suggestion of 'adopting other peoples' stories in cross-curriculum priorities</td>
<td>Seek advice from ACARA's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Group to develop protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General capabilities</td>
<td>General capabilities</td>
<td>VADEA</td>
<td>General capabilities references are too general and should place more emphasis on critical and creative thinking in the Arts subjects</td>
<td>Revise general capabilities section to describe specifically general capabilities in individual Arts subjects. Strengthen the inclusion of general capabilities in the content elaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band descriptions</td>
<td>Band descriptions</td>
<td>NT, WA</td>
<td>Band descriptions are too repetitive and need to be succinct and specific to the art form’s knowledge, understanding and skills</td>
<td>Apply a more consistent framework for band descriptions. Remove repetitive inclusions, e.g. references to safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>States/ Territories/ Professional Teacher Associations (as listed in Appendix 3)</td>
<td>Specific matters needing attention</td>
<td>ACARA’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other            | Glossary    | NSW, WA AEA, ASME, VADEA                                                        | Separate glossary is needed for each Arts subject | While one glossary across all five art forms will remain in place, when there is a difference in definitions across art forms, clearly explain the difference e.g. **Projection:**  
  - *in Dance, the communication of meaning through extension and focus of the body*  
  - *in Drama, the effect loudness of the voice of an actor* |
<p>| | | | | |
|                  |             |                                                                                 |                                   |                  |
| Editorial        |             | ACT, NSW, NT, QLD, SA, VIC, WA AEA, APPA, ASME, ATOM, AUSDANCE, VADEA            | Language is not consistent across bands within Arts subjects, i.e. use of: ‘art form’, ‘Arts subjects’, ‘artwork’ ‘arts works’ | Ensure consistency through professional editorial process |
|                  |             |                                                                                 |                                   |                  |
| Across subjects  | Historical context | WA, NSW, NT AEA/VADEA                                                            | The place of historical context and critical analysis needs strengthening | Strengthen references to critical analysis in the Responding content descriptions and clarify the nature of the key questions/viewpoints/perspectives as well as the expectation that students critically analyse their own work and the work of others |
|                  | Audience    | WA (In a lot of survey commentary) Noted by: AEA, VADEA AUSDANCE, ASME Drama Australia, ATOM | Learning to be an audience | Include content on developing critical audience skills, and the skills needed to be a ‘good’ audience. Placing students in situations where they are an audience will however ultimately be a school’s responsibility |
|                  | Skills vs. techniques | APPA                                                                  | Distinction between skills and techniques is not clear | Explain the difference between skills and techniques in ‘Learning in &lt;subject&gt;’ section in each Arts subject |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>States/ Territories/ Professional Teacher Associations (as listed in Appendix 3)</th>
<th>Specific matters needing attention</th>
<th>ACARA’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-specific</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>WA, Drama Australia</td>
<td>The importance of practising skills needs greater prominence</td>
<td>‘Practising’ to develop and refine skills is now present in the rationale and in several band descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIC, Drama Australia</td>
<td>Essential dance skills are not clearly identified</td>
<td>Revise to show the distinction between skills and techniques and how the curriculum demonstrates sequential development. Refer to fundamental skills (technical and expressive) in ‘Learning in Dance’ section, and include sequential development in elaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Rationale does not articulate what is unique to Drama</td>
<td>Review and revise Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA, Drama Australia</td>
<td>Band descriptions are not specific to the content for the relevant years and some things are missing from the content, i.e. collaborative nature of Drama</td>
<td>Revise content descriptions to be more specific, but still allow for flexibility in implementation. Revise band descriptions to be more specific to the Drama content in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drama Australia</td>
<td>Some elements are not clear, due to problems with the language used</td>
<td>Review and revise definitions of elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Media Arts does not reflect best practice and 21st century thinking. It is based on a narrow focus and understanding</td>
<td>Revise Media Arts rationale and ‘Learning in Media Arts’ section to better reflect this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>States/ Territories/ Professional Teacher Associations (as listed in Appendix 3)</td>
<td>Specific matters needing attention</td>
<td>ACARA’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Overly complex across all bands</td>
<td>Revise ‘Learning in Media Arts’ to explain ‘elements’ for primary generalist access and consistency across Arts subjects. Revise band descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Pitched too high, particularly for primary</td>
<td>Revise aims and some content descriptions to address concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Too much content across bands</td>
<td>Reduce number of content descriptions across F–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Over-representation of cross-curriculum priorities in some content descriptions</td>
<td>Review and revise as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA, ATOM NSW</td>
<td>Too technical and not enough creativity and critical thinking</td>
<td>Review content descriptions and ‘Learning in Media Arts’ section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>WA, NT, NSW, ASME, MCA</td>
<td>The elements are not clearly defined and ‘duration’ is not suitable as an element</td>
<td>Revise elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NT WA, ASME, MCA</td>
<td>Lack of clear sequential developmental continuum</td>
<td>Revise content descriptions to include a clear focus on: aural skills, composition, performance and notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NSW, NT</td>
<td>Imbalance of performance and practice</td>
<td>Revise Rationale, ‘Learning in Music’ section and content descriptions to describe distinction between skills and techniques and how the curriculum demonstrates sequential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>States/ Territories/ Professional Teacher Associations (as listed in Appendix 3)</td>
<td>Specific matters needing attention</td>
<td>ACARA’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>NT, NSW, WA ASME, MCA</td>
<td>No reference to notation</td>
<td>Review the use of the phrase ‘record and share’ while making specific references to notation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NT, NSW, SA, TAS, VIC, WA AEA, VADEA</td>
<td>The Learning in Visual Arts section is unclear, requiring a clearer definition of Visual Arts content and naming of the concepts, skills and processes</td>
<td>Revise this section to include a clearer explanation of Visual Arts content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW, WA AEA</td>
<td>Rationale and aims are vague</td>
<td>Review and reword Rationale and Aims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIC, WA AEA, VADEA</td>
<td>The content descriptions are wordy, too broad and repetitive</td>
<td>Revise content descriptions to include more specific arts practices in primary elaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AEA, VADEA</td>
<td>Achievement standards are too generic</td>
<td>Revise achievement standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AEA, ADDA, Drama Australia</td>
<td>Design is not clearly evident</td>
<td>Include a definition of design in ‘Learning in the Arts’ section. Revise content descriptions to include references to design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below summarises the percentages of respondents to the online survey regarding Dance who agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement. An analysis of feedback on each section of the survey with feedback from the written submissions is presented in the following pages.

Responses to survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total surveys completed: 16 (245 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. response s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALE AND AIMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Dance rationale provides a clear foundation and direction for the draft Australian Curriculum in Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Dance aims describe the intended learning in the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING IN DANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The two-strand structure Making and Responding is clearly explained for Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The elements of Dance are clearly explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATION TO YEAR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total surveys completed: 16 (245 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance by the end of Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 3 AND 4**

Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Dance by the end of Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 5 AND 6**

Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. The draft content description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students undertaking these units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Dance by the end of Year 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 7 AND 8

Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

29. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total surveys completed: 16 (245 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Dance by the end of Year 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 9 AND 10**

- **Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Dance by the end of Year 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DANCE ACROSS FOUNDATION TO YEAR 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Across the band levels for Dance, draft content descriptions cover the important learning for this subject</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Across the band levels for Dance, draft content descriptions show appropriate progression of knowledge, understanding and skills)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 17 respondents to the Dance section of the survey which is representative of 255 participants, including the Department of Education and Training, SA survey response which represents 200 participants. Respondents were more supportive of the draft Dance curriculum than respondents for the other Arts subjects.

**Rationale and aims**

**Strengths**

The majority of survey respondents (more than 70%) agreed that the rationale provided a clear foundation for the subject and that the aims for Dance described the intended learning. Several written submissions observed that the rationale and aims of the draft Dance curriculum clearly convey that an aim of Dance is to enrich student life. Dance is seen as an avenue for communication and engagement, enriching social, emotional and physical experiences.

Respondents indicated that the aims of the draft Dance curriculum were easy to understand. The focus on technical and expressive skills was also identified as a strength.

Regarding the rationale of the draft Dance curriculum, respondents observed that the rationale provided the teacher with considerable flexibility.

**Concerns**

A comment received on the aims of the draft Dance curriculum suggested that support documents will be needed to assist teachers in achieving all of the content with students.

Another comment was concerned that the draft Dance curriculum only catered for solo dancing and, consequently, did not cater for a wide enough range of dance types.

There was also a view that an explanation of how an understanding of dance helps all other art forms should be included in the rationale and that Dance did not seem to be linked clearly to other learning areas.
**Suggestions**

A number of suggested improvements to the aims of the draft Dance curriculum were put forward in survey responses:

- include an aim of safe dance practice
- include the development of ‘confidence and self–esteem to understand human experience through movement’, and ‘understanding of both onstage and offstage roles’ as aims.

On the topic of safety, written submissions from two education authorities observed that Dance involves a range of safety risks so teachers need to be informed about safe warm-up and performance management. It was noted that as this is not part of training or experience for most primary teachers, it is important to have safety aspects included.

Regarding the rationale, a respondent suggested that giving student’s specific dance skills should be mentioned, specifically a ‘logical, sequential content that draws aspects from several dance genres’.

A written submission suggested that the rationale needed a stronger statement regarding the importance of Dance in a child’s education. A similar suggestion from the survey was that the rationale should mention how Dance supports the study of other Arts subjects.

Two written submissions suggested that under aims in the Making section there should be an explicit statement that choreographing and performing are of equal importance.

**Learning in Dance**

**Strengths**

Survey respondents indicated that the elements of Dance were easy to understand and a strength of the draft Dance curriculum.

**Concerns**

Comments received through survey responses questioned only having two strands, Making and Responding. It was suggested that a third strand, such as performing or presenting, would be appropriate.

Similarly, another comment suggested that performance should be included as a separate organising strand.

Another respondent expanded on this theme:

> Only two strands are given – Making and Responding. One of the key aspects of dance is presenting what has been created. This is a unique process requiring a set of skills, different to those required when making and responding. There may also be a perception that making and responding are equally weighted. It would be a great injustice if half a dance course was theoretical and the other half was practical. There is no mention of technical and expressive skills in the body section. Ensure the three strands are weighted one-third each. (Teacher, QLD)
It was also suggested that there needs to be a stronger description of the breadth of the elements.

**Suggestions**

Survey respondents suggested a number of improvements in the Learning in Dance component of the draft Dance curriculum.

In Space it was suggested that choreographic structure and use of choreographic devices be added. It was also observed that non-movement components such as costume could be more clearly represented.

Clarity was sought as to whether the phrase ‘elements of dance’ must be used by teachers.

One respondent suggested that ballroom and its genres be included as an alternative syllabus to be implemented in schools by qualified coaches.

**Foundation to Year 6 content**

The majority of survey respondents (70%) agreed the band descriptions, content descriptions and content elaborations were clear and appropriate.

**Strengths**

Several written submissions observed that, overall, the band descriptions in the draft Dance curriculum were clear and covered the breadth of the Arts subject.

**Concerns**

Of the comments received through the survey regarding concerns with the Years 3 and 4 levels, one respondent felt the content descriptions differed little from the F–2 content descriptions. Two respondents observed they would like a summary section to be provided. One respondent felt the band descriptions did not clearly match the content descriptions (a similar comment was made for other year levels).

Regarding content descriptions, two respondents questioned if the number of outcomes was too ambitious. One respondent suggested that safety could require a separate outcome.

Two written submissions, including one from a teacher, observed that vocabulary and technical and expressive skills required beyond F–2 would be difficult for non-specialist/generalist primary teachers.

Regarding content elaborations, one respondent felt that the level of technical language may not be appropriate for primary teachers beyond Year 2. This comment was also made regarding content descriptions for Years 5 and 6.

Regarding the Years 5 and 6 band description, there was a comment that further detail was required regarding the development of understanding, skills and outcomes to distinguish it from the previous band.
Regarding the Years 5 and 6 content elaborations, it was suggested that students should be taught some of the conventional movements and steps used in dance. Otherwise, they will be at a distinct disadvantage when choreographing and performing.

**Suggestions**

Regarding band descriptions, it was suggested that specific reference be made to professional dance works.

In relation to the content descriptions a number of editorial suggestions were provided. These included that 4.1 needs further explanation, and that warming up and cooling down should be included in all bands, whereas currently it is stated in 4.4.

At the Years 5 and 6 band, minor amendments to wording were suggested for the achievement standards, band description, content description and content elaboration. For content descriptions, a respondent questioned the use of the term of ‘choreographic devices’, although an alternative was not specified.

**Foundation to Year 6 achievement standards**

**Strengths**

The majority of survey respondents agreed the achievement standards for the primary bands were clear and appropriate. Several written submissions from both education authorities and a significant dance company stated that achievement standards for Foundation to Year 6 were realistic and met expectations.

Comments received through the survey regarding strengths of the Years 5 and 6 band of the draft Dance curriculum indicated that the achievement standards would allow flexibility for the teacher. It was observed that the content description, particularly 6.1, was ‘very well expressed’.

**Concerns**

Three written submissions, from both education authorities and a dance company, suggested that achievement standards could be better aligned with content descriptions.

Some written submissions were concerned about how the achievement standards would be reached within the timeframe. Of the comments received through the survey regarding concerns with the Years 5 and 6 band, one respondent considered that the achievement standards were not specific enough in defining the standard of attainment.

**Suggestions**

Survey respondents suggested a number of improvements. For the Years 3 and 4 band, in response to the achievement standards, there was a view that further description is needed for the generalist teacher.
Years 7 to 10 content

Strengths

Several written submissions observed that, overall, the band descriptions in the draft Dance curriculum were clear and covered the breadth of the subject. The transitions between bands were complimented for being logical and well-connected. A respondent commented that:

…it is obvious that the evaluation process from the first draft has been productive … the rigour is more apparent. (Secondary teacher, Catholic Education Office, NSW)

Comments received through the survey indicated the Years 7 and 8 band description was clear and understandable.

Respondents endorsed the relevance and usefulness of the examples provided in the content elaborations. One respondent stated that they particularly liked the inclusion of ‘developing personal goals for improving dance skills’.

Regarding the content in the Years 9 and 10 band, respondents felt that these were ‘well-written’ and provided an ‘excellent guide for teachers’.

Concerns

Regarding the Years 7 and 8 content descriptions, a respondent observed that the process of abstraction was frequently misunderstood by both teachers and students, and it therefore deserved a careful explanation.

Comments received through the survey regarding concerns with the Years 9 and 10 band were limited. Those made mirrored points relating to Years 7 and 8.

Suggestions

Two written submissions, including one from a teacher, suggested that content descriptions and elaborations need more clarity for Years 7 to 10. They indicated that this will be particularly valuable for generalist teachers.

Regarding band descriptions and content descriptions, some suggestions were made.

- specifically on content description one respondent felt that, in the band for Years 7 and 8, students should be continuing to experience improvisation

- another comment suggested that a focus on the interrelation of the elements of dance to create meaning would be better at this point

- another respondent observed that ‘musicality is missing from all band levels’ and suggested this be addressed.

A respondent asked that onstage and offstage roles be added to content descriptions and elaborations, since these are an integral part of dance performance.
With regard to content elaborations, a respondent observed that technical proficiency and dance styles were mentioned, but again, a defined set of movements and technique would enhance students’ sense of accomplishment.

It was also suggested that reference could be made to stagecraft and theatre conventions as they relate to dance. A number of other additions were suggested, including ‘lighting’ and ‘understanding differing tempos and time signatures to develop musicality’.

In response to the Years 9 and 10 band description, it was suggested that basic dance anatomy and a more sophisticated knowledge of safe dance practice could be included earlier on and more explicitly.

For content elaborations, a respondent suggested that technical skills and movements for a selection of dance styles should be explicitly listed for this band.

A number of specific suggested additions were put forward including ‘strength, balance, alignment’, ‘flexibility’, ‘costumes’ and ‘describe and interpret movement and non-movement elements’.

Years 7 to 10 achievement standards

Strengths

Comments received through the survey regarding the Years 7 and 8 band of the draft Dance curriculum suggested that the achievement standards gave scope for flexibility within the band.

Equally there was reasonable support for the achievement standard for the Years 9 and 10 band.

Concerns

Comments received through the survey regarding concerns with the achievement standards of the Years 7 and 8 band included a view that the standards were achievable but more clarity was needed.

There was a view that aspects of the achievement standards may be challenging by the end of Year 8 if that was the first year of Dance for students.

Suggestions

Additional commentary from respondents suggested improvements to the achievement standards for the Years 7 and 8 band and suggested that more examples were needed.

Comments received through the survey regarding improvements to the achievement standards for the Years 9 and 10 band suggested including how dance and its outcomes are affected by soundscapes and technologies.

A written submission from an education authority suggested that the achievement standards for the Years 9 and 10 band needed to indicate the depth of challenge and progression at this stage.
Implementation issues

Another respondent emphasised that they would like to see a comprehensive Dance curriculum that is strongly content-based, because students want to learn how to dance.

A number of written submissions, including one from a teacher, stated that generalist primary school teachers need the strong support of assessment tools, rubrics, checklists and work samples. The need for support documents to accompany the curriculum was also emphasised in several survey comments.

Similarly, several written submissions from both education authorities and a significant dance company stated that teachers need appropriate protocols associated with fulfilling content related to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Perspectives by state and territory

The table below summarises feedback provided by states and territories regarding key themes and perspectives (i.e. strengths, concerns and suggestions for improvement) in relation to the draft curriculum for Dance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Concern over the adequacy of two strands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Suggestion of a third strand to accommodate the presenting or performing of dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW SOUTH WALES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Language used is clear and engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There has been progression from the shaping paper, and the draft Australian Curriculum: Dance improves on aspects of existing state curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There is not enough of a link to other key learning areas across the draft Australian Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers will need a mixture of support and tools to assist the successful implementation of the Dance Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Language could be further refined and more specific to dance, particularly in the definition and understanding of the elements of dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHERN TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Clear language that articulates the value of dance and the distinct features of it as an area of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEENSLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum: Dance will be useful for generalist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an appropriate focus on the technical and expressive skills of dance throughout the document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Two strands are not sufficient to organise the learning of Dance. A third strand – Presenting – is needed to capture the unique nature of dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The focus on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Asian perspectives will need significant support and training for teachers if it is to be properly implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern/Improvement</td>
<td>Key perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improvement | There is capacity for higher-order language and terminology  
The intellectual and academic aspects of Dance could be further emphasised  
There is more detail required in defining the elements, particularly to assist generalist teachers understand them  
There could be greater consistency of language throughout the bands |
| SOUTH AUSTRALIA | |
| Strength | There is a clear rationale with links to broader learning, development and wellbeing  
The draft Australian Curriculum is easy to understand |
| Improvement | The connections to broader learning, development, self-esteem, confidence and self-expression could be more explicit throughout the draft Australian Curriculum  
The intellectual rigour associated with learning Dance needs to be made more clear  
More detail on the specific elements of Dance will be required to support generalist teachers  
There should be a more explicit reference to the musical elements of dance throughout the draft Australian Curriculum |
| TASMANIA | |
| Concern | The F–6 bands need more structure and specific examples to assist generalist teachers implement the curriculum and assess students |
| Improvement | There should be more specific dance language and terminology used throughout the draft Australian Curriculum  
There should be more emphasis on the skills-based aspects of dance, incorporating creative exploration of movement and structured and sequential learning |
| VICTORIA | |
| Concern | There is too much emphasis on solo dance, which could have an effect on Dance’s appeal to male students  
The two strands of learning are not necessarily appropriate to all genres of dance. Not all genres fit neatly with sequential learning |
| Improvement | More specific detail is needed to assist in understanding the elements of Dance. This also applies to the definitions provided in the glossary |
| WESTERN AUSTRALIA | |
| Strength | The draft Australian Curriculum is well-written. It is flexible and adaptable to implement |
| Concern | There should be a greater emphasis on particular dance genres within the draft Australian Curriculum |
| Improvement | The wording about safe practices could be included in the aims of the subject  
More detail is required about the elements of Dance  
Learning in Years 7 and 8 could be more challenging – to assist students as they move into more specialist study in Year 9 and beyond |
5. CONSULTATION FINDINGS - DRAMA

The table below summarises the percentages of respondents to the online survey regarding Drama who agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement. An analysis of feedback on each section of the survey with feedback from the written submissions is presented in the following pages.

Responses to survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIONALE AND AIMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Drama rationale provides a clear foundation and direction for the draft Australian Curriculum in Drama</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Drama aims describe the intended learning in the subject</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING IN DRAMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The two-strand structure Making and Responding is clearly explained for Drama</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The elements of Drama are clearly explained</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOUNDATION TO YEAR 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>No. responses</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama by the end of Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 3 AND 4
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama by the end of Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 5 AND 6
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>No. response</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The draft content description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students undertaking these units</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Drama by the end of Year 6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 7 AND 8**

Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. response</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total surveys completed: 44 (328 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. response</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Drama by the end of Year 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 9 AND 10
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. response</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Drama by the end of Year 10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAMA ACROSS FOUNDATION TO YEAR 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. response</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Across the band levels for Drama, draft content descriptions cover the important learning for this subject</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Across the band levels for Drama, draft content descriptions show appropriate progression of knowledge, understanding and skills</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 44 respondents to the Drama section of the survey which is representative of 328 participants.

Rationale and aims

**Strengths**

In response to the survey, 85 per cent of respondents agreed that the rationale provided a clear foundation for the subject and 76 per cent of survey respondents agreed that the aims for Drama described the intended learning.

Several written submissions observed that the rationale for Drama was broad, yet it provided a comprehensive description and explanation of the subject. Comments received through the survey regarding strengths of the aims of the draft Drama curriculum included that it had ‘clear and well-written aims’.

A number of respondents commented that the rationale was clear, effective and comprehensive. They endorsed the choice of language as accessible and understandable. A respondent described the rationale as an ‘excellent summary’.

A respondent ‘liked the inclusion that the study of … drama … is a joyful experience’. Another respondent said that the mention of joy captured ‘something of the reason why we study the subject’. Another respondent felt the draft curriculum was broad, ‘but necessarily so, given the wide range of abilities … that a teacher can expect to encounter’. There was support for the ‘acknowledgement of each art form and their own skills, techniques and processes’.

**Concerns**

Regarding the rationale of the draft Drama curriculum, more comment was received about the use of ‘emotive words’ such as ‘enjoy’ and ‘exciting’. A respondent who dislikes these phrases observed that including them denigrates drama, relegating it to a ‘fun, happy’ subject, rather than suggesting academic rigour. A concern was raised that the rationale did not describe what is unique to drama as an art form. One respondent felt that:

> … the idea of Drama being a collaborative learning place is not highlighted substantially enough in the rationale. (Secondary teacher, QLD)
Comments received through the survey regarding concerns about the aims of the draft Drama curriculum included that there should be an aim to ‘develop students’ knowledge and understanding of drama’. Connection and engagement were identified as more appropriate terms.

Another respondent was concerned that Arts subjects combined into one learning area resulted in the Drama aims being clouded by the aims of the Arts learning area. This concern was also raised in relation to the rationale.

**Suggestions**

Some submissions, including from a teacher and a school drama department, observed that the notion of aesthetic knowledge is central to Drama, and this should be recognised in the rationale. A respondent indicated that the rationale should talk about the uniqueness and the unique qualities of the subject of Drama. A number of respondents felt there should be a stronger focus on the collaborative nature of the art form. There was also a view that higher order thinking skills need to be mentioned and it was also suggested that a stronger focus on a set of specific skills would be helpful for each two-year band of learning.

A number of respondents made suggestions about reordering dot points within the aims to better align them with the values and aims of drama teaching. The quote below is indicative of these suggestions.

*Aesthetic knowledge needs to come first. It is important that the aims regarding Making and Responding need to be clearly articulated. Core content and elements of drama need stronger explanation re knowledge and understanding. The context, purpose and different perspectives is missing. Self-esteem and confidence need to be one of the first points – these are essential. It must mention and highlight that students learn by experience – experientially.* (Secondary school teacher, NSW)

Further suggestions were:

- there should be ‘equal amounts of the knowledge of drama and the application of drama’
- more focus placed on voice and movement
- rebalance the discussion of contemporary and traditional art forms, as it currently reads as having a greater focus on the contemporary. However, another survey respondent stated that students do not need knowledge of traditional and contemporary drama in primary school, so this should not be referred to at this stage
- the rationale should state that drama is an overarching art form that is inclusive of movement, dance, music
- greater emphasis needs to be placed on the ‘inherent value of role play, and in stepping into another person’s shoes to explore new ways of seeing, knowing, thinking about and understanding our world’. 
Learning in Drama

Strengths

Eighty-five per cent of survey respondents agreed that the two-strand structure *Making* and *Responding* was clearly explained for Drama. Seventy-two per cent of survey respondents agreed that the elements of Drama were clearly explained. A number of respondents commented on the clarity of the document. In particular, the elements of drama were viewed as being clearly defined.

There was support for moving to two strands rather than the current three strands in place in NSW. One respondent commented on this point as follows:

*I don’t mind that performing is subsumed into Making and Responding. The critical component of audience is better conceptualised in the whole process of the creating of dramatic meaning.* (Teacher, NSW)

Concerns

There was also concern raised about the two-strand *Making* and *Responding* structure. A respondent felt this was an ‘oversimplification of drama learning’. The absence of performing as a third strand was seen as unnecessarily reductive and undermining of the purpose of drama making – to perform to a live audience.

Another comment was that compacting *Making* and *Responding* into two areas of content devalued the current content of making, performing and appreciating.

Other concerns were raised about aspects of terminology or emphasis. For example, a number of respondents questioned why certain dramatic elements were not included while ‘tension’ was. Several respondents felt that the elements of drama had not been captured well and there were significant gaps.

Suggestions

A number of improvements suggested by survey respondents referred to *Making* and *Responding*. For example:

- *Making* and *Responding* need fleshing out to cover how performing/presenting fit in
- it should be clear that the *Making* strand has to cover the large components of creating (planning, preparing) and presenting so should have twice the emphasis and descriptions compared with the *Responding* strand
- *Making* involves students planning, preparing and presenting. *Responding* involves students appreciating, reflecting, analysing and evaluating their own and others’ drama works
- the two strands relate well to drama but the descriptions of *Making* and *Responding* should include a sense of the shaping and sharing of the artwork
- *Making* should only mention presenting, not both presenting and performing
- in describing *Making*, focus should be on presenting not performing
- making and performing should be separate as they are very different skill sets.
Other suggestions included:

- adding stagecraft as a further element of Drama
- separating role and character as they are quite different
- improvisation or script should form part of the elements of Drama descriptions
- voice, language and aural sound dimension needs to be developed further.

There was also concern that audience had not been emphasised enough. One respondent felt that 'neglect of this makes this course read like an English-based course rather than a Performing Arts course'.

There was a view that the content descriptions lacked clarity and reflection and that critical evaluation should be included. Overall, the respondent felt the descriptions needed to reflect drama more specifically.

**Foundation to Year 6 content**

**Strengths**

A number of respondents commented that the band description was clear and appropriate. Positive comments were also received regarding content descriptions for this band. A survey respondent commented that the achievement standards for Foundation to Year 2 were detailed and specific to the band.

Across the draft F–2 curriculum, there was support for the examples provided in the elaborations. A teacher commented as follows:

> Well done! If I were a lower primary teacher it would be very clear to me what context to teach and what sort of activities might help me to teach that context. (Officer, Arts education provider, Theatre venue, NSW)

For Years 3 and 4 two survey respondents commented that the band descriptions were appropriate and cover the subject. The content descriptions and content elaborations were described by one respondent as ‘wonderful’.

For Years 5 and 6 the band description was seen by a number of respondents as offering clear guidelines. Draft content descriptions and draft content elaborations for Years 5 and 6 also received praise. One respondent commented that it is ‘very exciting to read the breadth of theatrical forms to be studied in this band’. (Arts educator, NSW)

**Concerns**

Several respondents felt the band description for Foundation to Year 2 was too wordy and repetitious. One comment was concerned about the lack of mention of designers. A related comment in response to content description also commented on the lack of design.

Content description feedback contained some comment about descriptions being too broad or vague. A specific concern was that the draft Drama curriculum did not provide primary teachers with an indication of how much they should teach drama as an explicit form, as distinct from using drama as pedagogy. A second comment also observed that ‘there needs to be clarity in defining form in Drama’. (Secondary teacher, NSW)
For the content elaborations, a concern was expressed regarding the ability of teachers to integrate other Art areas, especially in the earlier bands where access to specialists may be difficult.

Commentary suggested that most of the elaboration examples have no context, and are examples that very young children would use. It was felt that the examples in the elaborations needed to be better contextualised so that generalist teachers in particular would have some ideas about using these specific contexts.

Feedback on Years 3 and 4 suggested the band description needed significant revision, and the Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts offered a useful guide for this. There was limited commentary regarding concerns with the content descriptions, but one respondent suggested there was a ‘big jump conceptually’ from the Foundation to Year 2 band into the Years 3 and 4 band.

There was also a view that some of the content descriptions were repetitive and they did not reflect the sequence of skills and dramatic elements involved in the making/creating process.

There was a comment that the level of performance staging will be challenging for generalist classroom teachers.

**Suggestions**

At the Foundation to Year 2 level, survey respondents suggested the inclusion of guidance regarding assessment strategies and marking criteria. It was also stressed that the achievement standards needed to be explicitly linked to the band description. Some respondents had specific examples of objectives to illustrate this or improve clarity.

Similarly, for the Foundation to Year 2 band description; there was a suggestion that further guidance about what to teach was needed. It was also suggested that the text from the *Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts* replace the text in the draft Drama curriculum.

Content description and content elaboration feedback emphasised the importance of linking with other learning areas, including literature. There was also a view that Drama should place more emphasis on fictional and imagined texts.

At the Years 3 and 4 band, comments regarding the band description were similar to those referred to for Foundation to Year 2. It was also suggested that the impact of storytelling in both Aboriginal and Asian cultures should be included. A similar comment was made in response to content descriptions.

At the Years 5 and 6 band, feedback on the band description requested tightening of the descriptions of what students are expected to do. There was also support for revisiting the text of the Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts. Regarding Year 5 and 6 content descriptions and content elaborations, there were suggestions that these could be clearer and more streamlined. Additionally some respondents suggested an expanded use of examples. There was a view that the elaborations were ‘bland’ and needed to be made more evocative and interesting.
Foundation to Year 6 achievement standards

**Strengths**

More than 60 per cent of survey respondents found the achievement standards for the primary bands clear and pitched appropriately. For Foundation to Year 2, a number of respondents felt the achievement standards were somewhat vague. There was also a comment that the achievement standards did not adequately reference the key learning described in the content descriptions.

For the Years 5 and 6 achievement standard, there were again comments about using specific language and ensuring a clear link to the band description.

**Concerns**

Some written submissions felt that while the achievement standards mostly had appropriate clarity and pitch, they may present some challenges to generalist primary teachers at the earlier levels.

Years 7 to 10 content

**Strengths**

Comments provided by survey respondents on the Years 7 and 8 draft Drama curriculum, indicated the band description, content description and content elaboration were clear and comprehensive. The content descriptions were viewed as clear and appropriate. A comment on the content elaborations suggested they were particularly clear.

**Concerns**

Feedback regarding the band descriptions for Years 7 to 10 reiterated the strengths of the shape paper and referred back to that document. A comment regarding the content descriptions suggested that at this level students are more likely to be devising than scriptwriting.

One comment regarding content descriptions for the Years 7 and 8 band questioned if the curriculum was assuming that the students have had Drama experience in the previous years, suggesting that it might be too advanced for students who have not.

Feedback on content elaborations included a respondent asking why martial arts films should be included. They felt this would better belong in Media Arts.

Regarding the Years 9 and 10 draft Drama content, feedback on the band description raised concerns summarised above, particularly regarding the need for clarity, the use of the Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts, and the need to ensure high standards of rigour.

**Suggestions**

At the Years 7 and 8 band, improvements again suggested the need for more prominence for production roles and design. Survey feedback on the band description included a comment seeking greater prominence for script writing and working with scripted drama.
Although it is included in content descriptions respondents suggested it should be mentioned in the band description).

Feedback on content descriptions and elaborations highlighted the need for more concise language in some areas. One respondent strongly endorsed the use of ‘realistic and non-realistic’ performance styles.

Years 7 to 10 achievement standards

Strengths

Survey respondents found the Years 7 and 8 achievement standard was clear and comprehensive. Feedback on the Years 9 and 10 draft Drama content included an observation that the breadth of these achievement standards was an excellent approach. However, several comments regarding the achievement standards stressed the need for these to link back to the band description.

Concerns

Concerns raised in survey comments about the Years 7 and 8 achievement standards were similar to the concerns about the achievement standards for the primary years. In addition, one comment emphasised that achievement standards must articulate the achievement benchmark expected, and that a high level of achievement should be the benchmark. No specific concerns were identified for Years 9 and 10.

Suggestions

At the Years 7 and 8 band, improvements suggested the need for the achievement standard to link more clearly to the band description.

Implementation issues

Several comments expressed support for the draft Australian Curriculum: Drama.

Understanding that it will be expected that all schools will follow this curriculum I believe that the level of challenge is quite high but if all primary schools follow the curriculum, and there is adequate PD on implementing it across other learning areas in general classes, the high expectations in high school should be readily achievable. (Primary teacher, WA)

Concerns mainly related to being satisfied with the support that would be provided to teachers through learning materials, and the level of rigour that would be applied in implementing the curriculum.

Some guidance for schools as to how to implement this would be very useful. Many primary school generalist teachers are uncertain of their ability to cover the Arts without specialist help and, as things are, the schools cannot fund additional specialist teachers or fit them into already complex timetables. The desire is there but the hugely overcrowded curriculum is a big barrier. The document is good (and exciting!) but how do we put it into practice in a way
that will appropriately do justice to all the Arts disciplines while acknowledging the time needed for all the other curriculum areas. (Primary teacher, TAS)

Perspectives by state and territory

The table below summarises feedback provided by states and territories regarding key themes and perspectives (i.e. strengths, concerns and suggestions for improvement) in relation to the draft curriculum for Drama.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum is clear and understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>More explicit language could be used, particularly in the defining of the elements of Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW SOUTH WALES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Aims of the subject are clearly written and expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The emphasis on the joy of learning Drama is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The learning area is clear and appropriate, and there is support for the two-strand approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cross-curriculum focus is a strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The consultation process on the draft Australian Curriculum has been done well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>A concern that the rationale was more aligned with theatre than drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation issues were raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum could be more rigorous, particularly if it is going to challenge gifted and high-achieving students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There could be more emphasis on the theory and traditions of drama, better expressing the intellectual rigour of the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationale could be more concise and focused on articulating the uniqueness of drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The collaborative nature of drama needs to be better expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The language should be more specific to drama, particularly the articulation of the elements. Examples accompanying the elements should also be provided to assist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There could be a greater emphasis on both the experiential learning that Drama enables, as well as the clear sequencing of skills that are needed in the learning of Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was concern over the adequacy of the two strands to describe learning in Drama, with a suggestion that Creating could be added to the two strands to accompany Making and Responding. There could also be a greater articulation of the role of the audience in drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHERN TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Clear and concise language that is inclusive and promotes holistic learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>At times generic language does not detail the distinct genres, theory and practice that underpin Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Greater use of language and terminology that is specific to Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearer links to other learning areas, particularly History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern/Improvement</td>
<td>Key perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEENSLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum is broad but this allows flexibility and adaptability when implementing The two strands are appropriate to Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum could be clearer There is not enough emphasis on the collaborative nature of drama There is not enough emphasis on the academic rigour associated with learning Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There should be a greater emphasis on the academic rigour and intellectual nature of learning Drama There could be a greater balance between the contemporary and traditional art forms of drama There could be more of a focus on the broader learning and development outcomes associated with learning Drama More detail in the Making and Responding to drama is required to make them specific to Drama There could be a greater emphasis on presenting rather than performing The draft Australian Curriculum could be more student-focused in its language and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum is broad but this allows flexibility and adaptability when implementing The two strands are appropriate to Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There is not enough emphasis on the cross-curriculum connections Some concern over the definitions of elements and their application to the skills associated with Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There needs to be a greater balance between traditional and contemporary drama The curriculum needs to reflect that drama is an overarching art form that incorporates other movements and music There could be greater emphasis on the intellectual features of drama Specific detail and more engaging language would improve the curriculum and glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASMANIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum is accessible The consultation process has been appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There will be implementation issues, particularly for primary school teachers who will need guidance and training to deliver on the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There could be a greater emphasis on the intellectual rigour associated with the learning of Drama Language more specific to drama should be used throughout the curriculum Consideration of a drama-specific glossary is also warranted There could be greater consistency in the curriculum linking learning in Drama with the definitions of the elements of Drama A greater articulation of the two strands Making and Responding and their application for learning in Drama is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern/Improvement</td>
<td>Key perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTORIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Consideration of the adequacy of the two strands is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater clarity is also needed about the Drama elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTERN AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Properly implemented and supported, the draft Australian Curriculum will challenge students and lead to good learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>The Drama rationale needs to be more clearly differentiated from the broader Arts rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The clarity of the aims and rationale needs further work, with more explicit reference to broader development and learning associated with learning Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the Drama elements are not clear, with inconsistency between the definitions of the elements and their application in the content descriptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist teachers will require more guidance and assistance to effectively assess and grade students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. CONSULTATION FINDINGS – MEDIA ARTS

The table below summarises the percentages of respondents to the online survey regarding Media Arts who agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement. An analysis of feedback on each section of the survey with feedback from the written submissions is presented in the following pages.

#### Responses to survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIONALE AND AIMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Media Arts rationale provides a clear foundation and direction for the draft Australian Curriculum in Media Arts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Media Arts aims describe the intended learning in the subject (n=16)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING IN MEDIA ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The two-strand structure Making and Responding is clearly explained for Media Arts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The elements of Media Arts are clearly explained</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOUNDATION TO YEAR 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total surveys completed: 24 (60 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts by the end of Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 3 AND 4**
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts by the end of Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 5 AND 6**
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total surveys completed: 24 (60 participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUESTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The draft content description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students undertaking these units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Media Arts by the end of Year 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 7 AND 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUESTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total surveys completed: 24 (60 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts by the end of Year 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YEARS 9 AND 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Media Arts by the end of Year 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEDIA ARTS ACROSS FOUNDATION TO YEAR 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Across the band levels for Media Arts, draft content descriptions cover the important learning for this subject</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Across the band levels for Media Arts, draft content descriptions show appropriate progression of knowledge, understanding and skills</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 40 respondents to the Media Arts section of the survey which is representative of 60 participants

**Rationale and aims**

**Strengths**

Written submissions stated that the rationale gave clear direction to the scope of Media Arts, as it gave specific reference to different media types in the first sentence. Eighty-five per cent of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the rationale for Media Arts and commentary acknowledged Media Arts as an emerging art form that is constantly evolving.

Several respondents commented that the rationale was appropriate and covered essential aspects of Media Arts.

> The rationale provides a very clear understanding of the Media Arts subject and acknowledges that media is an emerging art form that is constantly evolving. (Queensland Catholic Education Commission)

The aims were reported as ‘succinct and achievable’. A survey respondent strongly endorsed the aims of the draft Media Arts curriculum:

> … this draft curriculum … [is] an exciting development for Australian education and recognises the innovation it brings to the school experience of all Australian children, providing mandatory Media Arts education for the first time. The group believes the curriculum is well-designed and covers the essential elements of education in Media Arts from Foundation to Year 10. The curriculum is designed in a manner that will allow the unique characteristics of Media Arts education to be implemented at the various stages of schooling. (Academic, Screen Content, Education and Media, Qld)

**Concerns**

Some respondents queried if the rationale for Media Arts could be made clearer.

> The rationale needs to define and make explicit the difference between Media Arts, Technologies and the ICT capabilities in order for Media Arts to stand in
Issues were raised regarding the aims of Media Arts, where in several written submissions it was stated that a higher sense of rigour is needed for older students. This was suggested in three written submissions, including two from education authorities and one from an individual.

Some respondents suggested that the aims also continue to outline activities that are intuitive rather than learned. It was suggested that the aims needed further clarification, particularly around cyber safety.

... also needs to include self-responsibility in cyber safety and security. (NT Department of Education and Training)

**Suggestions**

One respondent suggested the five key concepts that currently form the conceptual framework in Media Arts teaching could be more explicit in the rationale:

*The five key concepts which form the conceptual framework for Media Arts could be communicated more explicitly in the rationale and in the scope and sequence as a road map for generalist teachers in considering this subject.*

(Australian Teachers of Media, Qld)

**Learning in Media Arts**

**Strengths**

The majority of survey respondents indicated agreement with the organising strands of *Making* and *Responding* and with the elements in Media Arts. Written submissions indicated that the key concepts were clearly described and would be understood by a generalist teacher.

**Concerns**

A survey respondent suggested the meaning of ‘Media Arts’ was not explicitly defined.

Survey responses indicated concern that the apparent focus was on technical skills, and was ‘devoid of engaging with aesthetic choices in a media form to create a symbolic representation of personal experience’. (Australian Teachers of Media, NSW)

The written submissions raised concern at the use of the words ‘concepts’ and ‘codes’ rather than ‘elements’ as used for Learning in the other Arts subjects.

**Suggestions**

One submission suggested more art form specific terminology be included such as ‘designing, planning, producing, capturing and recording, choosing, combining and editing, representing and distributing’.
Respondents concerned with the use of the words ‘concepts’ and ‘codes’ rather than ‘elements’ suggested that it would help if there was consistent use of terminology such as, ‘elements’ across all the Arts subjects. A survey respondent thought that the codes and conventions could be better explained through the provision of more information and examples. One written submission regarding ‘concepts’ said:

*Codes and conventions is a narrow take on the art form. A suggestion would be to create a list of elements that include … rhythm, pace, space, timing, framing, composition. (ACT Education and Training Directorate)*

**Foundation to Year 6 content**

**Strengths**

For Foundation to Year 2, more than half (75%) of the respondents agreed the content descriptions were clear about what was to be taught and learned.

The band description for F–2 was described by a respondent as providing a ‘comprehensive overview to the nature of learning in the Media Arts in the early years’. (*Qld Catholic Education Authority*

Survey respondents described the content descriptions for F–2 as realistic and achievable, and content elaborations as drawing ‘well upon integration in other key learning areas’.

(*Primary teacher, NSW*)

For the Years 3 and 4 content descriptions, overall 64 per cent of respondents agreed that the content descriptions were clear about what was to be taught and learned and that the pitch was appropriate. Strong agreement was recorded from Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia.

Band descriptions at this level were considered straightforward and ‘cover[ed] the breadth of the subject’ (*Queensland Catholic Education Commission*). Content descriptions and elaborations were considered realistic, concise and clearly written.

*The content descriptions and elaborations are clear and pitched appropriately most of the time. (Australian Teachers of Media, QLD)*

For the Years 5 and 6 content descriptions, overall 60 per cent of respondents agreed that the content descriptions were clear about what was to be taught and learned and that the pitch was appropriate. Strong agreement was recorded from Qld and WA with disagreement noted from ACT, NSW and SA.

*The content descriptions and elaborations are clear and pitched appropriately most of the time. (Australian Teachers of Media, QLD)*

**Concerns**

A survey respondent expressed that content descriptions at the Foundation to Year 2 band ‘completely underestimate the potential of students in this age group’. (*Australian Teachers of Media, NSW*). One education authority commented:
Codes and conventions are fundamental concepts across all bands, and yet only ‘codes’ are mentioned [in Foundation to Year 2]. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

Commentary suggested the elaborations did not effectively illustrate the content descriptions.

Very simplistic and like the content descriptions, the elaborations do not give any guidance on teaching aesthetic skills. These elaborations could be applied to any number of subjects! (Australian Teachers of Media, NSW)

Several respondents stated that the content descriptions for Years 3 and 4 and Years 5 and 6 were very similar in terms of content, with difficulties in determining a sequence for learning.

We read through content descriptions for 3/4 and 5/6 and found it difficult to determine what the difference is between the content and learning as a sequence. (Australian Teachers of Media, NSW)

Suggestions

One respondent said content descriptions could be enhanced through explicit visual reference to the key concepts that underline them. This would be particularly helpful for generalist teachers, who would then be able to map their programs more clearly.

It was suggested that at the Foundation to Year 2 band more guidance and clear examples were required. A respondent suggested that the content elaborations ‘should provide more specific examples of the ways in which specific film forms align to the content descriptions’. (Academic, Screen Content, Education and Media, QLD)

At the Years 5 and 6 band, similar feedback was given as for the Years 3 and 4 band. A suggestion was made that the content elaborations could include more examples of new media forms.

Foundation to Year 6 achievement standards

Strengths

Some respondents reported the Foundation to Year 2 achievement standards as being clear and appropriate.

Concerns

Achievement standards for Foundation to Year 6 were reported as being too broad, and it was not clear what the students will have achieved at each stage. There was some concern by survey respondents that generalist teachers would ‘struggle with understanding some of the concepts and processes presented’.

A survey respondent observed at the Years 3 and 4 band, an ‘incredible leap in expectation of students … from the previous stage’, (ATOM, NSW) where the sequencing of learning is very unclear.
At the Years 5 and 6 band, the achievement standards seemed to:

... underestimate what would be possible for students who have completed prior stages of skill, knowledge and understanding in this subject area.

(ATOM, NSW)

**Suggestions**

At the Foundation to Year 2 band, respondents found the achievement standards were ‘very open ended and open to interpretation’ (Primary Teacher, NT) and suggested more guidance and clear examples on what standard students need to be achieving.

At the Years 3 and 4 and Years 5 and 6 bands, respondents asked for further guidance on the achievement standards that students should be reaching.

**Years 7 to 10 content**

**Strengths**

More than half (>70%) of survey respondents indicated agreement with the clarity, pitch and language in the content for Years 7 to 10.

Upon closer examination 75 percent of survey respondents considered content descriptions for Years 7 and 8 clear but only 50 percent of respondents felt they were appropriately pitched.

At Years 9 and 10, 70 percent of respondents found the content descriptions were clear and pitched appropriately. The inclusion of safety and ethical behaviour was commended by some respondents. There was concern about the focus of the content elaborations.

*The elaborations provided for the content areas for Responding are largely about a study of mass media it seems, not of an art form. (Australian Teachers of Media, NSW)*

**Concerns**

At the Years 7 and 8 band there was concern from a respondent that the band descriptions lacked development from the previous band.

Respondents indicated concern that content descriptions contained too much content for the amount of time available in schools. It was suggested that elaborations must recognise that Media Arts is an introductory subject in many schools, as students transition from primary to secondary. A further concern was that the wording of the content descriptions was open to misinterpretation.

*Content description 8.1* implies that students are supposed to be using Asian equipment and technologies in a sustainable way. This interpretation has no connection to what this content description is about. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

There was concern that context was not specified to guide students in analysis and production in Media Arts in Years 7 and 8.
It is too open and lacks definition in the complexity which is expected in the content descriptions and elaborations which are used in this band. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

The teacher professional association, Australian Teachers of Media, WA, was concerned that the pitch of content descriptions was too high for this band.

[Content description 8.8] The concept presented is too difficult for age group. The need to look at media institutions is more relevant in Years 9 and 10. (Australian Teachers of Media, WA)

[Content description 8.9] … may create ethical, moral and legal issues as the majority of social media requires age limits in order to engage [students]. (Australian Teachers of Media, WA)

At the Years 9 and 10 band, one comment suggested that the skills required for the content descriptions in the Making strand were too basic. Some respondents indicated concern with the focus on technical and industrial skills associated with media technologies at the expense of creativity and critical thinking.

The elaborations do not give examples of learning activities that we consider to be deep learning. Where is the investigation, questioning, meaning making in these elaborations? (Australian Teachers of Media, NSW)

Additionally there was concern that:

The content descriptions do not reflect understanding of the aesthetic practice of film making. (NSW Board of Studies)

Suggestions

Suggestions for improvements included revision of elaborations for Years 9 and 10 to include reference to specific film forms or genres.

Years 7 to 10 achievement standards

Strengths

The majority of survey respondents (75%) were in agreement with the achievement standards for Years 7 and 8 and Years 9 and 10.

Concerns

Respondents indicated that the achievement standard for Years 7 and 8 did not adequately represent the learning in the content descriptions.

Respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the achievement standard for Years 9 and 10, concerned that it did not reflect the complexity or volume of content and in fact placed:

… a disproportionate emphasis on Responding than in any other Media Arts band, or indeed Arts subject. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)
There was also commentary regarding terminology. Respondents suggested consistency was required in using terms such as ‘media’, ‘medium’ and ‘form’. One education authority noted:

*Vocabulary specific to the media arts is missing.* (NT Department of Education and Training)

**Implementation issues**

There was general concern about the pitch and terminology across Media Arts.

*The band levels from 7–10 require significant reworking regarding the use of language, expression of concepts and overall level of complexity.* (Australian Teachers of Media, NSW)

There was commentary regarding implementation, including concerns that not all schools will have access to the technology described.

*While primary schools will welcome Media Arts as a component of The Arts, they will find the technical and equipment demands impossible to meet.* (Australian Primary Principals Association)

The suggestion from various representatives of NSW presented during the consultation on the draft Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts that Media Arts not be included as one of the Arts subjects was repeated.

*Media Arts should not be included as a separate discipline in the Arts, it should be incorporated appropriately in all learning areas.* (NSW Board of Studies)

However the State’s education authority went on to clarify the concerns as implementation matters:

*The subject of Media Arts is already embedded within other subject areas in NSW. Its inclusion as a separate subject raises concerns as to its impact on time allocation, pre-service training, staffing and resourcing.* (NSW Board of Studies)

There was reiteration of the continuing concern from SA about the transition to secondary school occurring at the end of year 7, therefore halfway through the Years 7 and 8 band. Respondents also commented on resourcing and time allocation.

**Perspectives by state and territory**

The table below summarises feedback provided by states and territories regarding key themes and perspectives (i.e. strengths, concerns and suggestions for improvement) in relation to the draft curriculum for Media Arts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There is not enough emphasis on the collaborative nature of Media Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There could be more explicit reference to the vocational nature of Media Arts, and potential pathways to the media arts industry in the more senior years of the draft Australian Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW SOUTH WALES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The inclusion of Media Arts in the draft Australian Curriculum confirms its importance and relevance to contemporary life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum enables innovation in this area of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Media Arts is its own distinct subject with its own tradition and history – the language used in the draft Australian Curriculum risks it being seen only as an extension of other subjects like Cultural Studies or English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The language used in the aims is unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is too much focus on technical and industrial skills associated with Media Arts at the expense of creativity and critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHERN TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Clear and engaging language used throughout the Australian Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Clearer articulation of the importance of health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Further detail and examples to assist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEENSLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum recognises the importance of Media Arts, is well-designed and implementable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There could be more explicit links to other learning areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There could be greater emphasis placed on the importance of media literacy to navigating contemporary culture and life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There needs to be more focus on the analytical and other higher order skills developed in the learning of Media Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the two strands appropriate to Media Arts? Suggestions to change <em>Making</em> to <em>Designing/Producing/Creating</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The aims are clear and concise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There are concerns over the terminology used in the rationale and learning in Media Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum could be more future-orientated with more explicit reference to the role of emerging technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples and guidance to assist teachers understand the elements and content descriptors would be helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICTORIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The aims are clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>The rationale for Media Arts could be more concise, and more clearly differentiated from other Arts subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some concern over the content at senior levels not being age appropriate, and difficult for teachers to understand and implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern/Improvement</td>
<td>Key perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>There could be more emphasis on creativity and enjoyment associated with studying Media Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>There is not enough differentiation of Media Arts from the other Arts subjects Confusion over the <em>Making</em> and <em>Responding</em> strands and their appropriateness to the learning of Media Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>More support will be required to assist generalist teachers implement the Media Arts subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. CONSULTATION FINDINGS - MUSIC

The table below summarises the percentages of respondents to the online survey regarding Music who agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement. An analysis of feedback on each section of the survey with feedback from the written submissions is presented in the following pages.

Responses to survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALE AND AIMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Music rationale provides a clear foundation and direction for the draft Australian Curriculum in Music</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Music aims describe the intended learning in the subject</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING IN MUSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The two-strand structure Making and Responding is clearly explained for Music</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The elements of Music are clearly explained</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATION TO YEAR 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total surveys completed: 248 (698 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Music by the end of Year 2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 3 AND 4
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Music by the end of Year 4</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 5 AND 6
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Total surveys completed: 248 (698 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. The draft content description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students undertaking these units</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in Music by the end of Year 6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YEARS 7 AND 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do in Music by the end of Year 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEARS 9 AND 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do in Music by the end of Year 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC ACROSS FOUNDATION TO YEAR 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Across the band levels for Music, draft content descriptions cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the important learning for this subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Across the band levels for Music, draft content descriptions show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate progression of knowledge, understanding and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Across the band levels for Music, draft content descriptions provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coherence and continuity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 248 respondents to the Music section of the survey, which is representative of 698 participants. Of the Music survey respondents who provided qualitative responses:

- 81 respondents identified as secondary school teachers
- 86 respondents identified as primary school teachers.

Analysis of the qualitative comments (identified strengths, concerns and areas of concern) provided, indicate that respondents from a primary school perspective:

- consistently identified more strengths to the draft curriculum than respondents from a secondary school perspective. This was reflected by the teachers participating in the intensive engagement and is identified in the draft Consultation Report on Intensive Engagement Activity: The Arts
- consistently identified fewer concerns about the draft curriculum than respondents from a secondary school perspective and is also identified in the draft Consultation Report on Intensive Engagement Activity: The Arts
- suggested more options for improvement than respondents from a secondary school perspective.

Rationale and aims

Strengths

There was a notable degree of disagreement (>50%) with the statement that the Music rationale provided a clear foundation and direction and that the aims described the intended learning. It should be noted that some respondents commented on the clear and engaging language used to outline the rationale and aims of Music.

*I liked that the rationale was concise and informative. I feel that a primary classroom teacher would be able to read this and understand. (Primary teacher, Tasmania,)*

Concerns

The inclusive language and approach referred to above also drew significant criticism from survey respondents as well as from individuals and organisations that provided written submissions. There were frequent criticisms of the broad and generic wording of the rationale and aims and the lack of clarity they provided to the subject.
The intention of the rationale is admirable but is too vague in terms of specific skills and content to be in keeping with the aims of a truly national document. (Queensland, Secondary school teacher)

This is a curriculum that seems intended to support both the classroom teacher without musical education and the specialist teacher with a lifetime of music making experience and teaching experience. But is that possible? (Music Council of Australia)

The commentary on the generic language used throughout the draft Australian Curriculum closely aligned with other major concerns that were recorded in the survey and submission data. Primarily, these concerns related to the absence of music-specific terminology and notation that is specific to the discipline of music and the lack of a structured and sequential approach to the study and learning of music.

Respondents felt that the omission of these two critical features undermined the academic and intellectual rigour associated with studying music.

The importance of music learning being developmental, sequential and continuous is not mentioned. (Australian Society for Music Education (National))

The expectation outlined in the Shape Paper that learning in music education will involve development learning about and skill development in essential concepts and practices is not always clear in the curriculum. (Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority)

The curriculum offers no real sense of the importance of a sequential developmental learning continuum. Each band seems to be a simplistic generic advance on the previous, with no real recognition of the distinguishing activities suitable for each level. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

The document appears to be sequenced according to adjectival descriptions rather than a developmental progression of skills or concepts. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

There is a distinct lack of quantifiable music skills, notation and appropriate vocabulary/terminology throughout. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

The content descriptors and elaborations must be more specific about the necessary skills and knowledge required. Children need to be secure with the skills and language of music before they can competently and confidently creatively apply and interpret them. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

The Music aims lack academic rigour, cognitive knowledge, higher order skills, discipline-specific terminology and symbol system, a cumulative and sequential development of knowledge and skills and accepted musical terminology. (Secondary school teacher, NSW)
There was also a strong view that, by not using the language of music and not clearly articulating the intellectual rigour and the specific practices involved in the study of music, the draft Australian Curriculum: Music actually devalued the discipline of Music, both in comparison with other Arts subjects, and particularly in comparison to other learning areas.

Of major concern is that the importance of music education has not been acknowledged. The content structure, band descriptions and achievement standards are not specific and this allows for variance in delivery and results in inconsistent learning outcomes. Lack of absolute time allocations marginalise and devalue the unique discipline of Music and the place of the Arts within the Australian Curriculum in general. (Kodaly Music Education Institute of Australia)

Our concern with the rationale and aims of the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts, and the structure of the music curriculum, is reflected in detail in the response submitted by the Music Council of Australia. We share and support the Music Council’s concern that the document lacks emphasis on the value and importance of music education and its purpose and benefits for students. (Melbourne Symphony Orchestra)

Respondents frequently cited the length and detail of the draft Music curriculum as indicative of how the study of music is viewed and valued.

The description of the Music curriculum has been given in only 22 pages, a quarter or less of the space devoted to Phase 1 subjects. It neither treats music as a serious study nor serves the greater need for detail in the case of musically uneducated teachers. As befits a valued and rigorous discipline, the music curriculum needs much more content and course description. (Music Council of Australia)

Suggestions

Following on from the key concerns identified above, respondents argued that elements such as the development of cognitive knowledge, reading and understanding standard music notation, music literacy, and the developing of skills and techniques needed to be explicitly stated in the rationale and aims of the Music curriculum.

There were also suggestions to draw out the links between the study of music with broader student development and learning, and the lifelong impact and enjoyment that music can bring.

No mention of lifelong enjoyment of music. (Australian Society of Music Education (National))

This could note that music nurtures the integrated development of significant cognitive, affective, motor, social and personal competencies, enhances intellectual domains as well as the acquisition of language, literacy, numeracy and creative skills. Music has the power to transform lives. There is a need to embrace what music does for the whole person living in the whole world, as is stated in the Arts objectives. (School director, NSW)
The rationale for Music would read better with a more impassioned statement about the way music assists a person’s social development in educational and expressive emotional contexts. Music is a subject that empowers people with a sense of authenticity and resilience. It has positive benefits in literacy and numeracy and is understood to greatly assist with general cognitive, reasoning, healing, creative and motor functions. (Victorian Music Teachers Association)

Learning in Music

Strengths

Some respondents commented that the two-strand structure, as it was presented, was clear and adequately explained. However respondents tended to be critical of the Learning in Music section, as outlined below.

Concerns

There were significant concerns regarding the appropriateness of the two-strand structure and its application to the study of music. The term Making was frequently cited as an inappropriate description of activities associated with the composing and performing of music. Respondents felt it was more applicable to other Arts subjects like Visual Arts. Similarly the term Responding was viewed as having an emphasis on the experiential nature of music at the expense of skill acquisition and development.

The term making is clumsy and is perhaps better suited to other art forms. (Primary school music specialist, WA)

Making of music does not clearly differentiate between performing and composing. How are these two areas going to be divided up? What is the value of each area for assessment? There is no clear link or establishment with assessment and weightings. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

Further, the adequacy of the two strands, Making and Responding, was questioned by many respondents as being able to fully capture the breadth of activity associated with the study of music. Respondents cited examples of existing curriculums that were structured around a greater number of distinct strands that were more directly relevant to the unique discipline of music.

Making and Responding are not appropriate. Primary school music includes singing as a fundamental skill for learning melody and pitch, and movement as a fundamental skill for learning rhythm, metre and form. The six areas of the Music curriculum outlined in the syllabus published by the Queensland School Curriculum Council in 2002 are comprehensive and straightforward. (Primary school teacher, QLD)

Typically in music learning, there have been three distinct strands. The composing and performing aspects of Making have traditionally been seen as distinct. If there are now two learning strands, are they equally weighted? This seems to be the intent of the whole document: an increased focus on
Responding activities rather than Making. This would surely be in the face of research findings where participation rather than reflection is more suitable for modern young people. (Secondary teacher, QLD)

Suggestions

There were a significant number of suggested changes to the language and terminology used in the Learning in Music section, particularly to the definitions of the elements of music in the draft Australian Curriculum: Music. This included changes, clarifications and corrections to the elements currently listed, as well as suggestions for additions to the list.

There was also a concern that the elements were not consistently applied throughout the rest of the draft Music curriculum, which gave rise to questions about their worth and validity.

Having questioned the adequacy and appropriateness of the current two-strand structure, respondents made a range of suggestions to modify or expand them. There was a consistent view that a change to the term Making was required. Among respondents there was a view to replacing it with a term such as Creating, which was felt to better encapsulate the composing and performing aspects of music.

There is strong support for the focus on active music making. However, there was near universal dislike of the term Making, which is commonly used in the visual arts but rarely used in music. In Music, instead of making, the term creating would be used to describe the activity of composing or improvising and recreating for performing another’s work. (Music Council of Australia)

There was also considerable comment recommending a broadening of the two-strand structure, Making and Responding.

There needs to be a third tier of learning with Arts in Context included. Making and Responding does not necessarily cover this adequately. I get the feeling that this music curriculum is more geared to primary level education. (Secondary teacher, SA)

I suggest division into three understood outcomes; composing, performing, listening/musicology. The two-strand structure only serves to oversimplify and again reduce the existing clarity of thought. (Secondary teacher, ACT)

Rather than a two-strand Making and Responding structure, it would be more musically appropriate to have Composition, Musicology and Performance. (Student, SA)

I far prefer: Skills, Concepts and Dispositions. This is something you can evaluate and report on. It’s clear what is meant and would provide a better structure to plan lessons from. (Member of Kodaly Music Education Institute of Australia, SA)
Foundation to Year 6 content

Content

The majority of survey respondents (>75%) were not satisfied with the draft Music curriculum for Foundation to Year 6. Refer to Appendix 1 for the breakdown of responses to each question.

Concerns

Respondents were concerned about the appropriateness of the bands for the effective teaching of music, particularly the first band Foundation to Year 2. There was particular focus on the breadth of students’ developmental experience within this three-year band.

- The 2–3 years of duration for these bands makes it difficult to specify expected progress and outcomes. (Primary teacher, NSW)
- The problem is that the band from F–2 is far too wide to write an accurate description of what students should be able to do. (Primary teacher, WA)
- Most [of our respondents] expressed concern that F–2 was too wide for a band of learning, with huge learning and developmental differences between F and 2. They expressed a preference for organising the curriculum into year bands, or at the minimum separating F from Years 1–2. This would then validate a more play-centred approach for the F band to link with the EYLF and allow for more specificity and focus on necessary skill development for students in Years 1 and 2. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

There was also concern that the bands from Foundation through to Year 10 were not adequately differentiated to provide for the development and assessment of skills and knowledge over the course of the individual band.

Respondents were concerned about the generic language used in band descriptions and achievement standards for Foundation to Year 6.

- The band descriptors are too general and vague and will lead to unfocused approach to content delivery. Other subjects such as Maths are very explicit in content. Why is that not the case for Music? Music is like teaching Maths. It is sequential and certain concepts need to be learnt first. But not having specific content devalues the subject and makes it look less important. (Primary teacher, QLD)

Similar concern was voiced over content descriptions, which were labelled as vague and lacking academic rigour. This in turn led to concerns about the capacity of generalist teachers to implement the draft Australian Curriculum: Music in the classroom.

- A generalist teacher would think they could easily teach this, but would not know how or what they don’t know. A music specialist would interpret this in their own way. As a result there will be no uniformity in what is taught. Is this what the Australian Curriculum is all about? I thought the idea was to have basic unity and uniformity throughout the country. (Primary teacher, WA)
Suggestions

While primary school teachers who provided qualitative responses to the survey were more engaged and constructive with the draft Australian Curriculum: Music than secondary school teachers, there were still a number of calls for support and guidance for teachers – particularly generalist teachers – to assist them in the teaching of music from Foundation to Year 6.

As a generalist primary teacher starting to teach in the 1980s I was lucky enough to have the WA Music in Schools curriculum from which to work. It gave specific direction and support to teachers so that anyone could follow and work out a program. This is what is needed to ensure uniformity Australia-wide. (Primary teacher, WA)

Research has shown a number of times that generalist teachers lack the confidence to teach music and therefore if you are to include generalist teachers you need to be more prescriptive. (Music Advocacy Queensland)

Foundation to Year 6 achievement standards

The majority of survey respondents (>75%) were not satisfied with the achievement standards for Foundation to Year 6.

Concerns

Respondents were concerned about the generic language and indicated, as they did for the content descriptions, that the achievement standards were too broad.

There is no description of a standard. They are only general statements that could mean anything. (Primary music specialist, ACT)

Years 7 to 10 content

Content

The majority of survey respondents (>60%) were not satisfied with the draft Australian curriculum: Music for Years 7 to 10. Commentary suggested respondents were dissatisfied with a lack of subject specific content and language. Refer to Appendix 1 for the breakdown of responses to each question.

Concerns

In Years 7 to 10, concerns around the adequacy of the structure and sequencing of the subject continued to be raised. These concerns revolved around the appropriateness of the language used, particularly as the teaching of music in the secondary years becomes more specialised, and the adequacy of content descriptions.

As the subject of Music is nearly always taught by trained specialists at these year levels, the band description should include recognisable musical terminology, rather than vague and confused statements. (Secondary teacher, ACT)
There were comments that the Years 7 and 8 band was still too generic but that the language and terminology used in the Years 9 and 10 band was an improvement and more relevant to the study and learning of music.

**Suggestions**

For Years 7 to 10, secondary school teachers strongly indicated that the Music curriculum should use more detailed language and terminology that is specific to music.

> Music has very specific and almost universal (at least in Western music) terminology, symbols and structures and students need to be exposed to these and, through sequential development, learn to interpret them and create with them. (Secondary music specialist, QLD)

**Years 7 to 10 achievement standards**

**Concerns**

Respondents indicated that the draft achievement standards did not adequately describe what students should have learned by the end of the secondary bands.

> The achievement standards for Year 10 Music demand nothing of the students other than vague creativity, free from a knowledge-based context. At this level, after 11 years of a Music curriculum, they should be showing highly developed musicianship with very specific and tangible outcomes. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

> The achievement standard does not adequately reflect the knowledge and skills that would be needed to successfully complete Music at an appropriate standard, particularly in preparation for upper school courses and tertiary entrance. (Kodaly Music Education Institute of Australia, WA Branch)

**Suggestions**

Respondents indicated a preference for more definition within achievement standards:

> The achievement standards are recognised by portfolios of annotated student work samples through the Australian Curriculum. By placing more emphasis on the developmental phase of a student’s process through various mediums, the level of learning and student engagement can be determined. The achievement standards bring the never ending debate of process versus product. In the Arts the process can show more learning than the annotated end product. How can this be judged by an end product? (NT Department of Education and Training)

**Implementation issues**

Among survey respondents there was frequent reference to current curriculums in operation in other jurisdictions. These curriculums were often cited as examples of best practice that the draft Australian Curriculum: Music should be modelled on. The NSW and Queensland
music curriculums were two curriculums that were often cited by respondents from those two particular jurisdictions. There was also reference to overseas curriculums.

The existing NSW Board of Studies Stage 5 Music curriculum is excellent for Year 10 students with detail, specifics, terminology, symbols, skills, tools and processes. The existing Qld Music curriculum provides reference to specific musical content and terminology as does WA Music curriculum … By failing to include the recognised and accepted body of knowledge or any pedagogy, Music is presented as undeserving of serious study or academic respect.

(Secondary teacher, NSW)

These documents [Canada, UK, Ontario] provide many recorded examples of “best practice” and written exemplars of ways to practice from which to derive suitable activities at varying levels, while still achieving set outcomes. These examples of best practice are inspiring to teachers, and are demonstrative of the standards achievable within real classroom environments. (Kodaly Music Education Institute of Australia)

There was some concern among respondents regarding a lack of clear and explicit connection to specialisation in Years 11 and 12 and beyond that reference to vocational pathways into the music industry.

Due to its lack of specific language and achievement levels we are not providing a sufficient grounding for Years 11 and 12 music students. For example, with no specific reference to musical notation how can these students achieve? (ASME, SA)

I have been learning music since year 1 and am currently in Year 12. If this curriculum was around when I was younger, I definitely would not have the same musical knowledge to apply for the Sydney Conservatorium, or any other music courses at any university. This does not provide you with adequate knowledge or understanding of even simple music elements and lacks any music terminology. (School student, ACT)

Insufficient foundation and inspiration for the next generation of musos. Sydney Symphony offers ACARA any assistance it can provide in moving forward. (Sydney Symphony Orchestra)

Implementation issues were raised by a number of respondents. These related primarily to the ability, capacity and resources of some teachers and schools to adequately implement the curriculum. Respondents indicated concerns regarding the allocation of time to Arts subjects.

There is considerable inequity of resources not only between sectors, but also within. (School, ACT)

It is clear but unachievable in the timeframe offered in the school timetables by teachers who are inadequately trained in Music. Music needs the support of mandatory face-to-face hours in a weekly timetable. (Secondary teacher, NSW)
Given the increasing role of technology, some respondents felt that a more explicit recognition of its role in the production and learning of music needed to be incorporated into the draft Australian Curriculum: Music.

*There is no mention of using current and emerging technologies or available technologies. A wide range of technology is available from F–10 (interactive software, iPads, computers).* (Primary teacher, WA)

*Technology needs to be better addressed and embedded in the curriculum to make it truly representative of the times.* (School, WA)

**Perspectives by state and territory**

The table below summarises feedback provided by states and territories regarding key themes and perspectives (i.e. strengths, concerns and suggestions for improvement) in relation to the draft curriculum for Music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Some support for the rationale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Concern | Concern over the absence of music terminology and language, and the level of detail throughout the draft Australian Curriculum.  
No structure or sequential learning to support the study of music.  
A lack of depth to the draft Australian Curriculum. |
| Improvement | A desire to see more detail on the distinct elements, language and skills associated with music.  
Clearer articulation of pathways to music specialisation and careers in music. |
| **NEW SOUTH WALES** | |
| Strength | Some support for the rationale |
| Concern | Significant concern over the specificity of language and level of detail used throughout the draft Australian Curriculum.  
The divergence between the draft Australian Curriculum and the Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts has been identified.  
No structure or sequential learning to support the study of music.  
Significant comment on the adequacy of the draft Australian Curriculum when compared to the NSW curriculum, and the impact it is likely to have on the quality of learning in Australia. |
| Improvement | More differentiation of Music from other Arts subjects, recognising the unique history, traditions, skills, language and disciplines associated with Music.  
There should be more detail on the distinct elements of Music, and use of specific language and skills associated with Music.  
Greater emphasis on assessment and the pathways between bands is needed. |
<p>| <strong>NORTHERN TERRITORY</strong> | |
| Strength | Clear language used that is appropriate for both specialist and generalist teachers |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improvement                 | Greater emphasis on the value and importance of Music to student development and learning  
                              | Clearer articulation of the lifelong impact and joy of music |
| QUEENSLAND                  | Support for the rationale as a clear and concise statement of Music  
                              | Promotion of Music as a holistic and inclusive subject acknowledged as a strength |
| Concern                     | Draft Australian Curriculum is too generic and lacking in intellectual and academic rigour  
                              | No structure and sequential learning to underpin the teaching of Music  
                              | The two strands are not appropriate to the learning of Music  
                              | The draft Australian Curriculum suffers when compared to existing Qld Music curriculum |
| Improvement                 | There needs to be more engaging language used which articulates the importance of Music to broader student development and learning  
                              | There needs to be a greater balance between self-expression and the intellectual rigour associated with learning music  
                              | Greater emphasis on Western music notation required |
| SOUTH AUSTRALIA             | Aims of the subject are clear and comprehensive |
| Concern                     | Concern over the language and level of detail throughout the draft Australian Curriculum  
                              | Not enough emphasis on the role of Music in encouraging intellectual, cognitive and other developmental outcomes |
| Improvement                 | Greater consistency between rationale and aims and the rest of the draft Australian Curriculum  
                              | Generalist teachers will need support and guidance to understand and implement the curriculum |
| VICTORIA                    | The Music rationale is identified as clear and concise |
| Concern                     | Concern over the language and level of detail throughout the draft Australian Curriculum, with respondents indicating it is unclear and vague. The elements of Music were described as either vague, incorrect or confusing  
                              | The appropriateness of the two strands is also questioned  
                              | No structure or sequential learning underpinning the draft Australian Curriculum |
| Improvement                 | A need to differentiate music as a stand-alone subject.  
                              | Greater emphasis in the curriculum on the benefits of music to brain development – particularly for young children  
                              | A need to see more specific music terminology used throughout the draft Australian Curriculum  
<pre><code>                          | Assistance and guidance is required for generalist teachers |
</code></pre>
<p>| WESTERN AUSTRALIA           | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Rationale and aims recognised by some respondents as clear and concise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Concern over the language and level of detail throughout the draft Australian Curriculum. Draft Australian Curriculum lacks depth and doesn’t provide the structure and sequential learning needed to excel at music. Concern over the ability of generalist teachers to implement the draft Australian Curriculum. No reference to Western notation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Recognition of the enjoyment of music and the role it plays in the development of confidence and personal wellbeing needs to be clearly articulated throughout the subject. Consideration of the appropriateness of the two strands to Music is warranted. The language associated with the learning in Music is unclear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASMANIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Rationale is clear and understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Concern over structure of the draft Australian curriculum, particularly its emphasis on creativity at expense of technical components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Too generic – the draft Australian Curriculum needs to differentiate itself from existing curriculums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. CONSULTATION FINDINGS – VISUAL ARTS

The table below summarises the percentages of respondents to the online survey regarding Visual Arts who agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement. An analysis of feedback on each section of the survey with feedback from the written submissions is presented in the following pages.

Responses to survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total surveys completed: 142 (368 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALE AND AIMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Visual Arts rationale provides a clear foundation and direction for the draft Australian Curriculum in Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Visual Arts aims describe the intended learning in the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING IN VISUAL ARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The two-strand structure Making and Responding is clearly explained for Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The elements of Visual Arts are clearly explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATION TO YEAR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts by the end of Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEARS 3 AND 4**

| Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable language     | 78                  | 1                | 15      | 29         | 55                  |
| the breadth of learning to be covered in the band                                 |                     |                  |         |            |                     |
| 14. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in understandable    | 79                  | 0                | 14      | 24         | 62                  |
| language what is to be taught and learned                                        |                     |                  |         |            |                     |
| 15. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is realistic    | 79                  | 0                | 16      | 19         | 65                  |
| yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level                      |                     |                  |         |            |                     |
| 16. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions effectively | 79                  | 1                | 13      | 22         | 64                  |
| 17. The content elaborations are clear, that is explained in understandable      | 78                  | 1                | 17      | 23         | 59                  |
| language                                                                          |                     |                  |         |            |                     |
| 18. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level                 | 78                  | 1                | 17      | 24         | 58                  |
| 19. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in understandable    | 73                  | 3                | 14      | 22         | 61                  |
| language what students should know and be able to do in Visual Arts by the end of |                     |                  |         |            |                     |
| Year 4                                                                            |                     |                  |         |            |                     |
| 20. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately                          | 75                  | 3                | 13      | 21         | 63                  |
## YEARS 5 AND 6
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The draft content description is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students undertaking these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts by the end of Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## YEARS 7 AND 8
Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total surveys completed: 142 (368 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>No. responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts by the end of Year 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEARS 9 AND 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band description; Content descriptions; Content elaborations; Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The band description is clear, that is explains in understandable</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The draft content descriptions are clear, that is explain in</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what is to be taught and learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The draft content descriptions are pitched appropriately, that is</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at this band level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The draft content elaborations illustrate the content descriptions</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The draft content elaborations are clear, that is explained in</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The draft content elaborations are relevant to the band level</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The draft achievement standard is clear, that is explains in</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable language what students should know and be able to do in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts by the end of Year 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The achievement standards are pitched appropriately</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 142 respondents to the Visual Arts section of the survey which is representative of 368 participants. Of the Visual Arts survey respondents who provided qualitative responses:

- 79 respondents identified as secondary school teachers
- 10 respondents identified as primary school teachers.

Among primary school teachers there was concern about the ability of non-specialist teachers to understand the draft Australian curriculum: Visual Arts and apply it in the classroom. Primary school teachers wanted to see a more concise document with clearer guidelines and direction to assist the teaching of visual arts.

Among secondary school teachers the main issues were, namely:

- the view that self-expression was emphasised at the expense of the intellectual rigour associated with visual arts education (particularly in NSW)
- the value of visual arts, to students and to the community, was not made explicit
- the language and terminology was unclear and could be made more specific, particularly to assist non-specialist teachers.

**Rationale and aims**

**Strengths**

Some respondents indicated that the Visual Arts rationale and aims were clear and straightforward. They provided a good foundation for the subject without being so prescriptive that they couldn’t be adapted to different classrooms and environments.
I like the new criteria of the Arts Curriculum aims, set out in the four different areas. It embeds solid practice within a cultural, social and historical context. ‘Encouraging curiosity’ as one of the foremost aims is a very welcome addition, as well as ‘developing innovative arts practices’ and ‘developing empathy for different viewpoints’ throw a wide net for new self-motivated practice and communication. (Survey respondent, NT)

These [rationale and aims] were a strength in the document. They are comprehensive, but there needs to be a conscious effort to make sure they transfer into the curriculum. (Independent Secondary School, NSW)

The emphasis on students becoming innovative, critical and imaginative is good. However they should be given the opportunity to become innovative, critical and imaginative art writers as well as artists and audiences. In this curriculum Making is privileged and the practices of the critic and historian are reduced to merely the aesthetic response of an aware audience. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

Teachers participating in the intensive engagement activity found the content accessible. (See Appendix 3: Report on Intensive Engagement Activity: The Arts.)

The description is relatively lengthy, but it presents information in an accessible way. (Secondary teacher, ACT)

**Concerns**

A strongly held view by many of the respondents was that the draft Visual Arts curriculum emphasised the self-experiential elements of the subject, at the expense of its critical and intellectual elements. This was a recurring theme throughout the survey responses and written submissions and underpinned many of the other key concerns recorded about the draft Curriculum: Visual Arts.

*The rationale retains a preoccupation with students’ expression as a way to build community, which is at best only a partial view of the purposes of the Arts. The importance of learning in this learning area is understated for a contemporary ‘world class’ curriculum.* (VADEA NSW)

*The rationale is weak, outdated and under-represents the subject as a body of knowledge that is valued by students and teachers. The premise for the rationale for the Arts and the Visual Arts as a process-based enterprise is outdated, wrong and fails to enable teachers to deal with contemporary practices across the full range of art forms.* (Art Education Australia)

*They [aims] are incoherent and diminish the intellectual nature of learning in the Arts. They do not reflect how students actually know, understand and know how to do things in the arts. The aims also have reduced knowledge in [visual] art to banal processes that do not guarantee quality learning outcomes.* (Secondary school teacher, NSW)

*Aims reinforce a partial and dated view. No explicit identification of value of knowing about a subject and its values – or the value of identification and*
recognition with a field of practice, for example, Visual Arts in a contemporary world. Reinforces a subjective view of Visual Arts. Not helpful in setting out what matters in knowing about a field of practice and domain of knowledge. (Primary school teacher, NSW)

A corresponding theme to this concern was that the draft Australian curriculum: Visual Arts was overly simplistic and lacked depth and was not built upon best practice and research.

… visual arts education stakeholders are concerned that the proposed curriculum does not match the standards and quality of syllabuses/curriculum frameworks that are currently available in the Visual Arts in different states and territories across Australia … It is essential that the curriculum represents ‘world class practices’ … (National Association for the Visual Arts)

Fails to reflect a 21st century position about what is arts education. (Secondary school teacher, NSW)

I feel that content is lacking developmental indicators. It seems over-simplistic and with the current layout it is difficult to see a progression of understanding and skills. There is a lot of repetition in the document. Redundant or over-obvious statements that lack depth and developmentally appropriate descriptions. (Survey respondent, NT)

Many respondents felt the connection between learning opportunities in the Visual Arts and improved student development and education, particularly regarding the nurturing of critical and creative skills, was not explicit enough in the draft Australian curriculum; Visual Arts.

It does not make a clear argument for the contribution that learning in the Arts makes to students’ opportunities to develop practical and conceptual knowledge, understanding and skills. (Tertiary student, NSW)

Similarly respondents felt that there was no connection made in the curriculum explicitly linking the teaching of Visual Arts with the broader arts community and the important role it plays in contemporary culture and identity.

The current proposal also fails to promote the Arts as a dynamic and valued component of education that will contribute to the development of Australian culture and identity. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

The aims indicate a ‘one way’ view of the artist reflecting back to the world through their artwork. [This approach] minimises the interconnectivity of the world, culture, the audience, artist’s background [that] have [all] influenced the artist themselves. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

The rationale appears adequate for primary levels; however the language of the text lacks sophistication in its wording and expressing the increasing prevalence of the visual arts in everyday life. (Survey respondent, NT)

In a similar vein, many respondents commented that for many of the reasons listed above, the draft curriculum devalued the Visual Arts and the teaching of it in schools.
The draft curriculum shows very little understanding of the study of the Visual Arts. It is disappointing and insulting that this subject has been undervalued to this extent. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

There was also considerable concern about the clarity of the draft Australian curriculum: Visual Arts and the language used throughout it. These concerns came both from specialist art teachers who criticised it as too generic, vague and unfocused, through to respondents who were concerned that it was too technical and beyond the capacity of generalist teachers to understand and implement in the classroom.

The imperative to make the curriculum achievable by primary specialists has resulted in the loss of visual literacy, language, skills and processes that are at the core of Visual Arts making and responding.

The consequence is a disservice to all teachers because generalist teachers were equally adamant that the Visual Arts curriculum failed to provide them with starting points or direction and based on the document they could not define what was important or make appropriate and informed decisions about Visual Arts learning for their students. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, WA)

We need clearer understandable guidelines as we don’t have an arts background and find the terminology challenging. (Primary teacher, WA)

Suggestions

There were suggestions for improvement of the rationale which included shortening the text and focusing on specifics, such as ‘include a clear understanding of practice as an understanding of Making and the critical and historical study of visual arts within the context of artists, artworks and their relationship to the world and audiences’ (Secondary teacher, NSW).

Additionally, respondents wanted to see reference to the contemporary cutting-edge nature of Visual Arts as a subject.

The Visual Arts needs to be written in a way that puts the more exciting aspects of the visual arts upfront and includes the skills. While tradition is important to the visual arts, the more contemporary cutting-edge nature of the visual arts’ role in questioning societal attitudes needs to be included. The use of active verbs and the progression of visual arts in a future global society like the media arts. In the rationale the emotional responses to visual arts are not evident. (NT Department of Education)

Learning in Visual Arts

Strengths

For some teachers, including those participating in the intensive engagement activity, the two-strand structure was supported.
The two-strand structure is clear and straightforward, providing a solid base on which tasks sit. (Primary teacher, ACT)

Concerns

There was significant concern among respondents as to the adequacy and appropriateness of the two strands, Making and Responding, to fully describe the breadth of learning associated with the Visual Arts. This included the view that the strands were simplistic and reductive; that the relationship and balance between the two was not clearly articulated; that the two strands did not adequately reflect the critical and historical practice that is intrinsic to Visual Arts; and that the current structure did not provide adequate guidance for generalist teachers.

The content in both strands should identify higher order thinking skills relevant to the various methods required for the development of creativity and innovation through experimentation with techniques and practices, use of creative processes and production of artworks. (Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority)

The organisation into two strands of Making and Responding is not appropriate for the Visual Arts as it does not allow for a sufficiently rich and rigorous investigation of the practices of art history and art criticism. Responding is a fairly meaningless term which could mean that a purely subjective and self-referential response to artworks is considered sufficient. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

The distinction between making and responding is not convincing. The demarcation of artists as distinct from critical/historical dispositions is not successful – it is confusing. The definition of making is convoluted and does not take into account that people make artworks on account of their intentions. The reduction of Making to processes strips the subject of any intellectual rigour. Responding should be renamed interpreting. Responding should not be reduced to processes. Interpretation of practice is underscored by knowledge of what, why and how critics and historians do things. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

While a specialist teacher may well feel confident to continue delivering Visual Arts according to the new Australian Curriculum, I doubt that the ordinary classroom teacher will feel as though they have the necessary background to be able to identify just what they should teach when! (Primary teacher, WA)

Suggestions

While there was significant concern recorded about the two-strand structure, Making and Responding, some respondents did identify strengths in the proposed model, arguing that it was simple and straightforward. Other respondents suggested a greater level of detail and clarification was required and that changes to the terms used for the strands could address many of the issues identified above.
The word Responding should not be used – I would use the word interpreting. (Secondary teacher, VIC)

The statement on page 6 just before the Responding section needs to be highlighted as we see this as fundamental to how the two areas interlink and relate, not too prescriptive. We recognise that the Making section has elements of responding, choices and decisions students make about their work. Responding is more about analysing and responding to others’ artwork. (School, TAS)

Respondents recommended identification of the concepts, skills and processes within Visual Arts. This included a recurring theme of the need for a clearer articulation of the fundamental importance of traditional art skills to the study of Visual Arts, particularly drawing and its continuing relevance to students.

Again, I must strongly advise that a more marked emphasis needs to be placed on the development of drawing across all grades. This needs to be taught so that students end up with a passable skill level to enable them to see, observe and document the world around them and translate their ideas into a valid art expression. Students coming through the education system have less fine motor skills and less patience than those even 10 years ago. A loss of further basic drawing skills will only lead to future generations losing the most primary method of visual communication. (Arts industry, Queensland.)

Foundation to Year 6 content

Strengths

A minority of respondents felt that the content descriptions were clear and manageable.

I have little issue with content descriptions as they are presented but I feel there should be a clearer highlight between the Making and Responding sections to be more clearly evident. (Visual Arts teacher, Primary, TAS)

Concerns

Across the Foundation to Year 6 bands there were recurring concerns about the adequacy of the subject’s structure and sequence. Respondents considered that there was an absence of a clear conceptual framework to support teachers to structure tasks and activities for students and with which to assess their learning and achievement. There was reference to the lack of a continuum of learning that would underpin increasingly complex tasks and activities for students. It was also felt that the language used throughout Foundation to Year 6 was simplistic, generic and not sufficiently challenging.

No real sense of learning continuum and fails to address scope, depth and sequence of Visual Arts. The content descriptions fail to address what the areas of content mean at different band levels. Sometimes they emphasise subject matter, sometimes technique. Content descriptors don’t describe the
knowledge, skills and processes teachers are expected to teach and students to learn. (Primary teacher, NSW)

A sense of continuum is not evident. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

I do not feel there has been anywhere enough emphasis placed on the learning and development of real skills such as drawing. The expectation that students will just explore techniques will lead to frustration as the building blocks of proper skill development are very minimal. (Secondary teacher, QLD)

Suggestions

There was significant commentary from non-specialist teachers, who felt there was a clear need for greater assistance, support and resources to help them understand and implement the curriculum. Common requests included calls for samples, examples, resource guides and information to assist the non-specialist teacher.

It is our impression that the language in this section of the document is somewhat less clear and explicit than other sections, and there is somewhat more specialist vocabulary used. This is less evident in the early years and to some extent in the upper primary years than in secondary. We recommend, however, that ACARA attempt to ensure that this domain is as clear, explicit and useable as others. (Australian Primary Principals Association)

Needs specific examples of what should be done ie what does this level look like – samples? (Primary teacher, WA)

Information across year levels, not just bands, would be helpful. (Primary teacher, WA)

The document is wordy and difficult to teach from as a classroom teacher and not a specialist in the area of visual arts. I think the document needs to contain a lot of examples of lesson plans for each descriptor … If the new curriculum isn’t more structured in what and how we need to teach art ideas, skills and develop a student’s understanding then I think that once again a non-art teacher, one who thinks they can’t draw so they can’t possibly teach art, will avoid the area and be able to breeze over the subject area … Give us clear guidelines of the best practice for teaching Visual Arts, lesson design, examples, exemplars etc. (Primary teacher, WA)

Foundation to Year 6 achievement standards

Concerns

Respondents felt there was an absence of a clear conceptual framework with which to assess student learning and achievement. Concern regarding the three-year band of Foundation to Year 2 was also noted.

Generic achievement standards give very little sense of what is valued and why. (Parent, NSW)
Not specific enough, in particular for the primary generalist teacher. There should be a K and P [Foundation] band and 1 and 2 band. What does it mean when you say look at and imagine when creating images, objects etc? Why not just say ‘when creating artworks’? A guideline for student achievement standards is essential within each band. (Perth College, WA)

Years 7 to 10 content

Content

Similar to the concerns raised regarding Foundation to Year 6, the structure and sequence of Visual Arts from Years 7 to 10 was criticised by respondents. Generally less than 20 per cent of respondents agreed with the band descriptions, content descriptions and content elaborations for Years 7 and 8 and Years 9 and 10.

Concerns

Specific concerns again related to an absence of a clear framework to guide and structure the teaching of the subject and how to adequately measure and assess student performance.

There is no clear outline of how learning is differentiated from Foundation to [Year] 10. They do not take into account students conceptual development in the visual arts. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

The draft Australian curriculum: Visual Arts for Years 7–10 was criticised by some respondents as simple and beneath student agency and capacity, while others criticised it as being too complex and beyond the understanding of both students and the teachers required to implement it. This is represented in the following respondent’s questions about the Years 7 and 8 content descriptions.

8.1 (1) … must we must teach all of 2D, 3D, 4D in every unit? (2) … combining and adapting … is telling us a unit to do (a project) Why is this in at all? (3) Is it compulsory to combine both old and new technologies for each exercise?

8.2 Why is OHS combined with understanding your audience?

8.3 Why sustainability, when we need to look more at archival of art by using appropriate materials eg acid free paper. Ethical responsibility and sustainable practices is a very complex area to be dealing with in Year 7 and 8 with minimum time with kids.

8.4 Art theory is very heavy on a unit that should revolve around making. At this age students are unable to predict any outcomes. Students are not able to apply ethical, environmental and sustainable dimensions on the collection of work they have made in 10 weeks.

8.5 This is adding on a very heavy art theory component onto a short introductory course that is aimed at getting them to like Art and to choose to do it again in Year 8 or 9. (Secondary teacher, ACT)
This difference played out principally between jurisdictions, with NSW teachers arguing that the secondary school years of the draft Australian Curriculum: Visual Arts were not challenging and have been 'dumbed down'. Some respondents from other jurisdictions however raised concerns for the earlier band, Years 9 and 10, and the capacity of their students to manage the course content and the achievement standards.

Concerns raised by respondents in the Years 9 and 10 band tended to focus on implementation issues. These included concerns over the ability to comprehensively cover the breadth and content of the subject in the time available, and having the skills and capacity to address specialist content, such as Aboriginal art.

-Time — while I realise that this is a school-based decision I can't be alone in thinking how am I going to get all this in, or even some of it, into an already crammed time allotment. (Secondary teacher, VIC)

-In order to address content about Aboriginal art we need a lot of direction from the Aboriginal community to ensure that what we include in our curriculum is relevant, culturally sensitive and not tokenistic. (School, TAS)

Suggestions

As for the areas for improvement raised in Foundation to Year 6, there were a number of matters raised regarding the use of language and the level of support and guidance provided to teachers. Suggested improvements included changes to the layout and formatting of the draft Australian Curriculum: Visual Arts to make it more user-friendly, supplying greater detail on descriptions, elaborations and standards, and providing a range of examples to guide and assist teachers implement the curriculum.

Years 7 to 10 achievement standards

Concerns

Generally less than 20 per cent of respondents agreed with the achievement standards for Years 7 and 8 and Years 9 and 10. Respondents from different jurisdictions commented differently with regard to the content in Years 7 to 10, indicating discrepancy in state-based expectations.

-The language of the content descriptors is not of a standard that allows me as a teacher to challenge my students. (Secondary teacher, NSW)

-In the achievement standards the comments across all phases of schooling are too general – not fine-grained enough. There needs to be a rubric of the mastered skills and techniques appropriate to design, compose and construct finished works. (Department of Education and Training, NT)

-This assumes that all students have equal amounts of time and come from a similar background of primary schooling – some rural schools don’t teach art, let alone dance, drama, music or media – so the starting base at [Years] 7 and 8 is not even – to get all students up to this level will be virtually impossible – these statements are written as ideals not realities. (Secondary teacher, Vic)
Implementation issues

There were a significant number of survey respondents from NSW who made consistent reference to the current NSW Visual Arts syllabus. The NSW syllabus was frequently cited as an example of best practice that the draft Australian curriculum: Visual Arts should be modelled on. Points of difference that were cited by respondents included the three areas of content to the NSW syllabus – frames, conceptual framework and practice – as well as its grounding in critical theory and art history, and its more rigorous assessment methods. The WA curriculum was also cited as a contemporary syllabus that the draft Australian curriculum: Visual Arts needs to reflect.

A number of serious concerns were raised in written submissions about the role and place of design within the draft Visual Arts curriculum.

Perspectives by state and territory

The table below summarises feedback provided by states and territories regarding key themes and perspectives (ie strengths, concerns and suggestions for improvement) in relation to the draft curriculum for Visual Arts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Improvement</th>
<th>Key perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY</td>
<td>Support for the two-strand structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Concern about the ability of generalist teachers to apply and implement the Visual Arts curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SOUTH WALES</td>
<td>The draft Australian Curriculum is lacking in depth when compared to the NSW Visual Arts syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There is too much focus on the experiential features of visual arts at the expense of the critical and intellectual aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not enough guidance and support for generalist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not enough of a connection to contemporary artistic trends and the broader visual arts industry and the role it plays in Australian culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>The two strands of Making and Responding simplify Visual Arts and are not adequate to describe the intellectual learning and critical reasoning that the study of Visual Arts can cultivate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN TERRITORY</td>
<td>A need for more concise and specific language throughout the draft Australian Curriculum for Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>A greater role of art theory, history and appreciation in the teaching and learning of Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater attention to the specialist skill sets within visual arts, such as drawing and painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSLAND</td>
<td>Clear, straightforward and appropriate language used in the rationale and aims of Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Appropriate scope and sequencing to the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad and generic – difficult for generalist teachers to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicability for complex and disadvantaged students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Development of examples and guidance to assist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearer articulation of the role Visual Arts can play in broader student learning and development outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>Concern over the generic wording of the draft Australian Curriculum for Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>The curriculum is broad and flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Features of the draft Australian Curriculum for Visual Arts are unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist teachers will not be able to implement this Visual Arts curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Clearer direction, guidance and suggested resources will be required to assist teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td>Links to other learning areas is a strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conclusion

Generally it was found the Dance, Media Arts and Music draft curriculums were well received whereas respondents were less satisfied with draft curriculums for Music and Visual Arts. In each subject respondents provided suggestions for improvement.

In addition to considerable commentary about each of the five subjects within the Arts learning area, there was commentary about the relationships between the arts industry and schools to assist teaching and learning in the Arts.

The draft Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts explains the importance of the relationship between schools, communities and the arts industry:

> 92. Teachers in schools are the key to providing students with rich, sustained, rigorous learning in each of the subjects in the Arts. The arts industry complements the Arts provision for young people in schools, through programs, partnerships and by increasingly providing specialist services for schools, as appropriate. This includes enriching and complementing the curriculum through experiences such as visiting performances, demonstrations and exhibitions, artists in residence, teacher professional development and access for students and teachers to specialised facilities in galleries, concert halls, theatres and other arts venues. The Arts curriculum will provide opportunities for teachers in schools, professional artists and arts organisations to develop students’ learning and experiences in the Arts. Relationships between schools and the arts industry provide teachers and artists with mutual professional development opportunities.

This is reflected in submissions from one education authority and from arts organisations in response to the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10 :
Quality learning programs also provide opportunities for students to engage in the arts through creative environments such as community spaces, festivals and arts projects, galleries and performing arts centres, theatres, libraries, museums and cinemas and in online spaces and through social media. This engagement with arts industry environments offers students authentic contextual knowledge and opportunities to communicate with arts practitioners and contribute to collaborative arts making. These experiences develop students’ understandings of the richness and diversity of arts practices and processes and their connections to communities. (Victorian Curriculum Assessment Authority)

Carclew encourages ACARA to consider the role arts organisations play in partnering with schools and supporting educators and to actively seek opportunities to utilise the arts industry as a resource.

Cross Sectoral Collaboration: The Consultation Feedback Report on the Draft Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts (August 2011) acknowledges the potential for the arts industry to augment the provision of arts education provided by schools.

In Carclew’s experience, a collaborative, multi-sectoral approach to support educators enables greater allocation of resources and specialist expertise for the delivery of arts experiences in schools, which in turn enhances the quality and impact of those experiences.

This is important in supporting generalist arts teachers, particularly primary teachers and/or those working in regional and remote schools who may otherwise have limited capacity to access additional resources. (Carclew Youth Arts, SA)

The very nature of performing arts is one of immediacy and ephemera. From the first inspiration, throughout the creative process and through to the performing life of the work, ideas are fluid and interpretation is subject to the individual’s responses. We feel that the draft curriculum covers the students’ opportunity to engage with the artistic process, however without opportunities for first-hand engagement to actual performance, this opportunity could amount to far less than the intended outcome.

We realise that there are logistical and economic limitations on many schools’ capacity to enable their students’ attendance at theatres, concert halls and events.

For this reason we would be most interested to work with ACARA and our Major Performing Arts (MPA) companies and key organisation colleagues to develop streams (ways and means) for the delivery platforms that might enable students to experience performing arts in the context of live performance. This may of course include live, digital live and digital recorded. (Bangarra Dance Theatre)
Draft Australian Curriculum – The Arts – Foundation to Year 10

Consultation Questionnaire

This PDF is to assist respondents in following the questionnaire and may be used to structure formal written submissions. Surveys must be completed online and will not be accepted by hard copy on this PDF.

Introduction

The draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10 reflects the directions described in the Shape of the Australian Curriculum: The Arts (August 2011). The Shape paper was finalised following national consultation and additional targeted consultation with key stakeholders. ACARA recognises that The Arts is a complex learning area and presents challenges in developing a curriculum that speaks to all people and that the views of all stakeholders were not definitively represented in the Shape paper.

In developing this draft, we have worked to ensure that the Arts Curriculum values the traditions and distinct features of the five Arts subjects – Dance, Drama, Media Arts, Music and Visual Arts; recognises the ways in which artists draw on technologies; ensures that all students will benefit from learning about and working with traditional, contemporary and emerging art forms and associated evolving technologies; and provides the flexibility required for teaching and learning programs in schools that meet contemporary and future needs.

This draft curriculum provides the first opportunity for all interested in Arts learning in Australian schools to respond to the directions described in the Shape paper. ACARA welcomes and thanks you for your feedback.

About the Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to enable individuals and groups to provide both broad and more specific feedback on the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10.

Broad feedback is sought on the Arts curriculum in relation to:

- rationale and aims for the Arts learning area
- structure of the curriculum
- manageability of content for teachers
- flexibility for teachers in developing teaching and learning programs.

More specific feedback in each Arts subject is sought in relation to:

- the rationale and aims
- coverage, clarity and pitch of curriculum content and sequence across the band levels
• pitch, sequence, clarity, usability and coherence of the achievement standards
• representation of key concepts, general capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities.

The first section of the questionnaire seeks background information that is required for purposes of analysis. You can then choose to provide feedback on any other section of the questionnaire. You can skip the sections you do not wish to provide feedback on. This will enable you to focus on the sections most relevant to your expertise and omit other sections.

The sections of the questionnaire are as follows:

• Background
• Arts Rationale & Aims
• Organisation of the Arts Learning Area
• Dance
• Drama
• Media Arts
• Music
• Visual Arts

For each section reviewed, please provide a rating for all the key statements. If you wish to elaborate on your rating, provide examples, disagree with any of the statements or outline why and how you believe improvements can be made, there are opportunities to include comments. Comments are optional and can be accessed following completion of the ratings. If you wish to prepare more detailed feedback, submissions can be forwarded to TheArts@acara.edu.au with the essential cover sheet.

Consultation Closes

The Arts consultation website closes on 23 September 2012.

Note: This site is intended to gather feedback on the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10. A questionnaire can be completed by an individual or by a group of people, e.g. an association or a school authority. Please note that ACARA may make any feedback provided during the consultation process publicly available. Please visit the terms and conditions of the website at http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/Home/Copyright.
**Background information**

1. Please indicate your state or territory: _________________

**Individual response:**

2. Which CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT best describes your perspective?
   - Primary Teacher
   - Secondary Teacher
   - School leader
   - Academic
   - Arts educator (that is arts industry)
   - Parent
   - School student
   - Tertiary student
   - Employer
   - Other (please specify): _________________

3. If you have identified yourself as a teacher or school leader, which sector of schooling best describes your view:
   - Catholic
   - Independent
   - Government
   - Other (please specify): _________________

**Group response:**

4. If you are providing a group or institutional response which category of respondent best describes the group’s perspective?
   - School
   - Professional association
   - University faculty
   - Education authority
   - Arts organisation
   - Community group
   - If other, please specify: _________________

5. Please indicate the name of the group: _________________

6. How many people have contributed directly to this response? _________________

7. If other organisations or affiliates have contributed to this response, please list below:
   - ____________________________________
   - ____________________________________
   - ____________________________________
   - ____________________________________
For each of the questions below, responses were sought using a four point scale: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree.

**The Arts Rationale and Aims**

1. The rationale for the Arts learning area is clear about the nature and importance of learning in The Arts for all Australian students.

2. The aims for the learning area clearly state the intent for the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10.

**Comments:**

**Organisation of the Arts Learning Area**

3. The organisation of the learning area provides a coherent view of the key components and features of the Arts curriculum.

**Content Structure**

4. The Content Structure for the learning area is appropriate.

5. The inter-related strand structure of Making and Responding is appropriate for organising the curriculum content.

**Comments:**

**The Arts across Foundation to Year 10**

6. The description of learning in The Arts across year – groupings is appropriate.

**Comments:**

**Achievement standards**

7. The explanation of the nature of achievement standards in The Arts is clear.

**Comments:**
**Diversity of learners**

8. The explanation of the ways in which the Australian Curriculum caters for the diversity of learners is clear.

**Comments:**


**General capabilities**

The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following general capabilities is evident in the curriculum content:

9. Literacy
10. Numeracy
11. Information and Communication technology capability
12. Critical and creative thinking
13. Ethical behaviour
14. Personal and social capability
15. Intercultural understanding

**Comments:**


**Cross-curriculum priorities**

The relationship described between the learning area and each of the following cross-curriculum priorities is evident in the curriculum content:

16. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures
17. Asia and Australia’s engagement with Asia
18. Sustainability

**Comments:**


**Links to other learning areas**

19. The links between The Arts and other learning areas are appropriate.

**Comments:**


Implications for implementation

20. The ways in which teachers can implement the Arts curriculum to support student learning are clear.
21. The ways in which teachers can implement the Arts curriculum to support assessment of student learning are clear.

Comments:

The Arts Curriculum

The draft content descriptions across the five Arts subjects:

22. cover the important content for the learning area
23. are coherent as a set, that is clearly articulated across strands and band levels
24. are manageable in terms of implementation
25. provide flexibility for implementation
26. provide opportunities to explore connections between the art forms
27. enable teachers to cater for needs of all students
28. together with the achievement standards provide clarity about the depth of teaching and learning required.

The achievement standards across the five Arts subjects:

29. set challenging but realistic standards.
30. are consistent in pitch or level of expectation at each band level.

Glossary

31. The glossary is comprehensive.
32. The glossary definitions are helpful.

Comments:

Comments (please indicate specific strengths and/or definitions for improvement):

Other comments

33. Please provide any additional comments on the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts (for example, strengths, priority areas for improvement).

Each Arts subject had its own set of questions. A generic version is provided below.
<SUBJECT>

**Rationale**

1. The <subject> rationale provides a clear foundation and direction for the draft Australian Curriculum in <subject>.

**Comments:**

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement with particular reference to specific content in the <subject> rationale:

**Aims**

2. The <subject> aims describe the intended learning in the subject.

**Comments:**

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement with particular reference to <subject> aims.

**Learning in <subject>**

3. The two–strand structure Making and Responding is clearly explained for <subject>
4. The elements of <subject> are clearly explained.

**Comments:**

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement in the Learning in <subject> section.

**Foundation to Year 2**

**Band description**

**The band description:**

5. is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band.

**Comments:**

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement in the band description:
Content descriptions

The draft content descriptions:

6. are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned.
7. are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students this band level.

Comments:

Please identify any content using the content description number that you believe should/should not be included in the draft curriculum. Give reasons for your selection such as specific strengths and/or areas for improvement.

Content elaborations

The draft content elaborations:

8. illustrate the content descriptions effectively.
9. are clear, that is explained in understandable language.
10. are relevant to the band level.

Comments:

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement with particular reference to specific content elaborations:

Achievement standards

The draft achievement standard:

11. is clear, that is explains in understandable language what students should know and be able to do in <subject> by the end of Year 2.
12. is pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at the band level.

Comments:

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement in the achievement standard:

<years>

Band description

The band description:

1. is clear, that is explains in understandable language the breadth of learning to be covered in the band.
Comments:

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement in the band description.

Content descriptions

The draft content descriptions:

2. are clear, that is explain in understandable language what is to be taught and learned.
3. are pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students this band level.

Comments:

Please identify any content using the content description number that you believe should/should not be included in the draft curriculum. Give reasons for your selection such as specific strengths and/or areas for improvement.

Content elaborations

The draft content elaborations:

4. illustrate the content descriptions effectively.
5. are clear, that is explained in understandable language.
6. are relevant to the band level.

Comments:

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement with particular reference to specific content elaborations.

Achievement standard

The draft achievement standard:

7. is clear, that is explained in understandable language what student should know and be able to do in <subject> by the end of Year 4.
8. is pitched appropriately, that is realistic yet sufficiently challenging for students at the band level.

Comments:

Please indicate specific strengths and/or areas for improvement in the achievement standard.
10. APPENDIX 2: LIST OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

List of Written Submissions – State and Territory Education Authorities

ACT Education and Training Directorate

Instrumental Music Program ACT

NSW Board of Studies

Catholic Education Office, Sydney (on behalf of schools and office of Catholic Education, Archdiocese of Brisbane)

Department of Education, NT

Queensland Studies Authority

Queensland Catholic Education Commission (on behalf of five diocesan Catholic education offices and Religious Institute schools and QCEC subject-specific reference group)

Brisbane Catholic Education


Department of Education, Tasmania

Victorian Curriculum Assessment Authority (in partnership with and on behalf of Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Catholic Education Commission Victoria and Independent Schools Victoria)

Schools and Curriculum Standards Authority, WA (in consultation with The Australian Independent School Association of WA, Catholic Education Office, WA and Department of Education, WA)

Association of Independent Schools, WA
List of written submissions – Representative bodies

Teacher Professional Associations

Art Education Australia (AEA)
Art Education Victoria (AEV)
Arts Education Practice and Research Special Interest Group
Association of Directors of Music in Independent Schools
Audsance National
Australian Primary Principals Association
Australian Society for Music Education, National
Australian Society for Music Education, NSW
Australian Society for Music Education, Qld
Australian Society for Music Education, SA
Australian Teachers of Media, NSW
Australian Teachers of Media, Qld
Australian Teachers of Media, WA
Collegiate of Specialist Music Educators (Australia)
Council for Dance Educators Ltd
Drama Qld
IPSHA Art Interest Group
Kodály Music Education Institute of Australia
Music Advocacy, Qld
National Association for the Visual Arts Ltd
Queensland Orff Schulwerk Association
School Music Action Group, Vic
South Australian Association for Media Education
Tasmanian Australian Society for Music Education
Visual Art and Design Educators Association
Western Australian Orff Schulwerk Association
**Arts organisations**

- Australian Ballet with Sydney Dance Company and Western Australian Ballet
- Australian Major Performing Arts Group
- Bangarra Dance Theatre
- Carclew Youth Arts
- Melbourne Symphony Orchestra
- Musica Viva
- Music Council of Australia

**Government Agencies**

- Australia Council for the Arts
- Department of Culture and the Arts, WA
- Asia Education Foundation

**List of written submissions – Schools, universities and individuals**

**Schools**

- Australian Centre for Contemporary Art (ACCA) and the Victorian College of the Arts Secondary School
- Barker College, NSW
- Bellarine Secondary College, Vic
- Somerville House, Brisbane, Qld

**Universities**

- University of Western Australia (School of Music)

**Individuals**

35 submissions from individuals were received.
Introduction

Purpose
This appendix provides a report on the intensive engagement consultation activity for the draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10.

Background
The aim of the intensive engagement activity consultation was to gain feedback on the draft curriculum through short short-term intensive activities with teachers and schools using the draft Australian Curriculum materials. This consultation process included intensive engagement by schools with the draft curriculum materials. Teachers identified content descriptions and relevant parts of the achievement standards, developed units of work or assessment tasks and collected work samples. (See Appendix A for a cover sheet to accompany work samples.)

ACARA worked with state and territory education authorities to invite expressions of interest from schools interested in participating in the consultation activity. This occurred from 1 August to 28 September 2012. (See Appendix B for a summary of nominated schools.)

ACARA selected 32 schools to participate in the intensive engagement activities. The final selection of schools was based on a range of factors including a reasonable representation of schools in terms of socio-economic status (low, medium, high); geographical location of the school (rural, remote, metropolitan); school sector (independent Catholic, government); and also the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

Following final selection, ACARA informed schools of their selection and requested confirmation of their participation and provided a package which outlined the commitments and resources associated with the intensive engagement activities (see Attachment C).

At the same time ACARA also communicated this information to state and territory education authorities and established processes for ongoing liaison (see Attachment D).

Participating Schools
Of the 32 schools selected to participate in the intensive engagement activities, eight withdrew due to reasons including workload, industrial action in Victoria and teacher illness. Three NSW schools did not complete activities.

Twenty-four schools engaged intensively with the draft F–10 Australian Curriculum: The Arts across all sectors and stages of schooling.
Below is a breakdown of the participating schools by system and school type.

**Table 1: School participating in the Intensive Engagement Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By system/sector</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By school type</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>F–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Nineteen schools indicated that they had one or more students with English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D).

18 Eighteen schools indicated that they had one or more students with a disability.

19 Nineteen schools indicated that they had one or more students with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background.

Figure 1 identifies the number of schools and teachers by their states or territories.

One Queensland school opted for all teachers in a particular band to participate in intensive engagement activities, noticeably increasing the number of Queensland teachers.

![Figure 1: Participating schools and teachers by state/ territory.](image-url)
In a state by state breakdown, Figures 1, 2 and 3 indicate that:

**ACT:** All three participating schools were secondary – two Catholic schools and one Government school.

**NSW:** The one participating school was a primary Catholic school.

**NT:** The one participating school was an F–12 Government school.
QLD: Of the six participating schools, three were primary, two secondary and one F–12. Of the six participating schools, four were Catholic schools, one was an Independent school and one was a Government school.

SA: Of the two participating schools, one was primary and one was secondary. Of the two participating schools, one was an Independent school and the other was a Catholic school.

TAS: Both participating schools were Government schools – one primary, one secondary.

VIC: Two primary and two secondary schools participated – two were Catholic schools, one was an Independent school and one was a Government school.

WA: Of the five participating schools, three were primary and two were F–12. Of the five participating schools, three were Government schools, one was an Independent school and one was a Catholic school.

Figure 4: Participating schools by state/territory and subjects

In a state by state breakdown, figures 4 and 5 indicate a mix of the five Art subjects across the five bands and represented across the participating schools.
Feedback strategies

The following strategies were used to collect feedback from teachers who participated in the intensive engagement activities:

1. The Australian Curriculum consultation and online survey on the consultation portal of the Australian Curriculum website – in which teachers participating in the intensive engagement activity rated and commented on the Appendix 3: Report on Intensive Engagement Activity – The Arts at a range of levels (i.e., from the whole curriculum through to individual content descriptions in each band of an Arts subject).

Feedback was sought on the following broad questions:

- Is the structure coherent?
- Are the content descriptions (F–10) and the achievement standards (F–10) clear about what must be taught and what students are expected to learn?
- Does the curriculum have an appropriate sequence? Is the content to be taught and the expected learning from it consistent with the teachers’ understandings of where the majority of students should be at any particular year?
- Is the content at any particular level band able to be taught at an in-depth level and within the time that a manageable to teach in in-depth and within the time that a teacher has?

2. An online discussion forum, set up specifically for the intensive engagement activity teachers to share experiences, concerns and resources relating to their involvement with the draft F–10 Arts Curriculum. Discussions were guided and monitored by ACARA staff.

3. A series of teleconferences were conducted with teachers from participating schools to initiate the intensive engagement activities. Six teachers participated in the online discussion forums.
At the conclusion of the intensive engagement activity period a further survey was sent to participating teachers to evaluate their experience of the intensive engagement activities.

**Summary of findings from online survey**

**Overview**

In total 43 out of 68 (63.2%) of intensive engagement school participants provided feedback on the Appendix 3: Report on Intensive Engagement Activity – The Arts via the online survey. This provided limited, yet consistent findings.

**Table 2: F–10 Arts Curriculum online survey respondents by state and subject.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>Total by subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by State/Territory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General concerns**

36% Thirty-six percent of teachers identified a need for a glossary to define terms.  

*There should be a subject subject-specific explanation for each term that is used by more than one Arts subject. Currently, the glossary does not provide a common understanding.* (Qld)

*I feel the need of a glossary … (which) should be divided up across subject areas.* (Qld)

*A Glossary glossary would make accessing the terms clearer for staff using the various syllabi.* (Qld)

*This trial is testing my understanding of some educational terms.* (Vic)

A majority of teachers considered the sixth Making content description unnecessary and suggested it should be excluded. This content description focussed on learning opportunities that could occur across Arts subjects and other learning areas, and was included as part of the Arts learning area organisation. It should also be noted that a significant number of teachers were confused by the term ‘cross-curriculum’ which occurred in this content description and is also used in the Australian Curriculum component ‘Cross-curriculum priorities’.
In the past, our music teacher and I have tried to collaborate with cross-curricular projects but I would not like to see content description 6 as mandated. (WA)

This content description stresses the need for collaboration across learning areas. However, I wonder – do other subjects have the same content descriptions or is it only the Arts … meaning is the onus placed on Arts teachers to initiate the cross-curricular links? (WA)

As a specialist music teacher who sees children 30 minutes a week I do not have the time to link the work I do with other Arts subjects. If I did have to teach the content descriptions it would end up just being ‘tokenism’. (Qld)

I think that it also helps to make the Arts relevant. All too often Art is seen as a sideline “hobby” subject, instead of being regarded as part of life or essential to all branches or learning. (WA)

10.6 is unnecessary as are all of the .6 descriptions as this is not content but an understanding and should be included in Cross-curriculum priorities. (SA)

There were a number of descriptions/elaborations that I found difficult to include – especially the sixth description. (WA)

6.6 seems the most difficult to link to assessment because it will be largely dependent on the teachers to make the links with other areas. (WA)

A majority of teachers found the overarching strand organisers, Making and Responding, inadequate and suggested a need for separate sub-organisers within each subject.

Making needs to be split into two areas for Dance, Drama and Music, one for the creation and one for the presentation of the work. (Qld)

In Visual Arts the Making strand is appropriate, however Responding is more reflective of the making process – perhaps Reflection ‘reflection’ would be a more suitable term. (Qld)

It is curious that the word ‘making’ is used rather than ‘creating’. (WA)

Some concern about the term ‘making’ – ‘creating’ is better. (QLD)

The specific delineation in the making component to distinguish between the many different types of forming and presenting must be more explicit. (QLD)

The term ‘making’ does not really fit well in music. (QLD)

Further considerations

In participating in the intensive engagement activities, some schools used their own programs or units of work without referencing the draft Australian Curriculum. This provided little feedback about the feasibility of the draft.

I hadn’t actually programmed and taught from the content descriptions etc. as I actually used my experience and prior knowledge to write a program and lesson plans etc. then I worked backwards by seeing which of the scope and sequence
points suited my assessments, and I am still questioning if I’ve selected the right points. (WA)

I haven’t actually taught from the draft but I still have sent in my tasks but they are not a viable example of teaching from the draft. (Qld)

Teachers’ approaches and responses to working with the Appendix 3: Report on Intensive Engagement Activity – The Arts indicated different state or territory perspectives and understandings of the term ‘curriculum’. During the intensive engagement activities, teachers indicated an expectation of specific content, more consistent with a syllabus than a curriculum, as demonstrated in the following comments:

More detail and specific content for general classroom teachers. (Qld)

After some time I finally realised that this is NOT a curriculum but a vague outline that needs to be fleshed out using or designing a curriculum. (Qld)

I can’t see the content in the content descriptions. (Vic)

The content descriptions are so vague and lack content. (SA)

I remember reading somewhere, maybe the Melbourne Declaration, discussion about the need for the curriculum to be ‘pedagogy - free’ or something along that line, not sure, but am wondering if this is why the writers of the draft have not included actual content. (Vic)

A further analysis of qualitative feedback revealed that there was a marked difference of opinion between generalist and specialist respondents. Generalist teachers found the draft curriculum manageable:

The Draft Arts Curriculum offers enough breadth to enable schools to choose their own areas of study, select only those content descriptions that are relevant to these areas as well as being able to read the achievement standards in conjunction with the content descriptions. (Qld)

Specialist teachers were critical, expecting more specific Arts subject content:

It [the Draft Curriculum] does not have enough depth which reflects the importance of Arts education. (Vic)

The Arts learning area

There was some discussion of the Arts as pedagogy applicable across the entire range of learning areas in the Australian Curriculum:

The Arts can easily be implemented across the whole National Curriculum. (Qld)

General capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities

Generally respondents were supportive of the inclusion of general capabilities in the draft Curriculum, but some were unsure how to implement them:
I particularly like the inclusion of intercultural understandings and ethical behaviour. (Qld)

Doesn’t address the inequities in cultural and social learning for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders within many school environments. (Qld)

… how to incorporate the general capabilities of Critical and creative thinking, Personal and social capability, Intercultural understanding and Numeracy and to make sure that these are explicitly taught in the curriculum. (SA)

Preparing each unit with the general capabilities in mind will be complex at first and will need to be thought about. (NSW)

**Content descriptions**

The Curriculum Design Paper Version 3 explains:

**Content descriptions** are statements that describe the knowledge, concepts, skills and processes which teachers are expected to teach. They will include the general capabilities, as appropriate, for each learning area. These statements will be linked to present a scope and sequence across years of schooling … (Curriculum Design Paper Version 3, p. 18)

Commentary by teachers participating in the intensive engagement activities suggests most teachers were not familiar with the Australian Curriculum’s definition of content description or that they expected content descriptions to be more specific.

**Content descriptions** – I think they are poorly named, as they do not actually list content to teach. (SA)

The content descriptions do not describe any content and should be named something else. (Qld)

They should be called maybe process descriptions as they list the processes involved rather than actually list the knowledge and understanding that we are to teach. (Qld)

By creating a generic approach through the 9 nine content descriptions the writers have failed to highlight the differences of the disciplines despite stating early in the document the 5 five Arts subjects are distinct. (Qld)

**Achievement standards**

Some respondents indicated they were looking for A to E grading within the achievement standards, focussing on terms such as ‘levels’, ‘grades’ and ‘standards’:

They are not specific. What level? (Qld)

More clarity about attainment levels – what is an A student response for example.? (ACT)

Too broad. I wouldn’t use them as they do not give specific standards etc. (Qld)
As for the achievement standard – it is very broad; is it also to guide for evaluation A–E? (NSW)
Dance

General overview

Ten teachers – five generalist and five secondary, – in a total of seven schools participated in the intensive engagement activities on the draft Dance curriculum, developing and implementing 16 tasks.

A total of seven teachers responded to the survey. Three teachers contributed to the online discussion.

The generalist teachers tended to engage more positively than the secondary specialist teachers, with the draft Dance curriculum as indicated in their responses.

I had no dance experience, following ideas from draft we had a ball. (Qld)

Aims

There were some concerns that safe dance practice was not included in the Rationale and was not identified as a specific aim for Dance. Although mentioned in content descriptions 4.4, 6.4 and 8.4, teachers noted that safe dance practice is not identified in the content descriptions for Years 9 and 10.

Should one of the aims be to do with safe dance practice throughout choreographing, rehearsing and performing? (WA)

No safe dance practice mentioned in the Years 9 and 10 content descriptions. (WA)

Band descriptions

There was one concern regarding the discussion inclusion of teaching of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander dance as referred to in a generic statement in each band description:

The sentence that reads, “students engage with works from traditional Aboriginal and Torres Strait peoples and other parts of the world”, is again, a great proposal but also
I am not comfortable teaching tribal/traditional dances when I don’t have the cultural and practical experience to support my teaching. I also don’t want to offend cultures if I do anything wrong or teach in a political[ly] incorrect way. (SA)

**Content descriptions**

A majority of Dance respondents were not satisfied with the strand organisers *Making* and *Responding* and would prefer the inclusion of ‘presenting’ or ‘performing’ in the organisation of the content descriptions for Dance.

*Whilst these are clear, I question having only two strands. A third strand, such as performing or presenting i.e. technique, would add a layer which more truly describes the art of Dance – making it, doing it, responding to it. (ACT)*

Sixteen Dance tasks (seven primary and nine secondary) were developed demonstrating the usage of content descriptions across the bands as follows:

- CD.1 – 62.5%
- CD.2 – 81%
- CD.3 – 62.5%
- CD.4 – 62.5%
- CD.5 – 75%
- CD.6 – 56.2%
- CD.7 – 56.2%
- CD.8 – 31%

Content description 6 requiring connections to other Arts subjects and learning areas was used extensively by the generalist teachers in the primary bands, (85.7%) but was rarely used by the secondary teachers (33%).

The cross-curriculum priorities provided resulted in some confusion, with some teachers perceiving the priorities should be evident in all content descriptions and others concerned the approach appears tokenistic.

*All the Dance content descriptions work except where they get too specific with cross-curriculum priorities which I assume should be embedded in ALL content descriptions. (SA)*

*I also think that some of the very specific references to the cross-curriculum priorities run the risk of being a bit tokenistic. I understand that the cross-curriculum priorities should be embedded in everything we do therefore [in] all content descriptions. (TAS)*

A majority of respondents indicated that the number of content descriptions in each band could be reduced:

*There is a LOT of overlap between 3rd and 4th (content descriptions). Could all Arts have just 3? (TAS)*

*10.2 and 10.5 content descriptions are very similar. (SA)*

*Too many descriptions – they repeat themselves. (WA)*
**Content elaborations**

Teachers generally found the content elaborations for Dance helpful:

*They are fine but there needs to be a statement that these are only EXAMPLES of what could be done, not the finite possibilities.* (TAS)

*I agree with the [Years] 9–10 descriptions and elaborations. I teach all of these in my Year 9 Dance class.* (SA)

**Achievement standards**

Two respondents felt that achievement standards did not reflect the content descriptions:

*There is not a clear relationship between the achievement standards and the content descriptions.* (TAS)

*Achievement standards don’t currently work because they do not pick up ALL the content descriptions and, where they do, different language is used and/or [achievement standards] are in a different order and/or only pick up a part of a content description.* (TAS)

One respondent suggested A–E standards needed to be provided:

*I think the standards are achievable but will there eventually be more clarity about attainment levels – what is an A student response for example?* (ACT)

**Curriculum organisation**

**Suggestions for improvement**

Participating teachers identified the following improvements for Dance:

- Using art form specific language as sub-organisers in the content descriptions, for example, performance
- Including safe dance practice in Dance in each band
- Placing reference to learning across Arts subjects and learning areas in the aims of the document, rather than in a separate content description
- Reducing the number of content descriptions
- Having achievement standards clearly reflecting the content descriptions.

**Findings by stages of schooling**

Due to the small sample of schools intensively engaged with the Draft Dance Curriculum, findings are limited in this area.

- **Years F–2** – no comments provided
- **Years 3–4** – no comments provided
- **Years 5–6** – no comments provided
- **Years 7–8** – there were conflicting comments regarding analysing the choreographer’s work:
I feel that the section where the achievement standard states analyse a choreographer’s use of elements of dance to communicate a choreographic intent would be quite tricky for students to do by the end of year 8. (WA)

I feel that it is also important for the students in year Years 7 and 8 to have the opportunity to research certain choreographers/dance companies as well as analysing dance works and choreographer’s intention as this would stand them in good stead as they move through Year 9 upwards for their knowledge and written work. This would also enhance the use of dance language within the Years 7 and 8 dance classes. (TAS)

- **Years 9–10** – 10.2 and 10.5 content descriptions are very similar. (SA)
Drama

General overview

Thirteen teachers – seven generalist and six secondary – in a total of seven schools participated in the intensive engagement activities of the Draft Drama Curriculum, developing and implementing 18 tasks.

A total of eight teachers responded to the survey. One teacher contributed to the online discussion.

Although there were some reservations from the specialist teachers, teachers engaged positively with the Draft Drama Curriculum.

We hope that when the Drama curriculum is finalised it offers teachers the opportunity to engage students creatively, academically and socially. (QLD)

The Draft Arts Curriculum offers enough breadth to enable schools to choose their own areas of study, select only those content descriptions that are relevant to these areas, as well as being able to read the achievement standards in conjunction with the content descriptions. (QLD)

There are many fine elements to the proposed syllabus but it must be careful not to sacrifice the academic component of the course, especially in Years 8–10, if it is to compete with other subjects. (QLD)

Two respondents were concerned that the subject should maintain its academic rigour:

We are concerned that we need to ensure academic rigour within the course or it will not equate with other school subjects in terms of academic challenge. (QLD)

Academic rigour must be matched with creative focus. (QLD)
Rationale

Generalist teachers were satisfied with the Rationale whilst while three specialist teachers described it as vague:

I feel the rationale is fairly thorough albeit vague. (QLD)

The rationale covers all you’d expect in a Drama syllabus. (WA)

Aims

Respondents were generally supportive of the aims:

The aims of the syllabus are thorough. (SA)

It's nice to see the other areas of theatre-making considered as appropriate for analysis. The final point is exciting and positive. (WA)

Band descriptions

There was only one comment regarding the band descriptions in Drama which suggested the inclusion of 'playwriting':

The band description should also include reference to the 'writing' of Drama as well as improvisation, rehearsal and performance. (QLD)

Content descriptions

Eighteen Drama tasks (nine primary and nine secondary) were developed and demonstrated usage of content descriptions across the bands as follows:

- CD.1 – 66.6%
- CD.2 – 50%
- CD.3 – 61%
- CD.4 – 55.5%
- CD.5 – 66.6%
- CD.6 – 55.5%
- CD.7 – 55.5%
- CD.8 – 44.4%

Content descriptions were generally described as flexible and allowed for a variety of drama experiences. Some respondents considered there were too many content descriptions:

Content descriptions, although perhaps too many, are clear and flexible for a primary teacher with experience in teaching Drama. (SA)

Content descriptions, have flexibility if you have some prior knowledge of teaching Drama. (QLD)

Content descriptions are flexible and can allow for a large range of activities, performances, ideas and assessments which is great for catering to the interests and
capabilities of individuals. It also allows for variety in teaching, viewing and responding. (SA)

Thorough and clear. (QLD)

Too many content descriptions, some could be collapsed. (QLD)

Some respondents had specific issues:

Content descriptions should also make reference to the ‘writing’ process in Drama. (SA)

The specific delineation in the Making component to distinguish between the many different types of forming and presenting must be more explicit. (Qld)

Skills to do with ‘other/off–stage’ roles need to be mentioned here to cater to individuals that do not necessarily have interests in performing. (SA)

**Content elaborations**

No comments were provided on the content elaborations for Drama.

**Achievement standards**

Achievement standards were considered clear and appropriately pitched.

The breadth of these achievement standards is an excellent way for teachers to choose, according to desired learning outcomes, which skills and understandings are being met. (Qld)

The flexibility of the standards is ideal for teachers and students who spend more than one year in the same school. (SA)

The achievement standards are pitched appropriately while leaving enough room for [a] teacher’s individual scope and selection. (Qld)

**Suggestions for improvement**

Participating teachers identified the following improvements for Drama:

- The inclusion of playwriting as part of the Making content descriptions
- Collapsing some content descriptions.

**Findings by stages of schooling**

Due to the small sample of schools intensively engaged with the Draft Drama Curriculum, findings are limited in this area.

- Years F–2 – no comments provided
- Years 3–4 – no comments provided
- Years 5–6 – no comments provided
• **Years 7–8**

  *I would like to see, by the end of year 8 the standard read as ‘Students use specific terminology, reflect upon their learning and accept feedback to enhance their drama making’.* (SA)

• **Years 9–10**

  *Making 10.1 should include ‘create’ and develop internally …* (Qld)
Media Arts

General overview

Nine teachers – seven generalist and two secondary – in a total of seven schools participated in the intensive engagement activities for the Draft Media Arts Curriculum, developing and implementing 16 tasks.

Four teachers responded to the survey. One teacher contributed to the online discussion.

The Draft Media Arts Curriculum was mainly positive with some minor qualifications.

*The Arts – Media Arts, gave me a clear understanding of what the Media Arts are, what areas I need to cover in class and what the students should be achieving at the end of the band level. (Qld)*

*As a Media Arts specialist I found the draft curriculum easy to follow. (WA)*

*Overall I think it is very good. I like the clear, specific content descriptions and there is a good depth and breadth of learning opportunities, without being unrealistic or crowded. (Vic)*

Rationale

Two respondents provided feedback about the language and terminology used:

*There seems to be lots of information essentially saying the same thing. (Vic)*

*I do worry that a generalist teacher will struggle with some of the terminology, but I imagine that if they are doing Media [Arts] in their classroom they will need to investigate the subject anyway. (WA)*
**Content descriptions**

Sixteen Media Arts tasks (13 primary and three secondary) were developed and demonstrated usage of content descriptions across the bands as follows:

- CD.1 – 56.25%
- CD.2 – 50%
- CD.3 – 37.5%
- CD.4 – 56.25%
- CD.5 – 31.25%
- CD.6 – 25%
- CD.7 – 37.5%
- CD.8 – 37.5%

There was one comment regarding the semantics of the organising strands:

> It is curious that the word ‘making’ is used rather than ‘creating’. The structure is fairly clear, however, I had to search for responding in the text. (WA)

The key concern of the majority of respondents was the sequential order of the content descriptions.

> I think the content descriptions are realistic, however I found the order in which they appeared to be a bit confusing. (WA)

> I think the biggest problem with the draft at the moment is that the content descriptions are not sequential – as in, in order of process. (WA)

> It would be good to have the descriptions in an order which is logical e.g. plan media art works, make the works, use codes and conventions relevant etc. (Vic)

> The splitting of the Making and Responding across each band and the numbering system used, made it look like these were sequential rather than going hand in hand as we thought they should. (Vic)

**Content elaborations**

One respondent commented on the formatting of the draft Media Arts curriculum document:

> We found the formatting of the document cumbersome and difficult to read to get the right elaborations to match the content descriptions. (Vic)

Another respondent indicated that the key concepts of Media Arts were easy to work with but they would like to see more examples to help understand the codes and conventions:

> The codes and conventions could be better explained by providing an example or more information. Key concepts are easy to follow. (SA)
**Achievement standards**

Two respondents indicated that the achievement standards were too broad and indicated that more detail was required:

*The achievement standards are very broad. I understand that it needs to be like that but some further guidelines on what standard they should be achieving would be helpful.* (WA)

*Some achievement standards are very brief.* (Qld)

A further respondent offered a contrasting view of the achievement standards finding them satisfactory:

*I think these achievement standards are great. They really get to the grit of what Media [Arts] teachers are interested in: the differences between representations and reality.* (Vic)

**Suggestions for improvement**

Participating teachers identified the following improvements for Media Arts:

- The draft content descriptions need to be in a sequential order to be better understood
- Achievement standards need to be more specific with more detail.

**Findings by stages of schooling**

Due to the small sample of schools intensively engaged with the Draft Media Arts Curriculum, findings are limited in this area. All feedback related to the sequential order of the content descriptions.

- **Years F–2** – no comments provided
- **Years 3–4**
  *I expect the content descriptions to be in order of the process – planning (4.4/ and 4.5) should be before creating. (4.2).* (WA)
- **Years 5–6**
  *Are the numbers e.g. 6.1, 6.2 in a particular order? Should one happen before the other? It is tricky to read all the Making content descriptions and then the Responding ones later.* (Vic)
- **Years 7–8** – no comments provided
- **Years 9–10** – no comments provided.
Music

General overview

Fourteen teachers – twelve generalist and two secondary – in a total of six schools participated in the intensive engagement activities for the Draft Music Curriculum, developing and implementing 26 tasks.

Ten teachers responded to the survey. One teacher contributed to the online discussion.

The feedback provided by music specialist teachers and generalist teachers on the Draft Music Curriculum varied greatly. Generalist teachers commented that the document was easy to follow, whilst while specialist teachers felt it was too vague and consequently lacked rigour.

*It cannot possibly be used as a tool for the assessment of students in Music because of its breadth and lack of depth.* (Vic)

*It does not assist any teachers with providing curriculum specificity and guidance for implementation.* (Vic)

*I found this document easy to understand and user user-friendly. I spoke to my colleagues (classroom teachers) and showed them the curriculum relevant to their year. From this, I feel that the F–6 needs to be broken down a little more for classroom teachers to feel that they can teach elements of Music in their classrooms.* (Tas)

*In considering the F–2 curriculum – the broad overview seems comprehensive.* (Qld)

*Looking at the draft I did not where to start teaching, what knowledge was I meant to teach? There is no knowledge listed. Sure, in music we sing, play,
listen, respond, reflect, compose but what concepts are we meant to be teaching. ? Where is the intellectual rigour? (Qld)

**Rationale**

There was a marked difference between the views of primary and secondary participants:

*I liked that the rationale was concise and informative. I feel that a primary classroom teacher would be able to read this and understand. (Tas)*

The wording is clear and concise. (Qld)

*The rationale needs to be more passionate and inspirational. The rationale need to show how music is useful and important within a school curriculum. It is not just a fun/bludge subject. That it has intellectual rigour. (Qld)*

**Band descriptions**

The band descriptions were described as too broad. Some teachers felt the inclusion of three years in the first band, Foundation to Year 2, was problematic:

*The band description cannot be clear because it is written across three year levels. Is it possible that the difference between a student in the Foundation year and a student in Year 2 is not known or acknowledged? (Vic)*

Additionally another respondent indicated that the content in the band descriptions was too vague:

*The band descriptions are too general and vague and will lead to unfocused approach to content delivery. (Qld)*

**Content descriptions**

Twenty-six Music tasks (20 primary and six secondary) were developed and demonstrated usage of content descriptions across the bands as follows:

- CD.1 56.25%
- CD.2 50%
- CD.3 37.5%
- CD.4 56.25%
- CD.5 31.25%
- CD.6 25%
- CD.7 37.5%
- CD.8 37.5%

Content descriptions were described as broad.

*The content descriptions, whilst being clear, are quite broad and could be interpreted very loosely by inexperienced teachers. This could mean that the expectations would neither be realistic or challenging. (Qld)*
The suitability of strand organisers, *Making* and *Responding* was questioned by one respondent:

> The term *Making* might sit well with Visual Arts but not so with Music. Creating could be more suitable to composing and improvising and re-creating for performing music composed by others. (Qld)

A majority of respondents indicated that there were too many content descriptions in the Bands for primary:

> I feel there are too many content descriptions. (Qld)
> Overall there could be just 3 three content descriptions for music.
> 1) Performance (sing/play)
> 2) Compose (read/write/explore/explore experiment)
> 3) Listen/respond. (Qld)

> What is the knowledge and music terminology and sequential learning that you want the students to learn and the teachers to teach? (Qld)

**Content elaborations**

Many respondents felt the content elaborations were too broad and therefore vague, and lacking detail:

> The elaborations do not provide any sequential skills to be learnt. Music curricula curriculums usually have a series of elements that are taught in a cumulative sequential way so as children can build on their knowledge as they progress. (Qld)

> The elaborations are very general and do not provide specifics; for example, for F–2 level, tempo could be – fast, slow, getting faster, getting slower. Pitch – high, low – progressing to moving in steps and leaps. (Qld)

> The potential for the elaborations is wonderful, however the content is constantly short-changed because they are written to the lowest common – denominator and are vague in their reference to which particular aspects of which particular elements of music need to be addressed at which particular band level. (Vic)

**Achievement standards**

The majority of respondents considered the achievement standards vague, lacking detail and too broad:

> The achievement standards lack detail and are presented as vague non-specific statements, it does not provide teachers both general and specialist with sufficient information to assess student achievements. It also fails to provide a national standard with which to measure student learning. (Qld)

> They are not specific – what level? This does not tell you anything. (Qld)
It is very difficult to discern how the achievement standards relate to what comes before. (Vic)

The achievement standards state that children will use ‘music symbols and terminology’. These symbols and terminology are not specifically mentioned in the elaborations or content descriptions. (Qld)

The lack of knowledge and concepts to teach is very disappointing. (Qld)

Too broad. I wouldn't use them as they do not give specific standards etc. (Qld)

The study of specific music knowledge, skills and processes needs to be stated so that assessment can take place. (Qld)

**Organisation**

Some teachers indicated concern about the organisation of the draft Music curriculum:

> It is way too complicated for a regular teacher to comprehend. As a musician we can make it work but this is just too overarching for someone who does not have a strong musical background to use effectively. (Qld)

**Suggestions for improvement**

Participating teachers recommended the following improvements for Music:

- Including specific terminology, skills and knowledge in the content descriptions for each band
- Reflecting specific terminology, skills and knowledge used in content descriptions be reflected in the achievement standards
- Identifying the sequential progression of skills and performance to be identified in each band
- Using specific music language as sub-organisers within the content descriptions
- Reducing the number of content descriptions.

**Findings by stages of schooling**

- **Years F–2**

  The F–2 band was not well received, with comments regarding the lack of basic knowledge and elements, inappropriate pitching and a lack of detail.

  > 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5 are all about elements of composing. Composing is important but equally as important is performing (singing/playing) which is 2.3, 2.4. (Qld)

  It is a bit disappointing that 3 three years of music education can be condensed into 2 two very small paragraphs for F–2. (Qld)

  Where is the basic knowledge starting in Foundation? (Qld)
The draft content descriptions are pitched at the lower end of what could be expected at the end of Year 2, indeed most should be expectations at the end of Foundation. They are not challenging enough. (Vic)

As a class Music teacher of this level F–2, I would include more specific information in the elaborations or have another section where sequential learning of terminology and music symbols could be spelled out for those teachers wishing to include this in their curriculum. (Qld)

- **Years 3–4**

  Respondents were reasonably satisfied with this band.

  4.6 – I found this great – it’s good to show how other Arts subjects can relate to Music. (NSW)

  4.7 – I like that students are required to respond to music they create and hear. (Tas)

  Two respondents expressed some concern regarding the exploratory focus of the first two content descriptions:

  In Music there seems to be an overemphasis on creating/exploring/experimenting which might be great for other Arts subjects but for Music it is only a [small] part. (Qld)

- **Years 5–6**

  One respondent indicated the pitch of the elaborations was too high for this band:

  I think the language/concepts in the elaborations is quite advanced for Years 5–6. (WA)

- **Years 7–8**

  Two respondents repeated concern about the vagueness of the wording of the content descriptions in this band:

  8.1 and 8.4 are broad and vague … I am looking for more explicit instruction. (Qld)

  Some descriptions, especially 8.1, are far too wordy and sound slightly confusing. (Qld)

- **Years 9–10**

  One respondent indicated concern regarding the uniform structure across Arts subjects:

  By creating a generic approach through the 9 nine content descriptions, the writers have failed to highlight the differences of the disciplines despite stating early in the document that the five Arts subjects are distinct. (WA)
Visual Arts

General overview

Twenty-two teachers – fourteen generalist and eight secondary – in a total of ten schools participated in the intensive engagement activities for the Draft Visual Arts Curriculum developing and implementing 32 tasks.

Ten teachers responded to the survey. Four teachers contributed to the online discussion.

The overwhelming response from the participating teachers was that the Draft Visual Arts Curriculum was vague, wordy and, overall, theoretical in its approach.

The draft in its current form does appear vague. (WA)

Essentially, I feel this draft may ‘dilute’ the quality of art education in WA. (WA)

The document is wordy and difficult to teach from as a classroom teacher and not a specialist in the area of Visual Arts. (WA)

Give us clear guidelines of the best practice for teaching Visual Arts, lesson design, examples, exemplars … etc. (WA)

As a classroom teacher I would struggle to follow this document and make it work in my classroom. We need clearer understandable guidelines as we don’t have an arts background and find the terminology challenging. (WA)

The overall ‘package’ is not consistent and I feel it needs to be cumulative and sequential. (Vic)

Feedback regarding the ‘language’ of the draft Visual Arts curriculum demonstrated confusion and the need for an explanation of properties of visual art forms, media and techniques.

I think the word ‘technique’ is important to Visual Arts and it is missing. (WA)
The use of ‘visual arts’ and ‘arts/art’ is confused throughout the Visual Arts subject. (Qld)

I am questioning why the Visual Art elements are not used. (WA)

I like to teach the Art elements, basic media and genre understanding so that we have vocabulary to discuss our art ideas and those of others. (WA)

**Rationale**

The majority of respondents considered the rationale ‘vague’, ‘long’ and ‘wordy’.

*The rationale is very wordy and too long. It would be better if it was one paragraph, it should only be an overview of the document.* (WA)

*The statement was very vague. It needs to be embellished with examples or pointers. There were phrases included that could have related to any subject area – not specifically Visual Arts.* (WA)

*The rationale does not mention the development of divergent and lateral thinking and problem-solving abilities as part of the skills students develop. These are fundamental to innovation. This could be included in paragraph 4.* (WA)

*As most rationales, the first reading was a blur of jargon. It leans towards theorising rather than a clear direction.* (WA)

*Rationale … very theoretic, and vague.* (Tas)

*The description is relatively lengthy, but it presents information in an accessible way.* (ACT)

**Content descriptions**

Thirty-two Visual Arts tasks (20 primary and 12 secondary) were developed and the usage of content descriptions across the bands was as follows:

- CD.1 – 71.8%
- CD.2 – 81.25%
- CD.3 – 71.8%
- CD.4 – 81.25%
- CD.5 – 34% (Majority of the responders were primary)
- CD.6 – 81.25%
- CD.7 – 53%
- CD.8 – 15%
- CD.9 – 6.25%

The majority of respondents’ considered the content descriptions lacked sequence and clarity and were frequently described as ‘vague’.

*My first impressions of the draft, was concern regarding the vagueness of the content descriptions, in particular the lack of verbs.* (Vic)
There seems to be no clear workflow, sequence or layering/spiralling in the descriptions. Old, well-used terminology such as elements and principles are is tip-toed around and the ideas behind the use of conceptual frameworks are stated but the tools are not named. (WA)

There is no sense of workflow from one description to another. Each description is its own ‘world’. (WA)

The boundaries seem blurry between some of them. I think they should be defined more clearly (especially for the novice). (Vic)

From attempting this I realised that the content descriptions are either very poorly written OR there is an intention to redefine ways of thinking and working completely. (WA)

The content descriptions are so vague and lack content. (SA)

Three respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the strand organisers, Making and Responding:

In Visual Arts the Making strand is appropriate, however Responding is more reflective of the making process – perhaps Reflection would be a more suitable term. (SA)

A majority of respondents recommended the exclusion of the sixth content description.

6.6 seems the most difficult to link to assessment because it will be largely dependent on the teachers to make the links with other areas. (WA)

There were a number of descriptions/elaborations that I found difficult to include – especially the sixth [content] description. (WA)

Content elaborations

Respondents felt content elaborations did not adequately illustrate the content descriptions:

The elaborations do not reflect the language in the content descriptions – they add significant deviations. (WA)

Not clear in terms of teaching design. For instance in 10.3 the words ‘Visual Communication’ could be added. (SA)

I found the elaborations did not help me to decipher the meaning of the descriptions … I was still questioning what the content descriptions actually meant. (WA)

Achievement standards

Most of the respondents considered the achievement standards were too broad and did not correlate with the content descriptions:

As for the achievement standard – it is very broad, is it also to guide for evaluation A–E? Or are the content descriptions more the focus for evaluation? (NSW)
I have been attempting to create marking rubrics using the Years 5 – 6 achievement standards ... and am finding it quite challenging. (WA)

One of the difficulties is that they do not relate to the content descriptions in a way that is sequential. (WA)

**Suggestions for improvement**

Participating teachers recommended the following improvements for Visual Arts:

- Including the elements of Visual Arts
- Using clear concise language
- Revising the elaborations to clearly illustrate the content descriptions
- Removing the sixth content descriptions in each band, about connection to the Arts subject and learning areas
- Using specific visual art form language as ‘sub-organisers’ in the content descriptions.

**Findings by stages of schooling**

- **Years F–2**
  
  The elaborations for F–2 are less clear than 4.5, 6.5. And for the younger grades wouldn’t the elaborations of 4.5 be more readily achieved, ie. – sharing work in a display sense, recognising the value of mounting their work etc. (Qld)

- **Years 3–4**
  
  I don’t understand the difference between 4.3 and 4.4. (WA)

- **Years 5–6**

  - 6.1 This uses the words ‘experiment’ with’ and ‘create’ in the same sentence and yet the elaborations seem to speak more about exploring and ideas. Is there an experimentation phase before the creating? (Vic)
  
  - 6.2 and 6.3. These could be defined a bit more to separate what they are actually referring to. (WA)

- **Years 7–8** – no comments provided

- **Years 9–10** – Content descriptions are clear except for 10.2 and 10.4 which are the same. (SA)

**Conclusion**

Teachers from primary years were more satisfied with the Draft Australian Curriculum: The Arts Foundation to Year 10, than were secondary specialist teachers. Secondary specialist teachers tended to indicate dissatisfaction with the draft curriculum in their particular subject, calling for more subject specificity within band descriptions, content descriptions and achievement standards. The analysis of the qualitative feedback indicated that teachers participating in the intensive engagement activities in Media Arts found this draft curriculum the most satisfactory followed by curriculums for Dance and Drama. There was less overall satisfaction with the draft curriculums for Music and Visual Arts.
ATTACHMENT A

Student Sample Cover Sheet

(One cover sheet for each student sample)

Student number: (from 1 to as many student samples provided)

Please complete for each student whose work you have provided

Please tick the following boxes as appropriate:

The student is an EAL/D learner

The student is a student with disability

The student is an Aboriginal student or Torres Strait Islander student

The degree of support provided to the student in undertaking this task:

Modifications to the assessment task (if applicable):

Instructions:

1. Number each student whose work you are sending and add the number (in pencil) to the student’s sample, the student sample cover sheet and the completed and signed permission to use student work form.
2. Attach a copy of this completed student sample cover sheet to each student’s work.
3. Attach the permission to Use Student Work form (2.3) to each student’s work.
## Summary of nominated schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Number of tasks</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Media Arts</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Visual Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Saints' College</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicheno Primary School</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell High School</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church Grammar School</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coogee Public School</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>withdrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigmore High School</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographe Primary School</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paul College</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joondalup Primary School</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawungan State School</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marist College, Ashgrove</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marymount Primary School</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Flinders Anglican College</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Ladies College, Claremont</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>Number of tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Media Arts</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>withdrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>withdrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

Assessment Task Template

Assessment task: [insert title of task]

Contributed by: [Insert name and email address]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The Arts [Insert subject]</th>
<th>2. Band level: [Insert]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Relevant content description/s addressed by the task:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relevant part of the achievement standard: [insert band level achievement standard and highlight or underline those aspects of the standard that the task allows students to demonstrate]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task description: [what students will be asked to do]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Any explanatory comments for example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Individual/Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Access to resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teacher input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Background/Context to task the context for the learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the prior learning that might be required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the explicit teaching that will be needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional information related to the assessment task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT D

Teacher discussion forums – teacher feedback and student feedback

ACARA has developed a secure online facility – including provision for online discussions with ACARA staff – which participating teachers will be able to access during the consultation period.

This enables teachers to raise matters of interest, pose questions, provide feedback and undertake discussion with colleagues in other schools.

The facility has the following features:

- Conduct online discussions on progress, issues and other topics, with ACARA staff, and with teachers and schools conducting similar activities
- Users can create and start new discussion topics (discussion postings will not be moderated)
- Upload relevant resources that will assist other participating teachers and schools (all users will be able to upload any educational resource and materials (in Word and PDF format) for sharing with other participants)
- Weekly email alert will be sent to users with summary of discussion topics and threads, and with a list of uploaded resources, for further viewing on the site.

In addition to teacher feedback, we are interested in student feedback that might inform the final development of the curriculum. We understand that this will be dependent on the activities of the individual school and the teachers involved.

Teachers may wish to use the above features of the online facility to assist them to provide student feedback. If at all possible, we would appreciate student feedback in the context of any of the following trial school activities:

- Feedback on the curriculum content or assessment activities that may be taught to students as a result of the trial school activities
- Feedback about the curriculum content that students find useful to include in The Arts
- Feedback about any aspects of the achievement standards that students find too easy or too difficult in relation to work samples provided.