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ABSTRACT

Curriculum development is a complex, problematic and challenging field. Nowadays educators and curriculum developers acknowledge that understanding of curriculum and approaches to curriculum development must be transformed in response to the rapidly changing and increasingly diverse world in which we live.

This study focuses on a particular curriculum development project, the Years 1-10 *The Arts Curriculum for Queensland Schools*, which was undertaken at the cusp of 21st century. While grounded in a technical model of curriculum development the project was influenced by reconceptualist concepts, particularly in terms of the valuing of diversity, and extensive and ongoing consultation which involved stakeholders in the construction of the curriculum. It was constrained by power disjunctions between contributing authorities, and the existing “model of the state”.

This thesis uses a narrative case study approach to document and analyse the process of curriculum development on this particular project. I worked as a participant-observer for the duration of the curriculum development project and have interwoven, into a single narrative, the personal, systemic and political influences on the developing curriculum.

The initial research question focused particularly on significant influences and constraints that contributed to the development of this arts curriculum. However, during the process of analysis, a second important question emerged: ‘What does it mean to be a curriculum developer involved in systemic curriculum construction at the beginning of the 21st century? In seeking to answer this second question I draw on reconceptualist approaches to curriculum theorising.

A review of literature encompasses curriculum theory, suggestions for curriculum development, outcomes-based-education, arts and drama education, and progression in drama.

The body of the thesis documents, analyses and critiques this curriculum development process in three phases: developing the design brief, constructing the outcomes and syllabus, and the trial/pilot process in schools. At the end of each phase important influences and constraints are identified.

I offer three insights emerging from this research which may be of value to future curriculum developers. The first of these is the proposal that we “curate” curriculum rather than create it. Curate derives from the Latin *curare*: to care, and curatorship is characterised by the processes of selection, organisation and “looking after” the items in a collection or exhibition. As curriculum developers we construct the curriculum out of existing materials, selecting some and discarding others. We organise and share the curriculum so that others can access and “see” things anew. I also suggest a framework for conversation about curriculum development which sees dialogue, recursivity and the valuing of diversity as essential underpinnings of the process. Finally I suggest desirable qualities of a collaborative curriculum developer. These qualities assist the developer to navigate the “shifting sands” that are inherent in any curriculum development process.

This study calls for increased attention to the nature and processes of consultation. It highlights the importance of teachers’ contributions to systemic curriculum development and the need for mechanisms of support that enable and value diversity of input.
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY
This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Signed:___________________________Date:_____________
DEDICATION

For my parents:

Mervyn John Stinson
1923 – 1992

Hiliary Edwin Stinson
1928 – 2004
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt gratitude to:
my supervisors for their persistence, rigour and encouragement –
John O’Toole, Bruce Burton and Penny Bundy.

my dear friends, who were always there with wit, wisdom and wine (when necessary); you will never know how much your support helped me through – Annette, Brad, Cathy, Cecily, Carolyn, Charlene, David, Frank, Jan, John O, John H, John G, Jonothan, Judith, Julie, Kate, Linda, Lori, Lyn, Mary, Michael, Morag, Peter, Robby, Sandra, Shay, Stephen and Susan.

and, especially, the children in my family –
Robert, Elise, Thomas, James, Annika, Rebecca, Jake, Matthew, Mitchell, Abby, Jessica, Callum, and Hannah

You are always on my mind.
PREAMBLE

When I was a child my father would come home early from work on Thursday nights and we would pile into the car and drive to Redcliffe or Sandgate beach, about half an hour from our house. The car would have been packed the previous night and in the boot was the fishing creel, bait buckets, a yabby pump and some old towels, smelling of salt water, fish and freedom. Before the sun went down we would hurry to the edge of the water, where the sand was soft and unmarked. On Dad’s signal my brother and I would plunge our feet into the sand as deeply as we could. We twisted our heels and legs, wiggling our bottoms and sinking deeper and deeper into the yielding, waterlogged sand until the pippies that were just under the surface would be forced upwards to lie on top where we grabbed them shrieking with glee and plonked them in the bait bucket for my father to take with him on Friday night when he went out with his fishing club.

On some nights, when the light lasted, or when we had collected enough pippies, Dad would ‘throw a line in’ and we built sandcastles and canals. The water surged round the complicated system of lanes and tunnels we constructed while my mother sat on a blanket further up the beach where the sand was dry and powdery, often with a book in her hands. On some nights, when we had enough money, we would eat fish and chips from packets of white paper that was big enough to be a tablecloth. The greasy, saltiness of the chips, the feel of the sand and the sound of the sea are inextricably linked in my memory.

And when we went back to the same place on the same beach, even only one week later, there was never any sign that we had been there, no matter how hard we searched or how well we had reinforced our castles and canals.

This embodied memory is part of my life, my way of being in the world.

The seashore is emblematic to most Australians. Our cities hug the coastline, windows of houses and apartments straining towards a sea view. It is still the place where most people go to relax and unwind. There is something about staring at the water and hearing the rhythm of the waves as they slide in and suck out, cleaning the edge of the shore, wherever they reach, or leaving the detritus of storms and currents behind.

At times, working on the project that I have described in the study you are about to read, I felt that we were working in the littoral zone, between high and low tide, at the mercy of the prevailing weather. The sands shifted as we tried to construct ‘castles’ with some sort of permanence, knowing that time, tides and bad weather would eventually wear them away to leave no trace. In this document I have tried to collect the shells and the coral, the skeletons of what was once alive. I tried to keep my memories, and the materials from which I have constructed this particular ‘castle’ above the highwater mark. I wanted to keep something safe and dry and to leave a sign that someone — in this case many, many people — had once been on this particular beach, trying to construct something that will, at least, remain in the memories of the participants.
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Chapter 1.

Introduction to the study: the shifting sands.

The story of this study begins on the 22nd of January, 1998. On this day I began work as a Project Officer for the Queensland School Curriculum Council (QSCC) to which I had been seconded for six months to begin to prepare the syllabus for The Arts for the compulsory years of schooling (Years 1 to 10) in Queensland.

The project took four years to reach its conclusion as the curriculum materials went through the various phases of design, development and trialling in schools.

This thesis documents and critically reviews the development of the Queensland Year 1-10 Syllabus in the “The Arts Key Learning Area”. The research reports from the inside, “dwelling between the horizons of the curriculum-as-plan and the curriculum-as-lived” (Pinar & Irwin, 2005, p. 15) in order to highlight the constraints and possibilities offered by this particular project, and inform future collaborative curriculum development undertakings. It seeks an understanding of the “fundamental interests, values, assumptions and implications of human and social action” (Aoki, 2005h, p. 99) that underpinned the curriculum development process under investigation.

The case study investigates the processes involved in this particular syllabus development project from its commencement in February, 1998 to final approval for general implementation in Queensland schools in 2002. The changes and modifications that derived from the consultative nature of the curriculum development process are documented and analysed and key compromises are identified. It is a “distillation of experience” (Ely, 1996, p. 172), in particular my own experience as a curriculum developer. This text has been “interpreted, and critically reflected on in an ongoing transformation of curriculum and self” (Aoki, 2005b, p. 118). Through the recording, recollecting, selecting, sequencing and writing of the events that took place during the four years of the project I have come to know the documents and the events that surround them, and myself, better.

*It is through story – through narrative of all sorts – that we understand ourselves and our worlds* (Ely, 1996, p. 182).
**Why this study?**

The process of design and development followed a politically mandated collaborative process of curriculum development involving the need to gain support and approval from three diverse systemic educational authorities. I document the decisions and actions taken during the time frame for development (including the trialling and evaluation of the materials) with consideration of the positioning of the researcher as a key member of the curriculum development team. The project was a distinctive case in its focus on the need for one document which encapsulated the key learning in five art forms.

This was a unique opportunity for research as I was a teacher, seconded to a curriculum development authority for the design phase of the arts curriculum. This opportunity offered both the time and occasion to document and reflect on the design and development process both at a systemic level and with consideration of the roles and challenges of the practitioner and implementer. My role as a researcher was one of participant observer (Agar, 1996). I attempted to make my professional life “strange”, distancing myself as a researcher of the project from myself as integral to it, as I worked inside the project and examined the process in which I participated. My position as a key member of the arts curriculum development team enabled me to record, document, reflect, contribute, engage, discuss, challenge, and critique in a unique and personal way because, “I was there,” (Agar, 1996, p. 31), participating in and observing the daily activities of the project team.

The study investigates key issues that arose during the development of the QSCC Syllabus and supporting curriculum documents in the Arts as one of the major developments in arts curriculum in Australia. Politically and systemically the decision had been made to include The Arts as one of the Key Learning Areas in Queensland. This indicated broad support for arts learning as an entitlement for all students in the compulsory years of schooling (years 1 to 10 or ages 5 to 15) but it was by no means certain that the curriculum would be adopted by and acceptable to Education Queensland, the Catholic Education Commission and the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland.

Part of the reason for the extensive and ongoing consultation process was to involve teachers as co-constructors of this systemic curriculum. Philip Taylor, who is critical of curriculum packages generated by ‘others’ for teachers to implement, asks “Why is it that teachers do not dominate or feature widely in these documents?” (Taylor, 1996b, p. 5). In this project, teachers featured at every level and at every
phase of the project contributing their lived experience, knowledge of the disciplines and particular schooling contexts.

As a curriculum developer I was working within a system frame where teachers perceive that decisions have “already been made by policy statements, curriculum documents or other system directives” (Brady, 1995, p. 26). The curriculum design process involved making decisions about demarcation of the field, content selection and sequencing, and support materials that provided models of pedagogy and assessment.

By inviting the reader to come with me behind the closed doors of this systemic curriculum development I seek, alongside Aoki,

*a deinstitutionalization of the traditional understanding of “development”, “implementing”, “evaluation,” and so on, and a reconstituting of these commonplaces of curriculum practice, firm in their instances of recognizing the presence of people who subjectively act* (Aoki, 2005e, p. 233, his emphasis).

**The research question**

The key question of this research was:

What were the influences and constraints on the development of the Years 1 to 10 Arts Curriculum, as exemplified by the Years 1 to 10 arts curriculum documents, prepared by the office of the QSCC between 1998 and 2001?

During the course of data collection, analysis and writing the following sub-questions emerged:

a. What were the political (external to the office) influences and constraints?
b. What were the systemic (internal to the office) influences and constraints?
c. What were the personal (to the curriculum developer) influences and constraints?
d. How were decisions/changes made during the syllabus development process? Who had the power and on what foundations?
e. What were the challenges and impact of the mandated consultative curriculum development process?
f. Who made decisions that directly impacted on the curriculum materials in the development process?
g. What was the impact of the researcher as curriculum developer?
h. What were the influences on the design and development of an arts curriculum for the Queensland context?
i. Was it possible to design an arts curriculum suitable for the Queensland context within the given and emerging constraints?

Data collection took place over the four years of the team working on The Arts Curriculum Development Project undertaken by the QSCC.

During the analysis phase a second major question emerged:
*What does it mean to be a systemic curriculum developer at the beginning of the 21st century?*

The report will consider key issues endemic to curriculum development and design, system management of such processes and the role of the curriculum developer, with particular reference to drama education.

**The task**

_The Years 1-10 Arts Curriculum Development Project is intersystemic and widely consultative. It will achieve the following outcomes:_

- the development of a Years 1-10 Arts syllabus document;
- the development of sourcebook material in each of the five Arts areas – dance, drama, media, music and visual arts – that illustrate effective curriculum planning and assessment in The Arts; and
- the development of initial inservice materials to introduce the syllabus materials to teachers and administrators and to support their initial implementation.

_These materials will be produced in a combination of electronic and print forms._

(Design Brief, First Consultative Draft, May 1998, p. 10)

When I started on this project my understanding was that we aimed to develop a syllabus document for learning in the arts. My focus was on drama and, while I was particularly keen to see this strand of the document be as fine as possible, I was hoping to contribute to a curriculum that would offer learning in all the arts to all students, simply because I believe it is every child’s entitlement to learn in, through, and about the arts.

My interest and motivation was personal as well as professional. As a school student I had belonged to the bright-so-we-don’t-have-to-worry-about-her group. I found learning easy although a bit boring and, because I was generally quiet and shy, I was not a trouble maker and was usually left alone by my teachers. In the 60s when I was schooled, there were few options for subject choice. You were either bright (destined for the academic strand) or not-so-bright (destined for the vocational
I was both bright and good at mathematics so there was no question that I would do sciences and I graduated high school having studied physics, chemistry, mathematics, and advanced mathematics. But I secretly loved drama, having been in one school production and when I went to Teachers’ College, I joined the drama club and my life became my own.

When I finished my teacher-training, which included taking a minor in educational drama, I began teaching at a local primary school and spent my vacations working for a children’s theatre company. After a stint as a member of a Theatre-In-Education company I went to the Central School of Speech and Drama in London, to gain a diploma in drama education and then returned to work as Artistic Director of The Playhouse, a children’s arts centre, established to work with children with disabilities, as well as the more “able”. In the mid-eighties I returned to primary teaching, gained my BA by studying part-time, and transferred to a nearby high school. I became the Head of the Performing Arts department, responsible for supporting the work of my colleagues in dance, drama, film and television, and music, but with special concern for drama. During the ten years I was Head of Department I worked with the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (BSSSS) in curriculum development and assessment moderation, studied part-time for my MA during this time, and was seconded to the Queensland School Curriculum Council (QSCC) for The Arts Curriculum Development project at the beginning of 1998.

When I started this project I had eleven nieces and nephews, the eldest of whom was in the first year of high school. Some of the children in my family do not find learning as easy as I did. For them it is effortful rather than effortless. One nephew has dispraxia and did not learn to speak until he was nearly five and only after intensive occupational and speech therapy. But he sang and made music from the age of two. Another was the most extraordinary roleplayer. At three he could sustain role for hours and loved drawing “the best” by the time he was five, but began having migraine headaches once he started attending school. My deep and ongoing motivation for this project was to make the curriculum as good as it could be so that children like those in my family could access artistic ways of knowing the world.

**Overview of results**

At a systemic level of curriculum development the organisation responsible for designing and developing the curriculum must also have the authority and power to design and implement assessment and reporting. In this project the division of responsibilities for development (by the QSCC) and assessment and reporting (the individual systemic authorities) made the task particularly challenging. Personnel
changes at senior levels, shifts in curriculum orientation, and a mandated consultative process with teachers and the community provided both influences and constraints. Despite support from the Queensland Catholic Education Commission and the Association of Independent Schools at every stage of the project, the antagonistic and belligerent nature of the relationship between the QSCC and Education Queensland ran contrary to the expectation of collaboration and intersystemic support. Education Queensland, the largest, best resourced, and most authoritative educational voice in the State was, by insisting on the retention of control over assessment, reporting and implementation, able to undermine the work of the QSCC.

In the final chapter I provide insight into the constraints and challenges that contributed to this curriculum and offer three considerations for curriculum development at a systemic level. I suggest this is a process of curriculum “curatorship” and develop Rita Irwin’s (Irwin, 2003) notion that, “In schools [and schooling systems] perhaps curators would care for the curriculum” (Irwin, 2003, p. 2). I suggest a “framework for conversation about curriculum development” that seeks to open space for dialogue and “true listening” to divergent voices in the development process. Finally I offer suggestions for “desirable qualities of the collaborative curriculum developer” which extend those already provided by Marsh and Willis (2003).

The role of the individual writer/collaborator in the design and development process is a dominant factor in the management of collaboration and the production of the materials. This was surprising to me as, at the beginning of the project, I had seen myself as being the handmaiden to the drama education community, and assisting them to write the documents. As time went on I came to realise that my credibility and negotiation as writer/collaborator was pivotal to the success of the collaborative process and the refinement of the materials. I was working in an “inspirited place of being and becoming” (Aoki, 2005f, p. 420) as I currered (Pinar, 2004b) in collaboration with others, collectively walking/guiding the course (Irwin, 2003).

**How I will report**

I have entitled this study “The Shifting Sands of Curriculum Development” and have endeavoured to highlight the changes in direction or footing that arose during the four years that it took for the project to come to fruition. When writing, I have been conscious of “storying” the landscape and kept the writer’s voice to the fore. In an attempt to avoid “dissertationese” (Ely, Anzul, Friedman, Garner, & McCormack...
Steinmetz, 1991, p. 168) I have tried to write with clarity and familiarity and to lead the reader through the complexity of the landscape of the project. Emerging issues are signalled at each phase of development. At the end of each major analysis and discussion chapter, I have signalled emerging findings from that particular phase.

Qualitative researchers work to be accepted and trusted in their roles, to construct deep understandings about what they are studying and to have some basis for deciding what is important and relevant and what is not (Ely et al., 1991, p. 51).

A particular challenge for me was to select what was important and relevant, and what was not. The data sets are large, detailed and complex. I have chosen to follow the threads of particular changes in direction and modifications to the curriculum. I am conscious that there is much I have left out of the story but hope that this case study will be a “valued particular” (Stake, 2005, p. 448) and thus offer a significant contribution to the field.

This chapter introduces the study, the uniqueness of the case and my role as curriculum developer/researcher/writer.

Chapter Two, With bucket and spade, describes the qualitative case study methodology that frames the research. This chapter identifies the data sources and the process of analysis.

Chapter Three, Collecting driftwood, provides a review of the literature in the field relevant to the project. The literature review encompasses curriculum theory, models of curriculum development, arts and drama education. There is a particular focus on drama education influences on curriculum in Queensland.

Chapter Four, A postcard view, locates the particular context of education and curriculum development in Queensland as an influential mediating force on curriculum development. This chapter endeavours to identify key influences and constraints prior to the commencement of the project. It gives a brief background to the curriculum development project and considers implications of diversity and location.

Chapter Five, Digging in sand focuses on the first phase of the curriculum development project. In this chapter I document and analyse the initial discussions and consultation that contributed to the first draft of the design brief. The chapter continues with the inclusion of additional material, and results of consultation as the design brief proceeded through two more drafts before approval by Council. The chapter also documents the establishment of consultation networks and processes.

Chapter Six, Collecting shells 1, describes issues and early findings that emerged in the analysis of the design brief phase of the project.
Chapter Seven, *Building sandcastles*, traces the development of the core learning outcomes and key aspects of the syllabus document through many drafts. In this chapter I identify key influences in the changes to the documents and describe the template followed by the QSCC.

Chapter Eight, *Collecting shells 2*, illustrates emerging issues and findings from the analysis of the syllabus development phase.

Chapter Nine, *The changing tide*, analyses the trial/pilot phase of the project and documents changes both external and internal to the office which impacted on the curriculum development project. The chapter provides information about conflicting conceptions of curriculum in Queensland at this time, the selection of representative schools, the external evaluation process, ongoing consultation, and the development of support materials.

Chapter Ten, *Collecting shells 3*, offers a brief insight into the issues emerging as the project continued in a quickly changing landscape.

Chapter Eleven, *A bucket of shells*, concludes the study. In this chapter I describe key findings and propose a model for collaborative curriculum development at a systemic level, and a list of essential qualities for the collaborative curriculum developer.
Chapter 2.

Methodology: with bucket and spade

The contestation over curriculum often results in compromises which partially satisfy a number of groups without threatening the hegemony of those who possess the biggest helpings of cultural and financial capital (Johnson & Reid, 1999, p. x).

When I began this research I knew little about curriculum theory even though I had spent over twenty years working in schools, teaching and preparing curriculum materials for the school, my department and my students. I had always enjoyed tussling with content, learning strategies and assessment to find the best way that I and my students could progress on our learning journeys together. My experience had centred on myself as the key decision-maker about the curriculum that would be enacted in my classrooms. But this new role, as a curriculum developer within a “system frame” (Brady, 1995, p. 26) meant that I was participating in curriculum construction at a different level, one where policy dictated protocols and decisions. As a school teacher and head of department I had been provided with the syllabus and my task was to interpret and implement that document for my students in my school. To be honest, I had endeavoured to interpret and enact the curriculum as “given” and left unconsidered the validity of the documents, believing that they had been carefully and thoughtfully created by “experts” with the best interests of my students at heart. The processes which informed the decisions that led to the “pre-active” (Ross, 2000) curriculum were unknown to me.

As an employee of the curriculum development authority I was in a position to observe, and I hoped influence, the creation of the syllabus; however I was conscious that there would be a number of constraints and influences upon the development process.

My key research question was, What were the influences and constraints on the development of the Years 1 to 10 Arts Curriculum, as exemplified by the Years 1 to 10 arts curriculum documents, prepared by the office of the QSCC between 1998
and 2001?, and I was in a unique position to answer this question as I engaged in the development of these materials. My positioning as curriculum developer led to the emergence of my second research question: *What does it mean to be a curriculum developer at the beginning of the 21st century?*

During the course of the project I was able to consider the opportunities that arose for the project team as we planned and designed this brand new curriculum, and to consider the constraints that impacted upon us within the development process.

I chose to use qualitative research as the methodology because it seemed most suitable to the particular context of this research.

> Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 10).

My position as a member of the arts curriculum development team meant I was both the researcher and the researched. Some of the decisions I made contributed directly to both the documents and the process of development and I have tried to tell the story of this project in this document.

**Qualitative research**

This study aligns with the principles and practices of qualitative research. In designing and writing the study I have attempted to consider and communicate the uniqueness of the situation under investigation with the acknowledgment that any understanding must be incomplete. I, the researcher, was the primary instrument of data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2002) and it is my interpretation of events that is privileged in this report though I have cross-referenced, interrogated and reinforced my interpretation by considering multiple sets of data from other perspectives and sources. Because of my secondment to the curriculum development project I had the unique opportunity to study the work of curriculum developers, “in their natural settings” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3) and provide an answer to the question stated above.

Qualitative research seeks to explain and exemplify, to describe the multiple truths constructed from within the changing circumstances in which people find themselves (Taylor, 1996a) rather than claiming to uncover or communicate a single truth. It values story and description (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Freebody, 2003; Merriam, 2002) and attempts to provide deep, rich and complex understanding of a particular situation, while acknowledging that understanding can only be partial. I
have attempted to provide a detailed and thorough description of events and to incorporate voices other than my own but must acknowledge that the story is shaped by my own history, experiences, points of view and hopes for the future.

For the purpose of this research I chose to use case study methodology because recording and reporting the detailed description and story of the process seemed the best way to capture the nature of the work.

**Case study**

The term case study is frequently applied to the product of the study (i.e. the report), however Yin (2003), Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) and Merriam (1988) define case study research as an approach, that is in terms of the process of doing a case study, Other scholars (Freebody, 2003; Stake, 1995, 2000) claim it is less of a methodological choice than a choice of what is to be studied. As Stake (1980) points out, a case study does not intend to tell the whole story but attempts to tell the story of the unity of the case, seeking to understand and communicate the complexity of the “bounded system” (Stake, 1980), the single entity, the unit around which there are boundaries, which is the focus of the research. Stake claims that a case study is both the process of inquiry and the product of that inquiry (2005).

For the purpose of this study, the bounded system was the curriculum development project for The Arts. It was bounded by time (4 years), by location (the offices of the QSCC), by personnel (those who were employed on the project), by systemic requirements (consultation with the three education authorities) and by a specific curriculum framework (an outcomes approach to education) and its particular purposes and goals (to develop a curriculum for the arts which would be suitable for implementation in Queensland schools). My report is interpretive and subjective as I seek to understand the dynamics of this particular project and provide details of “a unique example of real people in real situations” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p. 181).

Case studies have been described in several ways. Yin (1994; 2003) categorises three types of case studies in terms of their outcomes: exploratory (as a pilot to other studies); descriptive (providing narrative accounts); and explanatory (testing theories). Freebody (2003) expands on Yin’s categories. He claims exploratory to be a prelude to other research, stating that in this category “fieldwork and data collection may be undertaken prior to any specification of the research questions, even though the generic framework of the study needs to be created ahead of time” (p. 82). He warns that descriptive studies must cover the depth and scope of the case under study and face the possibility that problems will occur during
the project. Freebody describes explanatory cases as aimed at identifying and delineating causality, and analysis seeks to document patterns of practices and consider competing theories. Merriam (1988) also identifies descriptive case studies but labels exploratory studies as “interpretive” (developing conceptual categories in order to examine initial assumptions); and explanatory studies as “evaluative” (explaining and judging).

This report is essentially descriptive in nature, concentrating on “experiential knowledge of the case” (since I worked on the project as a curriculum developer) and paying “close attention to the influence of its social, political and other contexts” (Stake, 2005, p. 444). However there are elements of both causality and evaluation as my analysis of power and gate-keeping by individuals and groups reveals.

**Ethnography**

Though this case study is not an ethnography I have employed some ethnographic models of data collection. I worked as a participant-observer, a “halfie” (Agar, 1996, p. 21), being someone who belonged to the community that I was studying. Genzuk (2001) points out ethnography relies heavily on “up-close personal experience and possible participation, not just observation”. Agar’s “new ethnography” (1996, p. 9) highlights the *participant* side of the research process, with the participant’s experiences contributing to the narrative and applying “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) to assist in the definition of the experience. Agar talks about a “crisis of representation” (p. 12), referring to the challenge of how to represent the raw material of the research in such a way that the audience, who did not share the experiences, can understand. He reminds us that ethnography is a *participatory* methodology where conclusions are built over time, and unlike the *hierarchical* methodologies of traditional science (p. 15, his emphasis).

The study of this curriculum development project was an *emic* study from an internal point of view, rather than an *etic* study with the outsider’s viewpoint being predominant. There is no way of clearly distinguishing between an insider and outsider point of view. Researcher participation may be best described as a continuum which varies from complete immersion in the program as full participant, to the spectator role where the researcher observes from the outside, having no input or participation in the activities. For the duration of this study my research position varied from being completely immersed in some aspects of the project (e.g. in discussions about the refinements and redrafting of the documents) to being an outside observer (e.g. in some of the school interactions and in relation to the meetings at higher levels within the office). The community that I was part of was
fluid and changing throughout the project. The edges and constituents were not fixed and they intersected with other larger worlds: the trial schools, the professional associations, and the systemic authorities. This case study is focused on the influences on the developing curriculum documents and my own work as a curriculum writer.

**Considerations for the participant-observer**

In the case of this study I was positioned both as the researcher and the researched. I gained permission from the Director of the Council to study the project for my research study, and it was well-known within the office that I was keeping records and documenting the process of development for the purpose of my dissertation. In these circumstances I was “participant-as-observer” with a role which was part of the day-to-day routine of the office but known to be a researcher by other participants (Lewins, 1992). In other circumstances, for example when visiting schools as part of the trial/pilot or when facilitating workshops, I was a “complete participant” totally immersed in the daily routine and not known to be a researcher by other participants.

Ornstein (2003) points out that the decisions that curriculum developers make are, in turn, shaped by the influences that shaped them.

My commitment to drama is evident in my life history. I am also a passionate advocate for access to arts learning for all children, regardless of ability or circumstances. I am sure this is because I am conscious of how my life has changed as a result of access to learning in drama, and also because of my experiences of teaching drama to students from “special” schools and how they responded to the opportunities.

Yin (2003) highlights advantages and disadvantages of the participant-observer role. Deep immersion in the day-to-day practices is clearly one of the advantages, as is what he calls the ability to “manipulate minor events” (p. 94) such as convening meetings or discussion groups. He also identifies some of the problems that impact on the participant and one that I must acknowledge as influencing my work was the phenomenon of becoming a supporter of the organization being studied. The curriculum materials we were developing were a product of my own thinking and input and I became an advocate of them and the work of the office. In addition, and as Yin also points out, it was difficult to pay attention to my role as “observer” since the participant role required much time and attention with insufficient time for reflection, note-taking and the consideration of alternative points of view (p. 96). I sought to counter this disadvantage by ensuring that I kept all the annotated versions of the documents, revisiting them after
considerable amounts of time had passed, and making further margin notes as I recalled my responses at the time. I cross-checked with my journals and early drafts of materials that were never used. I talked to colleagues who participated on the Syllabus Advisory Committee or were members of the team to hear their perceptions and recollections of the same events. A good deal of time has passed since the project was completed. I believe this has been advantageous to my analysis, allowing me a more personally dispassionate consideration of events.

**Research design and research questions**

Once I had decided on my key research question I began to list additional and connected questions. I asked what would constitute a curriculum suitable for Queensland schools and how could this be described in the outcomes framework that was the preferred model at the time? I wondered what content would be selected and excluded and how these decisions would be made. I wondered who was to make the decisions about what would be included or excluded as part of this curriculum; how the mandated consultative and collaborative process of curriculum development would work; and what influence I would have in my position as a project officer. Because I was considering the case of the development of the curriculum I needed to consider how and when decisions were made during the curriculum development process. I needed to identify those contributors who had power within the curriculum development process and on what foundations that power was based. Thorough and detailed documentation at each stage of the process was essential to identify the full range of opportunities and constraints that impacted on the development of the syllabus.

**Ethical considerations**

This research was conducted with due regard to ethical research protocols. The Director of the Office of the Council was approached before I began to collect data and gave permission for me to research the curriculum development project, allowing me to use all internal documents for the study. As I explain later some official documents were classified as confidential during the life of the project but I was able to access them under the Freedom of Information Act once the project was concluded.

When it is a matter of public record I have used the names of individuals in positions of authority. Within the office I have gained permission to identify some of my colleagues but did not seek permission from all participants involved in the project and so have, in some cases, used pseudonyms. These are identified throughout the text. Within this document I have preserved the anonymity of all
Data collection and time lines

Data was collected from the beginning of the project in February, 1998 until I left the project at the end of 2001. I kept a personal journal of reflections, documenting not only the process of development but also my responses and observations. I collected data from office interactions and at meetings convened elsewhere, including the schools involved in the trial/pilot of the syllabus. As a matter of procedure the team members made hard copies of all records of meetings and suggestions for amendments. Office policy was that wherever possible electronic copies were kept and regular back ups ensured that soft-copy data was not lost. Minutes of team meetings and Arts Syllabus advisory meetings were copied to my computer and the various drafts of the syllabus documents were labelled by date and kept under different file names.

Data sets

Data sets included:

- Formal minutes of meetings of the Arts Syllabus Advisory Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Council;
- Faxes, email correspondence, memos, and mail in response to documents and procedures;
- A personal journal including informal notes of meetings held within schools and within the office;
- Artefacts i.e. multiple drafts of the syllabus, the sourcebook guidelines, initial in-service materials and modules, and the three evaluation reports from the external evaluator.

Minutes of meetings provided a rich source of data throughout the project, as did the responses to surveys and draft documents. I kept a personal reflective journal, attempting to pay “heightened attention” (Ely et al, 1991, p. 42) to my day-to-day work. Artefacts analysed included each draft of the syllabus, many with annotations that helped trace influences and amendments, drafts of the elaborations, modules, and the three reports from the external evaluators.

Minutes of meetings

I recorded, stored and analysed four sets of minutes throughout 1998-2001. Minutes were taken of the weekly team meeting, and formal minutes were recorded and verified at each of the Arts SAC meetings, the QSCC Curriculum Committee meetings, and the Council meetings.
Minutes of team meetings were not recorded for the entire project. For the first six months of the project the Arts team was made up of three people. One left the project in June and for the remainder of 1998 there were only two members of the team. At this stage of the project formal minutes of meetings were not taken and we relied on personal notes as records of meetings with the Principal Project Officer (PPO). Formal team minutes began to be kept from January 1999 when the Arts team expanded to eight members. Meetings were held every Tuesday morning for around two hours each week and detailed minutes were kept and circulated to the team following each meeting for member checking (see Appendix 2.1 for a sample of the team minutes).

The Arts Syllabus Advisory Committee met for full-day meetings four times each year and detailed minutes of each meeting were kept as evidence of the decisions which the committee contributed for the developing curriculum. Each set of minutes was posted to the committee in advance of the following meeting so that the accuracy of the recording could be verified by those who attended. At the commencement of each Arts SAC meeting, formal meeting protocols were followed for approval or amendments to the previous minutes.

The QSCC Curriculum Committee met six times per year, approximately one month in advance of the QSCC meetings. The role of the Curriculum Committee was to provide curriculum related advice to the Council. Minutes from this committee were confidential and unavailable to us during the life of the project but, following the amalgamation of the QSCC with the BSSSS and TEPA to form the QSA in 2002, I sought access to these minutes under the Freedom of Information Act. I was required to pay a fee to cover the costs of copying and posting and the minutes were processed and forwarded to me. Part of the processing was to remove any embargoed material, and to black out the names of discussants at the meeting e.g. *Ms [blurred] confirmed that the minutes were a true and accurate record.* I have continued to use this convention of confidentiality throughout this dissertation to remove the names of individuals in order to protect their identities.

Queensland School Curriculum Council met six times per year. Minutes of these meetings were also regarded as confidential and were not accessible to members of the Office. I gained access to the QSCC minutes under the Freedom of Information Act, following the same protocols as described above.

**Faxes and responses to documents**

During the design brief phase, two fax surveys were sent to schools. Responses were summarised in tables which allowed me to identify the source of the response (school context and arts specialisation) and responses to the specific questions on
the survey form. I further analysed these responses to identify emerging themes and concerns raised by the respondents.

Following the fax surveys used for initial data gathering we continued to employ faxes, email, and downloadable templates from the website as means of accessing feedback on the developing materials. Many respondents annotated directly their copies of the draft documents and these annotated responses were also kept.

**Personal journal**

A personal journal was kept throughout the project. I attempted to keep this regularly but there are some gaps when I was unable to maintain regular entries. This journal tends to be personal and reflective rather than analytical and has been a useful source of data about interpersonal relations within the project team, and with members of the consultative network.

**Artefact analysis**

The project yielded a large number of artefacts: drafts of the design brief and the syllabus. I kept hard and soft copies of each draft and supplemented the hard copies with annotated copies which were provided by members of the Arts SAC and consultative network as feedback.

**Analysing the research**

The detailed analysis did not begin until some years after the data collection had concluded. In the interim I had changed career paths and moved countries as I took up a position as an academic in the National Institute of Education in Singapore. I took a break from my studies as I needed time to come to terms with the changes in my life. This meant that I could see the data with some emotional distance.

For some time the boxes where I had stored my data files remained untouched and several times I started to unpack them, but found the task too daunting to fit in the time I had to spare from my teaching and newer research projects. I began to worry that I would never get to the analysis phase and began to avoid writing or even thinking about the task ahead. Finally I took a block of four weeks leave and determined to lock myself away until I had finished the analysis, little realising that it would take much longer than four weeks. I organised all the files into categories and set up my working space so that I could spread out and work with my various piles and bundles and began to read. I worked with a highlighter, marking the text when I found ideas or information that struck me as interesting. I began to reorganise the bundles into the three significant phases of the project: the design brief phase; the outcomes development phase; and the trial/pilot to publication
phase. Then I commenced a process of reading again and again, continuing to use a highlighter to mark up information that struck me on each read through. Fig. 2.1 illustrates the process of analysis.

**Fig. 2.1 Steps in analysis** (adapted from p. 131, (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000)

1. Sort field texts. Identify broad categories relating to Research Question 1.

2. Refine categories relating to sub-questions. Coding of journal entries, minutes, memos – noting dates, contexts, individuals/groups involved, topics.

3. Identify emergent issues. Reread and recategorize.

4. Identify specific data samples and representative quotes. Begin writing interim texts a) chronologically; b) by themes. Reread field data and coded materials.

5. Consider issues and data samples in relation to relevant theories. Construct framework for research text. Begin writing research text.

I chose to code and analyse my data manually rather than use computer software, after finding, along with Clandinin and Connelly:

*We have not found these computerized programs particularly useful in inquiries with massive amounts of field texts of different kinds composed over a span of years* (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 131).

I read again, this time transferring key words or phrases onto individual yellow sticky notes and stuck them on the large blank wall that was opposite the desk. The notes allowed me to move ideas and themes around to form categories.
and patterns until I felt I had a framework for analysis. These categories and themes were transferred to computer files and data inserted as analysis continued.

I began to write, constructing a variety of "interim texts" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 133). This was an important analytical process for me to go through. The writing process helped to sift again, clarifying what information to include and what was less relevant. Little of my early writing is present in this current document. As the patterns continued to emerge and become clearer, I came to realise that I could not tell the whole story of this curriculum development project, nor even a part of it in great detail.

Each time I returned to the data with my research question firmly in mind, I sought key threads and connection. I developed and refined my sub-questions and looked through the data sets again to find evidence of answers to those questions. I learned that my "back brain" (O'Toole, 2006) was constantly at work, worrying away at ideas and issues and helping me make sense of the data seeking to find ways of making sense of this "series of representations" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3).

I decided to start writing up the project in its three significant phases: design brief, outcomes development, and trial/pilot and reorganised the data into categories determined by these three phases. The design brief phase lasted for the first six months of the project and established the framework for the syllabus; the outcomes development phase was from August, 1998 till the syllabus was approved in June 2000, the trial/pilot to publication phase was from February, 1999 till December, 2001. Each phase of the project contains its own story and meanings but when connected and viewed as an entirety, richer understanding emerges.

In each phase I began to look for emerging issues and themes, "thinking units" (Ely et al, 1991, p. 144) and set up databases with those issues and themes (see Fig. 2.2) as the organising framework. I read and re-read the minutes and responses to drafts for comments that might help me understand the thinking behind responses provided in the consultation process, and the project team's decisions in relation to feedback, "seeking sweet water" (Stake, 1980). The variety of data gathered allowed me to search for connections and overlaps and to ask questions of "meaning, significance and purpose" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 121). As Stake (2005, p. 449) points out, rather than seeking to identify causality as a single linear cause-effect relationship researchers perceive events as "multiply sequenced, multiply contextual, and coincidental more than causal". Decision makers, the consultation process, and time and timing were three major themes that emerged at an early stage. I linked these to emerging sub-themes and identified overlaps and ongoing influences. I recorded the time and timing of changes to the
draft documents (see Appendix 2.2) going backwards and forwards through the minutes and my journal to identify when decisions were made to change the draft documents and who made those decisions. I sought to answer the questions of “who, why, what, how, context and form” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 121). For each phase I pinpointed key decisions in the draft document and tracked back through the minutes and my journal to trace the instigators of those decisions, and those who were the final decision makers. I sought to identify powerful and influential decision makers in each phase of the project.

**Fig. 2.2 Categories and themes emerging from the data**

I began to read books and articles on curriculum theory, something that I had never studied, and was awestruck by the complexity and diversity within the field. I wished that I had known some of the theorists and theories when I was working on the curriculum development project, instead of accepting the office position. I saw that the structure of the curriculum was essentially “Tylerian” (based on the work of William Tyler, 1949), though the work of Decker Walker (1971) had influenced the collaborative and consultative development process. I became conscious that I had acquiesced to previously made decisions about the curriculum development process as “givens” and was challenged by what I was beginning to learn about the positioning of curriculum, and curriculum developers, as social and cultural hegemony (Apple, 2004; Bernstein, 1996; Giroux & McLaren, 1989). Within the data...
I sought evidence of dominant and powerful voices and those who had little influence. I was conscious that I had to find specific evidence in the data that confirmed my emerging issues rather than working on unsupported assumptions. I looked for conflicting and contradictory evidence as I read and re-read, “linger[ing] in the midst of the story … and wondering how the [questions] belonged together” (Aoki, 2005g, p. 386). By this time I knew the data sets very well, and found often that I was able to remember that there was a snippet of information or a quote that would offer some representative understanding. As I continued writing my interim texts I became worried about the emotional involvement that was apparent in my writing, as both developer and researcher, but I came to see this as a particular strength of this research, permitting an acknowledgement of the emotional and personal influences on the decision-making processes, and locating the researcher as central to the study.

Researchers are encouraged to “triangulate” data to validate and verify the “truth” of their claims, but the notion of a single truth in research has been contested, especially by constructivist theorists (Stake, 2000). I do not claim that this research provides a single and incontrovertible truth. The results have been filtered through my multiple personal lenses: a teacher, a member of the team, a woman and a member of a family. I present a personally constructed view of the events.

Laurel Richardson (2000) talks of the validation process as “crystallisation”, coming to terms with the data through different lenses to see the essence of the research with clarity. Rather than the focusing inwards of the crystal, the analogy works better for me if I think of it as focusing outwards. As the light shines through the facets of the crystal it breaks up into colours and hues, not with sharp boundaries, but with blurred edges, shading and overlaps. Crystals refract light to create patterns that are discerned differently according to our “angle of repose” (Richardson, 2003, p. 517). Rather than seeking “validity” I seek “credibility” which has been gained by prolonged personal engagement with both the lived context of the project and the detailed and comprehensive field texts gathered throughout the four year span of my role as a curriculum developer.

**Reporting the research**

> Whatever the particular action, when someone tells a story, he or she shapes, constructs, and performs the self, experience, and reality (Chase, 2005, p. 657).

Because this is a narrative-based case study (O'Toole, 2006, p. 45) I have tried to retell the case as a story, a sequence of events. According to Clandinin and Connelly
we “lead storied lives on storied landscapes” (2000, p. 8) and this study aims to tell the story of a particular event i.e. the development of the curriculum. I have endeavoured to write a research report that is “believable and interesting” (Ely, 1996, p. 167) hoping that the reader will arrive at their own interpretation (Stake, 2005, p. 450). The narrative focuses on temporality (events happening over time) and people (narrated in terms of the process) described through action and with a degree of uncertainty, a tentativeness about the event’s meaning (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). I am conscious that the story is very much in my own voice and I have “shaped and constructed” both the story of the event as well as my own identity within it. I hope that I have managed to honour the voices of others who contributed to the curriculum by providing extracts in their own voices but realise that this account is particular, partisan and partial.

It is clear that the report also is bounded by the constraints of the research and reporting process. While I will attempt to pass on to the readers some of the personal meanings of events and circumstances, there will be others that I leave out and fail to pass along. Whether this case study report is unique or typical (and then potentially generalisable) I cannot be sure. However I believe that I have been meticulous and thorough in my documentation and analysis. While the case is unique and particular to the context of curriculum development in Queensland, I have identified some characteristics which could be generalisable and might be usefully translatable to future curriculum development initiatives. In these circumstances I hope that the events and situations are able to speak for themselves and the reader can interpret and make meaning as it relates to their own context.
Chapter 3.

Literature Review: collecting driftwood.

In this chapter I discuss literature broadly relevant to this curriculum development project in three separate fields of enquiry. In the first field the focus moves from conceptions of curriculum and models of curriculum development to the roles of curriculum developers, and a brief overview of outcomes-based-education as conceived by William Spady and adopted by the QSCC. Further into the chapter I raise considerations of arts education including issues relating to integration as the second field of scholarship. The final section of the chapter discusses the third field relevant to this thesis, the literature relating to learning and progression in drama.

This dissertation focuses on the design and development of a particular set of curriculum documents but curriculum is not limited to documents alone. Considering curriculum requires that attention be paid to processes of selection and judgment, sequencing and development – and the relationship between teacher and student. It can be argued that we curate curriculum rather than create it. “Curate” derives from the Latin cura, to “care” and the Oxford English Dictionary defines curate (v) as to “select, organise, and look after the items in a collection or exhibition”. As teachers and curriculum developers we construct the curriculum out of existing materials and “best-practice”, selecting some, discarding others; we evaluate what we believe to be “good”, “important”, or “representative”. We attempt to present or share (display) the curriculum so that others can come to know something new. The selection of materials is displayed in a particular sequence, but allows for revisiting, alternative pathways and lingering for periods of deep investigation or quiet contemplation.

Field One: Curriculum theorising

Curriculum is a difficult term to define. A scan of the field shows diverse explanations of the term and is testimony to the struggle with its meaning. In 1987 Portelli found more than 120 definitions in the professional literature (cited in Marsh & Willis, 2003, p. 7). Many theorists (Errington, 1992; Green, 2003; Kemmis & Fitzclarence, 1986; Marsh, 2004; Marsh & Stafford, 1998; Posner, 2004) describe curriculum as a noun: its content, its focus and its limitations as well as the
unexpected, hidden or silenced curriculum. Others Pinar (2005), Aoki (2005h), Courtney (1980) define it as a verb, to “curric”. In Courtney’s terms, those who work with curriculum are “currickers”, or for Pinar, “curricularists”.

The term curriculum is variously used to encompass the pre-active (Ross, 2000), planned or intended (Lovat & Smith, 1995; Pinar & Irwin, 2005; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2002; Posner, 2004), which is commonly ensconced in the written documents produced and disseminated by a ministry or education department (such as those which are the focus of this study); the enacted or operational (Eisner, 1994), describing the selection of content, activities and assessment from the planned curriculum that teachers actually apply in classroom practice; the experienced or lived (Aoki, 2005h; Lovat & Smith, 1995; Print, 1993) which incorporates the day to day learning experiences of the students; the hidden (Apple, 2004; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; Lovat & Smith, 1995; Pinar, 1998; Print, 1993), including expectations of behaviours, gendered or otherwise, and ways of working delineated by the implicit power structures and values enacted within a school community; and the nul (Eisner, 1994) which refers to content, subject matter, concepts and processes that are not selected as part of the course of study and hence excluded from the field of knowledge made available to students. Stenhouse (1975) describes the curriculum gap as the discrepancy between the planned and the enacted curriculum.

Marsh and Willis (2003, p. 13) define curriculum as “an interrelated set of plans and experiences that a student undertakes under the guidance of the school”. Posner (2004, p. 5) points out a range of contrasting definitions: “Some claim that a curriculum is the content or objectives for which schools hold students accountable. Others claim that a curriculum is the set of instructional strategies teachers plan to use”, while those who align with post-modern curriculum theories, for example Pinar et al, state that:

[Curriculum] is what the older generation chooses to tell the younger generation … [it] is intensely historical, political, racial, gendered, phenomenological, autobiographical, aesthetic, theological and international. Curriculum becomes the site on which the generations struggle to define themselves and the world (2002, p. 847).

Influenced by feminist and literary theory, Pinar (2004b, 1998; Pinar & Grumet, 1976) proposes “currere” which emphasises the personal nature of curriculum as experience. According to Pinar, currere “seeks to understand the contribution academic studies makes to one’s understanding of his or her life (and vice versa), and how both are imbricated in society, politics and culture” (Pinar, 2004b, p. 36).
The field of curriculum theory is dynamic and contested, not grounded in a single world view but encompassing diverse socio-political and ideological factors. Unsurprisingly, a range of conceptualising categories has been applied to those who participate in curriculum theorising.

Eisner and Vallance (1974) provided conceptions of curriculum classified into five major categories:

- **technological** – a technological process for producing whatever ends policymakers demand. Curriculum developers conceive of themselves as agents of their clients and hold themselves accountable by producing evidence that curriculum attains intended objectives. This orientation reproduces the cultural context in which it is developed (Apple, 1986/2004; Giroux, 1989; Pinar et al., 2002) and is the orientation which was promoted and supported by the QSCC. In particular the emphasis on collaboration privileged orientations towards maintenance of the status quo and current practice.

- **academic rationalism**– by which learners are introduced to subject matter disciplines as organized fields of study. This orientation views the organized content of subjects as a curriculum to be pursued rather than as a source of information for dealing with social problems. It advocates that the curriculum be grounded in “the storehouse of knowledge which has enabled humankind to advance civilization” (Ornstein, Behar-Horenstein, & Pajak, 2003, p. 22).

- **self-actualisation** (labelled “humanistic” by Kelly, 1982) – an orientation that stresses personally satisfying experiences for each individual with the ideal of producing a self-actualising individual. In this conception, the curriculum is not pre-planned by adults, but evolves out of the interests of the students. Students become the curriculum developers by selecting topics, or areas of interest that intrigue them. Content is identified by the extent to which it is relevant and meaningful to the individual student.

- **cognitive processes** – emphasises the ability to think, reason and engage in problem-solving activities. Specific content is regarded as less important than the cognitive processes. It is regarded as relatively “content-free” as the cognitive processes are generalisable from one subject area to another (e.g. Bruner, 1963; Mayer, 1992).

- **social reconstructionism** – societal needs are privileged over individual interests. The curriculum aims to effect social reform and derive a better future for society with a focus on the development of social values and how to use these in the process of critical thought. This curriculum orientation focuses on the problems
and dilemmas of society with the view of creating a more just, equitable, and humane community. Students consider how obstacles can be overcome in order to create a more ideal society.

Twelve years later Elizabeth Vallance (1986) reviewed this organisation of the field. She believed “self-actualisation” had lost currency in the intervening years. Vallance dropped self-actualisation from the model and added “personal success” relating to the strong orientation towards business. Personal success offers an orientation of curriculum as a means to an immediate practical goal. She added an additional area, “curriculum for personal commitment” which sees schooling as creating a “personal commitment to learning” (1986, p. 29).

Alternative categories are provided by Marsh and Willis (2003) who propose that curriculum theorists can be clustered under three categories: prescriptive theorists, descriptive theorists, and critical-exploratory theorists.

- **Prescriptive theorists** (e.g. Tyler, Taba, Goodlad) aim to improve school practices through providing the “best curricula possible” (Marsh & Willis, 2003, p. 103) which delineate “which knowledge is most worthwhile and which community traditions may or may not be worthy” (Hlebowitsh, 1999/2004, p. 267).

- **Descriptive theorists** (e.g. Schwab, Walker) attempt to come to understand how curriculum development actually takes place in school settings. For them the importance lies in the relationships between the steps and procedures that are followed in the curriculum development process.

- **Critical-exploratory theorists** (e.g. Eisner, Pinar) focus on deficiencies in past curriculum development practices and “replace them with more adequate practices” (Marsh & Willis, 2003, p. 103) considering the diversity and continuity of curriculum. They look at the curriculum of the past and the present and consider what the curriculum of the future might be.

The latter category is more commonly considered as curriculum “reconceptualists” following the 1973 “Reconceptualising Curriculum” Conference, in Rochester, NY, instigated by William Pinar. Reconceptualists disrupt found knowings of curriculum and problematise it as fluid, complex and often elusive. Theorists connected with the reconceptualist approach are often concerned with domination, exploitation, resistance and what constitutes legitimate knowledge in contemporary society (Doll, 1993a; Doll & Gough, 2002; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; Noddings, 2006b; Pinar, 2004a). Reconceptualists consider what might be necessary knowledge in the future and the impact of globalisation and capitalism on the work of
teachers (e.g. Apple, 2006). A reconceptualist curriculum theory questions the stability of knowledge, envisaging multiple viewpoints and multiple futures.

This group has uncovered weaknesses in previous curriculum models but have been criticised for being unable to provide a viable alternative (Doll, 1993b; Hlebowitsh, 1999/2004; Marsh, 2004). Reconceptualists, however, do not believe that there is a single alternative. They reject the modernist view of a stable-state universe and the belief that a better world can be accomplished through order and control (Apple, 1986/2004; Freire, 2000; Giroux, 1989). They criticise efficiency-oriented curricula for using schools as instruments of social control (Bernstein, 1996; Grumet, 1987; Pinar, 2004b) and highlight issues of gender (Grumet, 1988; Grumet & Stone, 2000; Lather, 1991), race (Castenell & Pinar, 1993; McCarthy, 1988) and, postmodernism/ poststructuralism (Doll, 1993a, 1993b, 2002; Giroux, 1991; Slattery, 1995). Instead curriculum must be autobiographical (Pinar, 1998; Pinar & Grumet, 1976) drawing on the personal pasts, presents and futures of both teachers and students, and dialogic with teachers acting as public intellectuals (Giroux, 1989).

When I was working on this curriculum development project I had no knowledge of the field of curriculum theory. My understanding of what constituted a curriculum was drawn from my years of practice as a primary and secondary teacher, and was based in the curriculum documents that were provided by the education department. These were certainly based in a technological conception of curriculum and were unchallenged within the schooling contexts where I worked. As I read, I found myself drawn more towards the reconceptualist approach (especially Pinar, Aoki, and Grumet) and the idea of curriculum being “lived” rather than enclosed within a text. I agree with Paul Stevenson (1978, p. 7) when he says, “A curriculum is not a document. A curriculum is an event”.

In particular, Noddings’ (Noddings, 2002, 2003/2004, 2006a, 2006b) conception of curriculum based in an “ethics of care” appeals to me:

If the aim is justice – to provide all students with an education that will meet their needs – the solution is likely to involve the provision of considerable variety in school offerings and to include material that might contribute to personal as well as public life. … [This] means cooperatively constructing rigorous and interesting courses centred on students’ interests and talents. It means that the schools should show the society that democracy honors all of its honest workers, not just those who finish college and make a lot of money (Noddings, 2003/2004, p. 339).
Noddings believes that education should be based on “caring encounters” whereby we learn, first what it means to be cared for, then to care for intimate others, and finally to care for those we cannot care for directly” (2002, p. 31). For her students need to be educated about politics and societies, and schools should aim to “reduce violence, to respect honest work of every kind, to reward excellence at every level, to ensure a place for every child and emerging adult in the economic and social world, to produce people who can care competently for their families and contribute effectively to their communities … our major educational aim should be to encourage the growth of competent, caring, loving and lovable people” (Noddings, 2006b, p. 18). Like Noddings, the renowned drama educator Dorothy Heathcote (1974, p. 4) argues, “we expect good fathers, husbands, honest citizens, fine, sensitive friends, tolerant and understanding neighbours to emerge from the classes we teach but we do very little to help these traits to come along” (cited in Burton, 1991, p. 55).

I also find personal resonance in Doll’s (1993/2004) post-modern curriculum and his four Rs” of “richness, recursion, relations and rigour”. By richness Doll refers to “the curriculum’s depth, to its layers of meaning, to its multiple possibilities or interpretations” (p. 254); recursion allows iteration, revisiting, “looping” back of “thoughts on thoughts” (p. 255), not merely repetition, but with reflection an integral part of the process; by relations Doll considers that we should “focus on the connections within a curriculum’s structure” through the “twin processes of ‘doing and reflecting-on-doing’” (p. 256); and rigor is interpreted in a post-modern frame – drawing on “interpretation and indeterminacy” (p. 259) as one continually explores, and looks for new combinations, interpretations, and patterns all the while being conscious that “valuations depend on (often hidden) assumptions” (p. 259).

I am drawn to concepts of curriculum that allow for multiple interpretations in practice, a livable curriculum rather than prescriptive models which allow for little professional judgement by teachers and for the diversity of school contexts and student needs. For me, a valuable and useful curriculum document is one which helps to guide teaching but does not restrict the educator to specific content or strategies which must be undertaken at a particular time. Such documents contribute to the larger understanding of curriculum as conversation between teacher and student, as community. Doing/living out the work of curriculum allows the teacher to consider and value the diversity of learners, learning styles and learning contexts. Thus I now position myself as a reconceptualist, alongside Noddings and Doll. My role however was to write materials in line with the technological orientation of the authority. My stance was important but sometimes brought me into tension with requests for specificity and rigidity in framing the outcomes and materials. The
outcomes-approach selected by the Queensland Government for the curriculum implies a linear-sequential model with the same curriculum on offer for all students. Fortunately recursivity and flexibility were integral to the principles and practice of the QSCC, and the process of development was underpinned by an ethics of care for all learners.

**Curriculum Construction**

This study focuses on a particular curriculum construction process so it is valuable to consider the processes of development (content selection, sequencing, and assessment) that have been proposed by others.

Ralph Tyler’s book, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949), was prepared as a syllabus for his university class. Still in print after more than fifty years, this text, which has become known as the “Tyler Rationale”, was selected by the, “Professors of Curriculum”, as one of two publications which has had the most influence over the field of curriculum and has been called the “bible of curriculum making” (Doll, 2002; Jackson, 1992). Tyler stated that there are four principles (or questions) that curriculum makers have to ask, and these must be answered systematically and *in this order* (Tyler, 1949, p. 1, my emphasis):

1. What educational objectives should the school seek to attain?
2. How can learning experiences be selected which are likely to be useful in attaining these objectives?
3. How can learning experiences be organised for effective instruction?
4. How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated?

In relation to the first question Tyler believed that it was important to consider three sources when coming to an answer: subject matter (what subject specialists consider is important to the discipline); society (what society thinks should be taught); and students (what students need to know). Thus his first question connects specialist disciplinary knowledge and the society in which schooling is situated. The focus is on preparing students for the world beyond the school. Question two links learning experiences to content and skills but is constrained by the already decided objectives, and the content knowledge and experiences of the teacher. Question three makes apparent the means-ends orientation of this model and focuses on the sequence of learning. Effective instruction implies the notion of efficiency. Regarding question four, Tyler emphasised that evaluation involves collecting evidence about changes in the behaviour of students and should not be confined to pen and paper tests. He advocated observation, interviews, questionnaires and collection of student artefacts as means of evaluation.
Hilda Taba, a graduate student of Tyler’s, slightly modified his four-step model, adding a preliminary phase “diagnosis of needs”, now often incorporated into a “situational analysis” (Brady, 1995; Brady & Kennedy, 1999). Her model, again intended to be followed as a step-by-step process was:

1. diagnosis of needs;
2. formulation of objectives;
3. selection and organisation of content;
4. selection and organisation of learning experiences;
5. evaluation (Taba, 1962).

The QSCC curriculum development process followed to a large degree that described by Tyler in 1949, though it could be claimed that consultation undertaken with stakeholders in the first phase of the project was useful in the diagnosis of needs.

These sequential, lock-step models have been challenged by others who believe that, in practice, teachers rarely start with objectives, nor do they follow such fixed and linear steps in planning (Aoki, 2005d; Eisner, 1967/2004, 1994; Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Kliebard, 1970; Schwab, 1970; Walker, 1971; Walker & Soltis, 1997). Others have raised concerns that no explicit guidelines are given about the selection of objectives and only those objectives which are chosen are evaluated hence the possibilities of unintended objectives are ignored and undervalued (Aoki, 2005a; Apple, 1999, 2004; Eisner, 1994; Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Giroux, 1989; Grumet, 1987; Noddings, 2006a). In this frame “goals do not emerge” (Doll, 1993/2004, p. 254) and are not permitted to emerge from the constraining and constrained curriculum. Additional criticisms relate to the orientation towards social reproduction rather than critique (American Association of University Women, 2004; Giroux, 2006; Ornstein et al., 2003; Pinar, 2004a; Thornton, 2004) and the lack of consideration given to social, cultural and political issues (Marsh & Willis, 2003). Tyler’s Rationale was labelled as a “prescriptive approach” to curriculum development by William Pinar, who went on to say that this dominant approach to curriculum development should be challenged (Pinar, 1998). However, as we will see in the case that follows, the approach remains dominant and was highly influential in the curriculum development model for the Arts curriculum at the centre of this study.

Modernist approaches to curriculum development have been challenged by the reconceptualists who have proffered alternative models to the linear progression dominant in the Tyler/Taba model. Macdonald, Wolfson, and Zaret (1973) propose learning organised around a continuous cycle of exploring, integrating and transcending. They also identify self-evaluation as an important aspect of this
conception. Bruner (1963, 1977) proposed a “spiral curriculum” where concepts and content are revisited with more complexity and depth at each succeeding level. His curriculum planning required the identification of the fundamental ideas and concepts of a discipline. These were to be introduced as concrete examples in the early stages of learning and create the foundations for more abstract learning at later stages.

Efland (1995) considers a “lattice” to be a preferable model allowing the conceptual landscape to be “criss-crossed in many directions to master its complexity and to avoid having the fullness of the domain attenuated” (Efland, 1995, p. 145). He rejects Bruner’s linear model, favouring the lattice model that allows for interconnectedness and overlap of content.

Decker Walker (1971) proposed a “deliberative” model of curriculum development which suggests two processes to be undertaken prior to the actual curriculum design. The first process is to establish the platform upon which the curriculum will be developed and this involves the evolution of a shared understanding of beliefs and theories about learning, and consideration of aims and procedures. The second process is one of deliberation whereby the curriculum developers consider precedents, costs and consequences; decide on the content needed; generate alternatives and choose the most defensible.

In *The Educational Imagination* (1979; 1994) Elliott Eisner proposed an “artistic model” of curriculum development. In brief he offers seven considerations for curriculum development which, unlike Tyler and Taba’s models, can be deliberated in any order. Eisner allows the “convoluted” nature of curriculum planning and stresses that the steps that follow cover just some of the many possibilities. Eisner suggests the curriculum developer must contemplate:

- goals and their priorities. He encourages the consideration of affective and even “unpredictable” (1967/2004) objectives that may arise during the learning process. The importance of deliberation on the hierarchy of goals is stressed.
- content. Eisner points out that in the process of selecting content that will be included in the curriculum, a “null” curriculum is produced i.e. the curriculum to which access is excluded.
- types of learning opportunities. The transformation of goals and content into “the kinds of events that have educational consequences” (1994, p. 138).
- organisation of learning opportunities. Rejecting the linear “staircase” model with its mono-directional, time-based orientation, Eisner suggests a “spiderweb” model in which the “curriculum designer provides the teacher
with a set of heuristic projects, materials, and activities whose use will lead to diverse outcomes among the group of students” (1994, p. 142).

- organisation of content areas. He encourages integration rather than disciplinarity with the aim of connecting with the messiness of real life.

- mode of representation and response. Eisner notes that the history of education has privileged written and verbal responses and encourages a greater diversity of representational modes as part of the experience of learning and in the opportunities allowed for students to respond. He suggests that students should be able to show what they have learned through action (doing an experiment), alternative verbal and visual forms (poetry, film) or in modes that are non-verbal (images, music, dance).

- evaluation. This should pervade the learning process rather than occur at the end-point, and is determined by the content and the learning opportunities that have been experienced.

The collaborative curriculum development process adopted by the QSCC Arts project can be seen to link with Walker’s deliberative model and the design is close to Bruner’s ‘spiral curriculum, though there are overlaps with other curriculum orientations. The adoption of Tyler’s focus on objectives and sequencing is evident in the QSCC outcomes approach. At variance with the fixed lock-step sequence is the allowance for recursion within and through the levels of outcomes, support for a diversity of pedagogical practices, and the consultation process with all stakeholders which was ongoing and iterative throughout the development phase.

**Curriculum developers at a systemic level**

This project was grounded in a process of collaboration and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. Unusually for curriculum development at a systemic level (Brady, 1995), consultation and development included teachers, parents, and community representatives as well as the “professional” curriculum developers employed by the various education authorities.

Who should be involved in systemic level curriculum development? Tyler (1949) believed in the use of subject experts who he felt would make objective decisions about the content of the curriculum because of their specialised knowledge. Ornstein et al (2003) question the objectivity of such subject experts and point out that curriculum specialists are influenced by their life experiences, social and economic background, education, and general beliefs about people. They say that even though curriculum developers may draw upon a range of authoritative sources their decisions are “shaped by all the experiences that have shaped them.
and the social groups with whom they identify” (Ornstein et al., 2003, p. 4). Print calls this consideration “curriculum presage” (1993, pp. 25-26) referring to the curriculum backgrounds of the developers; the activities and experiences in which they have participated as well as the organizational influences (representations of curriculum at a systemic level) and the philosophical foundations of the curriculum developers and the context in which they work.

Marsh and Willis state that teams undertaking curriculum development should have members with expertise in six areas:

- **Subject matter.** *Persons must know the substance of a particular discipline, its philosophy, and its limitations.*
- **Pedagogy.** *Persons must be skilled teachers and knowledgeable about students, the school environment, and the teaching process.*
- **Curriculum design.** *Persons must have skills in searching out needs, organizing purposes, and combining learning experiences in meaningful ways.*
- **Evaluation.** *Persons must be able to clearly identify and to appropriately weigh the value of ongoing activities as well as the overall impact of a package.*
- **Organization.** *Persons must have organizational and entrepreneurial skills.*
- **Writing.** *Persons must have skills in writing documents with clarity and conviction* (Marsh & Willis, 2003, p. 162).

In the final chapter I suggest additional personal qualities that are desirable for the curriculum developer.

Marsh (1987) cautions about the dangers of “curriculum amateurs”, those without an understanding of curriculum theory creating systemic curriculum documents, though Schwab (cited in Walker & Soltis, 1997) argues that curriculum decisions do not require a curriculum theory. Ornstein (2003) desires mature and understanding individuals who are able to understand others’ points of view. Jackson (Jackson, 1992) notes the move towards engaging the contribution of teachers as curriculum makers in the UK. Jackson’s recognition of the increased valuing of teachers as co-developers is particularly relevant in this curriculum development project as teachers were heavily involved. They contributed ideas, suggestions and challenges at the design brief stage; were involved in the development of the first-draft outcomes (through professional associations); gave feedback on each draft of the syllabus; the ‘trial’ teachers contributed to revisions and refinements during the twelve months of the trial period (this was not merely a testing of the outcomes in particular school contexts, but an ongoing process of consultation, revision and
refinement); and contributed to the development of the support materials that accompanied the syllabus.

**Outcomes-based Education**

When the QSCC was established in 1996 most Australian States and Territories were following an “outcomes-based” model. This followed the foundation established by the publications of the Curriculum Corporation in the early 90s based on agreement by the (then) Ministers of Education for each State Government. In line with this national initiative, the QSCC decided that all curriculum materials would be based on an “outcomes approach to education” (QSCC, 1997c) which was a modification of Outcomes-Based-Education (OBE) propounded by William Spady (1993, 1994, 1998, 2002).

The genesis of the OBE movement can be traced back to the work of Ralph Tyler (1949) where he argued that educational goals should be stated in the form of objectives which describe the desired changes in the learner in such a way that one can judge whether or not they have been achieved. These end-points, claimed Tyler, should form the basis of curriculum planning, selection of learning experiences, assessment and program evaluation. We could substitute outcomes for objectives in the following quote:

*These educational objectives become the criteria by which materials are selected, content is outlined, instructional procedures are developed and tests and examinations are prepared. All aspects of the educational program are really means to accomplish basic educational purposes* (Tyler, 1949, p. 3).

Tyler’s “Rationale” as his conceptual framework is known, became more narrowly defined over time and his ideas became “associated with the behavioural objectives movement which focused attention on the articulation of objectives in terms of expected student behaviours” (Willis & Kissane, 1997). Criticisms of behaviourism (and behavioural objectives) include that it does not allow distinctions to be made between accidental performance, rote performance, and performance that is a demonstration of a deeper and broader understanding.

OBE (Spady, 1993, 1994, 1998, 2002), focuses on key statements about learning that is desirable for all students to be able to demonstrate as a result of their schooling. Spady claims that there are three types of outcomes: traditional outcomes, grounded in the recognised discipline-located learning of, for example, English, Mathematics and other established subject areas; transitional outcomes, those that cross recognised subject boundaries and which are usually “exit” outcomes at the
end of a long-term course of study; and transformational outcomes, those that describe desired adult life roles. The syllabus that is the focus of this paper conforms to Spady's description of traditional outcomes as it has adhered to the traditional disciplinary boundaries of the arts, though the “valued attributes of a lifelong learner” (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002b, pp. 2-4) could be considered transformational outcomes.

OBE is grounded in beliefs that all students can learn; that learning should be developmental and sequential; and that students should be able to recognise and build on their own successes (QSCC, 1998, 2002; Spady, 1993, 1994, 1998; Willis & Kissane, 1997). Outcomes are learning-focused rather than time constrained: “student learning becomes the constant and time the variable” (Spady, 1993, p. 12) so students should be allowed sufficient time and multiple opportunities to demonstrate a learning outcome in an authentic context (Spady, 1993, p. 4) rather than being bound to demonstrate learning at particular points in time.

Some theorists (e.g. Marsh, 2004) have criticised OBE as being a form of behaviourism because of its reliance on observable evidence of student learning, but in fact OBE aligns most neatly with constructivism (Spady, 1994) where students are seen as meaning makers, who look for patterns in their lived experience, and who learn most effectively as part of a social group. So, how do outcomes differ from behavioural objectives? Both must be observable: one must be able to see the student demonstrate the evidence of learning, but while behavioural objectives can be expected to be observable at the end of a single lesson, and may be the result of drill, rote learning or direct instruction, outcomes are demonstrated as the result of diverse, shared and long-term learning experiences. Outcomes should be complex, requiring the application of higher order thinking skills (Anderson et al., 2001), and be demonstrable in a variety of ways and contexts. They involve reaching a certain standard rather than completing a certain amount of work in a given time and being judged on “how well” one has learnt the content within that particular time frame.

Behavioural objectives are reported on in terms of standards i.e. how well students have performed whereas the sense of a standard is inherent within the demonstration of the outcomes. The expectation is that the student will be able to “demonstrate” their performance of each outcome at a high standard and in a range of contexts. In addition outcomes statements should be conceptually linked so that one level forms the foundation for all consecutive levels and each level builds on outcomes previously demonstrated (see Fig. 3.1). This relates to Bruner’s conception of a spiral curriculum mentioned earlier and two of Doll’s (1993/2004) “4 Rs” – relations and recursivity.
Figure 3.1. QSCC Progression of conceptual development of outcomes

An outcomes approach is one of philosophy as much as one of practice. The focus is on what students learn rather than what teachers teach. Spady and his supporters claim that “all students can learn, though not on the same day and in the same way”, that “successful learning promotes even more successful learning” and “schools control the conditions for success” (Spady, 1994, p. 9). From only these three of his many proclamations about students and successful learning it is clear that the current lock-step organisation of schooling is inimical to OBE and that a major organisational factor that must be changed for successful implementation of this model is the compartmentalising of students into grade levels which are defined by age, and through which students automatically progress at the end of the year. This is not to say that grade or year levels should be abolished, but that a student’s progress is best determined by their being able to demonstrate what they have learned rather than by the passage of time. In addition Spady believes that we should allow for students to demonstrate their learning in multiple contexts (both to enable students to access the widest range of learning and working preferences, and also to assist teachers to authenticate their judgement that learning has taken place). This counteracts one of the criticisms of assessment of behavioural objectives (i.e. that a student may demonstrate the learning by chance rather than as a true demonstration) because when students are required to show that they can apply their knowledge and understanding in more than one context, and can do that consistently and well, teachers can be confident that the demonstrated learning has, in fact, taken place.

For a school or education system to adopt an outcome-based philosophy means, in effect, that “the system believes there are certain things that all students should learn as a result of attending its school(s), that it is prepared to say publicly what these things are, and that it is prepared to be held accountable in terms of them” (Willis & Kissane, 1997, p. 6). Outcome-based education requires a
fundamental philosophical shift in curriculum policy, practice and evaluation due to its unrelenting focus on what students have learned rather than on what systems and schools have provided and teachers have taught.

By the mid 1990s OBE was being widely criticized in terms of its lack of acknowledgement of the experiences of learners or teachers, and the rigid lock-step approach to implementation (Wien & Dudley-Marling, 1998). In addition, Marsh reports criticisms relating to:

- **a)** its over emphasis on outcomes rather than processes;
- **b)** schools inflicting values that conflicted with parental values;
- **c)** lack of hard evidence that outcomes worked;
- **d)** fears that OBE would “dumb-down” the curriculum and lower standards;
- **e)** concerns that content becomes subservient under an outcomes approach;
- **f)** students’ outcomes being difficult and expensive to assess.

(Marsh, 2004, p. 29)

Glatthorn (1993) claimed that OBE was a more coherent model than the “effective schools” model (p. 355) but questioned Spady’s claims that OBE leads to higher standards through “mastery learning”. He noted that teachers in schools where OBE was implemented were generally in agreement with the principles and processes even though OBE involves time-consuming and extensive planning processes. He refuted the claims of values conflicting with parents and communities and noted that “identifying outcomes as the entry point for developing curricula can be an effective strategy and does not necessarily lead to batch processing, fragmented learning, and the dehumanizing of the classroom” (Glatthorn, 1993, p. 357).

In Australia the first decade of the 21st Century has seen a move away from outcomes curricula developed at a State level and increased pressure for a National Curriculum Framework to emerge once more. State governments are now required to implement and report on Student Performance Standards (linked to age and year level of schooling) in order to receive Commonwealth education funding. This move aligns with global trends towards the practice of ranking and comparing schools in terms of student performance.

**Field Two: The arts and the curriculum - a brief overview**

Historically arts education has been justified in terms of either an "essentialist" or "contextualist" function (Eisner, 1972, cited in O’Neill, 1983). The essentialist justification emphasises what is unique to the arts and the unique contributions they
make to the individual’s experience in the world while the contextualist view is oriented towards an instrumentalist conception i.e. what the arts contribute to the student and society. The placement of this curriculum-in-development in The Arts Key Learning Area implies that the essentialist function was paramount. However, within the QSCC framework for all curriculum documents, there was a requirement to provide clear links to the “cross curricular priorities” of literacy, numeracy, lifeskills and a futures perspective, which allowed for significant overlaps between essentialist and contextualist views of arts education.

Peter Abbs (1987, 1989a, 1994, 1989b), an essentialist, argues for the grounding of arts curriculum on an awareness of connections to cultures of the past and requests a third of school time be allocated to the Arts. His claim that the arts belong to a single aesthetic community was criticised for opening the doors to arts integration (Best, 1992a). Accused of being a cultural elitist and an arts conservative, Abbs adheres to the view of the arts as “vehicles of understanding” (Abbs, 1996, p. 71) and symbolic orders of a longstanding cultural heritage (Abbs, 1989b, p. 10). He proposes the grounding of arts learning in the “aesthetic field” (Abbs, 1989a, 1994, 1989b) made up of the interrelated processes of forming, presenting, responding and evaluating. Abbs’ position was supported by Robinson (cited in Best, 1989, p. 73) though Robinson conceded that the use of the term “generic” led to misunderstandings that the framing of the arts as a generic community was intended to support curriculum integration, and interpreted by many as a push for “combined” arts. Robinson (1992) proposed that commonalities among the Arts include: the concern with symbolic representation of human experience in ways that can be shared with and re-created by others; creativity, in the sense of making something that did not exist before or conveying information in a new way; expression of meaning; and a sensitivity to the aesthetic qualities of objects or events.

David Best (1989, 1992a, 1992b), who is opposed to the notion of a generic community of the arts, pleads for the recognition of understanding and cognition in each discipline as crucial to education in the arts. He rejects the notion of the binary opposition of cognitive-rational versus affective-creative and considers that placing the arts solely in the sensory and affective domain destroys the case for the arts in schools. For Best, feeling and reason are not oppositional but interdependent. He believes that creativity should be central to all areas of the curriculum as should “feeling”. In fact “it is a serious failure if education in other areas does not stimulate feeling for a subject” (Best, 1989, p. 75). According to Best the aim of arts education should be to progressively develop understanding in each arts area and to recognise that artistic feelings are rational, since it is the “crucial role of cognition which
distinguishes emotions from sensations” (cited in Wright, 2003b); thus feeling
determines, and is inseparable from, cognition. He rejects framing arts education as
“expression” or “experiential” learning, proposing instead that it is “interpretive
reasoning” which is developed in the Arts.

Eisner (2002a, pp. 42-45) proposes five principles to guide practice in arts
education:

1. Pride of place should be given to what is distinctive about the arts.
2. Arts education should foster the growth of artistic intelligence.
3. Arts education should help students create satisfying arts works; respond
to arts works; and, understand the role the arts play in culture.
4. Arts education should help students recognize what is personal,
distinctive and unique about themselves and their work.
5. Programs should enable students to secure aesthetic forms of experience
in everyday life.

Maxine Greene (1977; 1989; 1995; 1999) promotes learning in the arts as a
means of developing “wide-awakeness”, an intensified realisation of one’s reality as
interpreted experience dependent upon “his or her situation and location in the world”
(1995, p. 19). She believes that the arts offer the potential to develop personal
agency as they affirm the “values of plurality and difference” (p. 42) and enable us to
“give credence to alternative realities” (p. 3). She charges arts educators to help
students learn through “a growing acquaintance with conceptual networks and
symbol systems characteristic of the culture’s ways of making sense” (p. 125) by
helping learners “to pay heed – to attend to shapes, patterns, sounds, rhythms,
figures of speech, contours, and lines – helping them to perceive particular works as
meaningful” (p. 125). Burton (1994) and Boughton (1993) distinguish between Art
with a capital “A” which valorises arts products to the point where they become
priceless commodities and art with a small “a” that stresses the continuity between
art and life, seeing the connections between our encounters with works of art either
as producers and consumers and the “spontaneous irregularities of everyday
existence” (Boughton, 1993, p. 553). Haynes warns of art being considered a
commodity where arts products make “cents” rather than “sense” (Haynes, 2001).

Robinson (1990, p. 25) noted that the Arts in all cultures are practised in the:

- visual mode – using light, colour and shape
- aural mode – using sound and rhythm
- kinaesthetic mode – using bodily movement, time and space
- verbal mode – using words
• enactive mode – using imagined roles.
He recommends specialist teaching by experts in each disciplinary area, complemented by work in “combined arts” courses. These combined arts practices would draw on collaborative practice between artists or teachers from various disciplines.

Robinson, who was involved in an influential curriculum project on teaching drama (McGregor, Tate, & Robinson, 1977) at one point in his career, defines the “enactive” mode differently from Bruner (1996, p. 155) who originally wrote of the enactive mode as being a process of actively engaging in activities and objects in order to achieve a result. Bruner stated that the enactive was the first stage of cognitive development and was followed by the iconic and symbolic stages. However he later acknowledged that he had changed his mind about the progression of learning through these three stages and said he would rename the enactive mode as the “procedural” mode: the “mode that imposes means-end or instrumental structure on the world” (Bruner, 1996, p. 155). In his claiming of the “enactive” as having direct links to the use of role Robinson seems to be attempting to use the term in a much more drama specific way.

The contextualist justification (Eisner, 1972) for the arts in education emphasises the instrumental consequences of learning in art with an orientation towards the needs of students and society e.g. leisure pursuits, psychological benefits, the development of creativity, or contribution to academic subject matter. Some arts educators argue that a significant purpose of arts education is to develop an arts audience with schools functioning as “agents of transmission, induction and innovation” (Aspin, 1989, p. 258). His proposition is that the Arts are more valued, appreciated and understood by someone who has taught to perceive and judge them, someone who is able to decode (Gardner, 1990) the languages of the arts. The classification of arts as languages has led to a proliferation of authors writing about arts “literacy” (Eisner, 2002b; Livermore, 1998/2003; Pascoe, 1998/2003, 2003; Wright, 2003b). Pascoe (1999, p. 124) offers two aspects of arts literacy:
• understanding and using art languages – the specific, unique languages of the arts form themselves
• understanding and using spoken and written language in making and responding to arts.
Others argue for the inclusion of the arts in the curriculum because arts learning improves student results in other areas (Catterall, 2002; Deasey, 2002; Fiske, 1999; Harland et al., 2000; Wagner, 1998) though this has been challenged (Winner &
Hetland, 2000) with requests for more rigorous research to support claims of transference of learning.

However we can be sure that:

*The ability to secure meanings from [arts] forms is not innate, rather it is developed and this development is typically affected by a school's curriculum* (Eisner, 1998b, p. 7).

**Arts curriculum organisation**

Existing organisational structures for arts curriculum include:

- doing or making, demonstrating or performing, and teaching about and in such activities (Aspin, 1989, p. 263);
- being able to conceive and make, present or have presented to them; express responses about the arts to others, and make considered judgments about their own work and that of others (Metropolitan Wigan, 1989, p. 7);
- production, aesthetics, history, criticism (Patchen, 1996);

In Australia (at the time of this curriculum development project) Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory, and the Northern Territory used the organisers proposed by the Curriculum Corporation (Curriculum Corporation, 1993, 1994; South Australian Department of Education, 1998; Victoria Department of Education, 1995):

- exploring and developing ideas;
- using skills, techniques and processes;
- presenting;
- arts criticism and aesthetics; and
- past and present contexts.

Western Australia (Western Australia Department of Education, 1998) used four strand organiser:

- communicating arts ideas;
- using arts skills, techniques technologies and processes;
- responding, reflecting on and evaluating the arts; and
- understanding the role of the arts in society.

Each of the above include facets of the making of arts works, the sharing of arts works and responding/critiquing to arts works.

As the curriculum that is the focus of this study evolved, we were encouraged to minimise the number of outcomes and two organising frameworks emerged from consultation. The first was “engagement in” and the second “reflection on”.

41
Engagement encompassed the processes of: doing; making; exploring and expressing ideas; using skills, techniques and processes; and performing and presenting; while reflection encompassed: critique; making judgments; and evaluating the arts. These organisers did not meet the needs of all the stakeholders in the project and the final framework offered arts strand-specific organisers. For dance these were choreographing, performing, appreciating; for drama: forming, presenting, responding; for media: constructing media, producing meaning, responding to meaning; for music: aurally and visually identifying and responding to music, singing and playing, reading and writing music; and for visual arts: making images and objects, making and displaying, appraising images and objects. Each of the strand organisers highlighted the processes of making art works, sharing art works, and evaluating art works. These link closely to the organisers of the aesthetic field proposed by Peter Abbs (1989a) and the framework proposed by Wigan in the UK (Metropolitan Wigan, 1989).

**Integration and the arts**

The issue of integration was significant throughout this project but arts educators are divided as to its usefulness and effectiveness in the learning process. Many are opposed to arts integration because of the threat to specific disciplinary knowledge that is required (Aland, 1998; Boyd, 1998; Emery, 1998; Kindler, 1987; Smith, 1989). Kindler (1987) argues against integration because she claims there is no conclusive evidence for the assumptions (e.g. similarity across arts, incorporating the arts in other areas accelerates and facilitates the learning process, learning in the arts promotes creativity, and is more economical than separate instruction) and argues that the assumption that facilities and resources can be shared is misleading: techniques, materials, and storage requirements for materials are distinctly different. Non-integrationists claim that modifying arts programs to interface with other subject matter diminishes the uniqueness and comprehensiveness of knowledge in art and that there is no evidence that infusion of the arts into other areas benefits the arts. Others disagree. Carlin (1994) proposes a “polyphonic” integrative model which allows for discrete disciplines but encourages the making of links between them: “The Arts are taught as vehicles of history, style, values and examples of everyday life, [and] carry with them valuable memories that transfer into future acts” (p. 30). Grumet emphasizes the collaborative nature of arts learning where we learn “the skills of democracy, the capacity to appreciate what is different within what we share” (Grumet, 2007, p. 132). She expresses concern about current tendencies toward a reductionist curriculum (Grumet, 2004, p. 54) and links integration with contemporary
cognitive theory which claims that learning involves creating “webs of concepts and categories” to “interpret and organise our experience” (p. 55). For Grumet the arts offer opportunities for integration that enrich learning and cognition. She draws on Fauconnier and Turner’s (2002) model of “conceptual blending” (cited in Grumet, 2007, pp. 124-125) when material from one domain is brought together into the “blended space” where students understanding of curriculum is encoded in “symbolic representations drawn from more than one symbol system” (Grumet, 2007, p. 130).

Integration allows students to make connections between curriculum and the world outside the school gates. The nature of integration that Grumet promotes recognises the need for discipline-specific expertise. Artists work in partnership with educators and each contributes the expertise of their own work and experience to the integrated study. She cites Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE)’s requirements (Aprill, 2003, p. 57) for the sustaining of learning communities, summarised here:

1. long-term professional development of teachers and artists;
2. committed time for planning;
3. long-term relationships among schools, arts organisations, and community organisations; and
4. connecting intellectual and aesthetic assets of the community in generative relationships with each other.

Russell and Zembylas’ (2007) comprehensive review of contemporary research point out that there is mounting evidence to support claims of benefits of arts integration (see for example Catterall, 2002; Deasey, 2002; Heath & Robinson, 2004; Heath & Smyth, 1999; Horowitz & Webb-Dempsey, 2002) but that meaningful integration requires time, teacher self-efficacy in management of arts learning and/or the teacher-artist partnership, and considerations of whether there has been sufficient pre-service preparation to assist teachers to work in an integrated way.

Certainly one of the values of integrating learning is the opportunity for learning to be transferred from one discipline or context to another. Rabkin (Rabkin & Redmond, 2004, p. 8) states unequivocally, “there is transfer. Students make substantial gains in the basics. Students become better thinkers, develop higher order skills, and deepen their engagement and their inclination to learn,” and this argument has been used in favour of developing integrated programs. However Winner and Hetland (2000) caution that, while the evidence is mounting (e.g. Podlozny, 2000, found evidence of causal links between drama and oral language development), more rigorous and longitudinal research is required to substantiate claims of transference of learning into other areas.
Eisner (2002a pp. 39-41) recognises the need for advice in how to plan integrated learning and proffers four structures for “integrated arts” curricula. These are:

1. the arts are used to help students understand a particular historical period or culture e.g. by including images, fashion, music, literature and architecture of the particular time;
2. within arts integration intending to help students identify the similarities and differences among the arts e.g. an investigation of rhythm in music and visual art;
3. a major theme or idea that can be explored from the arts and other fields e.g. the concept of metamorphosis explored through melody, demographics, and film;
4. problem solving e.g. students are asked to design a play area for pre-school children with consideration of design, development, materials, layout and aesthetics.

explaining:

another of the lessons I have learned from the arts is that while they share commonalities, different forms of art are put in the world in different ways. They speak to different aspects of my nature and help me discover the variety of experiences I am capable of having. I believe that such lessons have implications on the educational policy and to deciding about what knowledge is of most worth (Eisner, 1998b, p. 65).

In much contemporary arts practice it is difficult to decipher which is the “parent” form, with boundaries being blurred between form, medium, performer and audience. Barrett (1998) reminds us that:

It is also salutary to remember that the Australia Council in recent times has included another category in its classification of art forms to encompass “Hybrid Arts”, those arts works and events that are developed through a cross-fertilisation between what have been regarded as discrete arts forms, and new technologies (p. 2).

**Field Three: Constructing a drama curriculum**

According to Print (1993, p. 1) the fundamental questions of curriculum are:

- What to teach?
- How to teach?
• When to teach?
• What is the impact of teaching?

Apple (2004, p. 6) asks us to consider “Whose knowledge is it? Who selected it? Why is it organised and taught in this way? To this particular group?” He claims that schools “act as agents of cultural and ideological hegemony” (p. 5) and curriculum developers must be conscious of the political, economic, social and cultural implications of their selections.

A significant challenge for drama curriculum writers has been pointed out by Burton (1991, p. 1) who states:

*We do not have for drama an accepted body of content or subject matter, such as you find in maths or science curriculum around the world. There is still disagreement on the nature of the basic skills required for drama, unlike other performing arts subjects such as music or dance, where there is an accepted foundation of skills.*

This is indeed a major concern for drama curriculum developers as they draw on the writing and practices in the field to seek answers to Print’s four questions.

**Orientations to drama curricula**

In the history of drama education one can identify a range of orientations and purposes that have underpinned curriculum development and pedagogical practice. Perhaps drama is in an unusual position, being seen both as a discipline and pedagogy.

O’Toole and O’Mara (2007) identify four “paradigms of purpose” evident in contemporary drama education practice: cognitive/procedural (learning about drama), expressive/developmental (growing through drama), social/pedagogical (learning through drama) and, functional (learning the work of professional drama practitioners). The first and the last on O’Toole and O’Mara’s list connect most strongly with the “theatre practice” orientations of drama curricula, where the purpose is to concentrate on acting, theatre skills, and work in the theatre and performance industry (see for example Allen, 1979; Hornbrook, 1989, 1991). The expressive/developmental and social/pedagogical paradigms lend themselves to the pedagogical orientation of drama i.e. learning about self and society and ally with orientations that support integration of learning with drama as a “learning” medium (Wagner, 1976). However it must be said that these paradigms are not mutually exclusive and there may be considerable overlap.
The above four paradigms of purpose seem to be a development of Bolton’s “four aims” (1990) of drama i.e. learning about content (O'Toole and O'Mara’s social/pedagogical), personal development (expressive/developmental), social development (expressive/developmental again) and learning about the dramatic art form (cognitive/procedural and functional). The QSCC syllabus was created in an attempt to integrate the four paradigms of purpose with the emphasis on the expressive/developmental and social/pedagogical paradigms in the early years of schooling and using other subject areas to provide drama with “serious and worthwhile content [to] … illuminate these areas of the curriculum” (O’Neill & Lambert, 1982, p. 16). In the secondary school years, the expressive/developmental and social/pedagogical paradigms are retained with a more explicit orientation towards the cognitive/procedural and functional paradigms as students learn more theatre conventions and forms and work more independently as dramatic artists to form their own work and interpret the works of others.

Influences in Queensland

As one of Britain’s ex-colonies it is unsurprising that contemporary drama education in Queensland owes a great deal to its heritage of the history of drama education in the UK. There, early 20th century pioneers such as Harriet Finlay-Johnson (1911) and Henry Caldwell Cook (1917) contributed to the use of drama as a pedagogical tool whereby students transformed their learning into “plays”. A major pedagogical shift came in the 1950s and 60s when Peter Slade (1954, 1958) and Brian Way (1967) embraced drama as a means of developing the individual child (i.e. the expressive/developmental paradigm):

*Education is concerned with individuals; drama is concerned with the individuality of individuals, with the uniqueness of each human essence* (Way, 1967, p. 3).

Slade claimed “Child Drama” to be an art form in its own right, rejecting comparisons with adult theatre that considered the dramatic work of children to be a diminished, nascent or “a priori” (Woodson, 1999, p. 205) form of adult theatre. He made detailed observations of children at play and attempted to bring the play of children into the classroom and was one of the first drama educators to research natural play and provide advice about progression and complexity within it. Slade encouraged spontaneity of expression and discouraged public performances, acting skills and adult intervention in children’s playing. This led to the process/product split in educational drama: “the school play and child play were seen as incompatible” (Bolton, 1985, p. 153).
Both Slade and Way’s books were the “set” texts for pre-service drama education in Queensland teacher-training institutions in the 60s and 70s and Way’s *Development through drama* could be found in almost every teacher reference section of the school library during those years.

In the 1960s and 70s in the UK drama as pedagogy (social/pedagogical paradigm) was brought to the foreground by Dorothy Heathcote (see Bolton, 2003; Heathcote, 1974; Johnson & O'Neill, 1984; Wagner, 1976) and Gavin Bolton (1979, 1982, 1983, 1984). The role-based drama that characterised the work of these practitioners has had the strongest influence on drama education in Queensland. Heathcote (British Broadcasting Commission, 1971) decried “rocks and trees and fairies” drama, refusing to “water down drama” for children and famously described drama as being about “a real man [sic] in a mess”. She developed and refined the convention of teacher-in-role, working alongside the children (who were also in role) in “imagined group experience” (Wagner, 1976, p. 14) in a dramatic process that lead to “innerstanding” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 7). Heathcote (and Bolton) worked in role and through extended improvisation. Heathcote aimed to “perfect techniques which allow my classes opportunities to stumble upon authenticity in their work” (Heathcote, 1980, p. 11, her emphasis) through the dramatic process.

Bolton’s orientation, too, was to employ drama to assist students to “have their understanding of themselves in relation to the world they live in reinforced, clarified or modified and … gain skills in social interaction, which includes the ability to communicate their understanding and feelings” (Bolton, 1980, p. 71). Bolton sought to make the experience of working in role in drama a “verb” rather than an “adjective” (Bolton, 1978) so that the drama participant developed the skill of “behaving with integrity and spontaneity in a fictitious situation” (Bolton, 1980, p. 72): “It is happening to ME; I am making it happen” (p. 71, his emphasis) which O'Toole links to Vygotsky’s “dual affect” where “the child weeps in play as a patient, but revels as a player” (cited in O'Toole, 1992, p. 98). Both Heathcote and Bolton concentrated on developing strategies and processes which enabled students to work authentically in the art form, through the medium of role and with the teacher working as the “playwright” (Bolton 1980, p. 75; Johnson & O’Neill 1984, p. 32) and it was their influence that was felt as a new wave of drama educators, trained by Heathcote and Bolton, emigrated to Australia.

John O’Toole and Peter Lavery joined Queensland teacher-training institutions in the early 1970s. Both were passionate supporters of Heathcote and Bolton’s role-based drama. O’Toole introduced Theatre in Education (O’Toole, 1976) and both introduced the strategy of teacher-in-role to local teacher education. A visit
to Queensland by Bolton in 1978 assisted in speeding up the growing influence in Queensland of the drama pedagogy movement. This was also filtering in from the southern states, which had had longer exposure and a longer history of drama in schools and drama teacher-training. The newly established National and Queensland Associations for Drama in Education (1971) also helped to disseminate knowledge and practical expertise from the several influential Queensland and Australian teachers who had studied in the UK, such as Roma Burgess and Pamela Gaudry (who wrote the first Australian text that provided advice on progression in drama (1985), Bruce Burton, Howard and Joan Cassidy, John Carroll, John Deverall, Brad Haseman, and Jenny Simons. Later O'Toole collaborated with Brad Haseman to write Dramawise (Haseman & O'Toole, 1986) which provided teachers with a practical handbook for teaching the elements of drama, and emphasised learning in and about these components of the art form. O'Toole, Haseman and Lavery spearheaded changes in teacher education practice in Brisbane Universities and were influential in the development of the drama curriculum guidelines (Queensland Department of Education, 1991) and the Senior Drama Syllabus (Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1993) current in 1998.

The title of the Years 1 to 10 Drama Curriculum Guide (Queensland Department of Education, 1991) Drama Makes Meaning is evidence of the influence of these drama pedagogues stating:

Drama is an activity which involves a group of people agreeing to believe in a fictional context for the purpose of exploring lifelike situations, roles and relationships. The context is shaped into dramatic action which has meaning for the participants. Drama becomes theatre when the purpose is to convey meaning to an audience other than the participants (p. 3).

The emphasis throughout this document is on the harnessing of drama as a meaning-making process through the modes of playing (learners exploring and discovering meaning for themselves), playmaking (workshopping dramatic text and action to clarify meaning), and plays (creating a product to communicate meaning to an audience) (p. 3).

Drama and/or theatre?

Australia was fortunate in that the drama versus theatre divide which characterised the drama education community in Britain in the 1980s had little impact. Rather than drama and theatre being seen as a continuum with drama at one end and theatre at the other, drama and theatre were conceived of as a single entity. As Burton (1991,
p. 7) points out educational drama and theatre are complementary aspects of the processes of “acts of identification” and “participating in an imagined experience”. More recently Fleming (1997, pp. 1-2) has acknowledged:

> Publications on drama, now largely take it for granted that the dichotomies between “process” and “product”; “theatre” and “drama”; “drama for understanding” and “drama as art”; “experience” and “performance” were false polarities.

Role is considered “that central feature of all theatre” (O’Neill, 1995, p. 69) and Bolton (1982, p. 41) claims that through harnessing what theatre and drama have in common, the teaching of dramatic form (albeit indirectly) is what occurs in role-based drama.

O’Neill connects process drama (as the genre has come to be known since the 1990s (Bowell & Heap, 2001; Haseman, 1991; O’Neill, 1995; O’Toole, 1992) with the avant-garde theatre of the 1960s and more recent postmodern theatre practices which include “fragmentation and distribution of roles among the group, a nonlinear and discontinuous approach to the plot, the reworking of classic themes and texts, a blurring of the distinction between actors and audience, a double self-consciousness, and constant shifting perspectives” (O’Neill, 1995, p. xvii), claiming it has “a special capacity to lay bare the basic dramatic structures it shares with other kinds of theatre and that give it life” (O’Neill, 1995, p. xix). Neelands (1984, Chap. 7) wrote that the elements of theatre form also belong to classroom drama, and later with Tony Goode (1990; 2000) compiled a handbook of theatre “conventions” which can be used to structure learning through role and which hearkens back to Heathcote’s use of the term in 1980 (Signs and Portents, pp. 160 – 169 in Johnson and O’Neill (eds.) 1984).

The role-based drama pedagogues have always used the elements (see Haseman and O’Toole, 1986, and O’Toole 1992) and conventions of theatre to structure learning for students. It is now commonly understood that, “Development in understanding in drama (including the use of drama across the curriculum) arises through participation in the art form: education in and through drama complement each other” (Fleming, 1997, p. 2).

**Teaching theatre form**

Most frequently students are introduced to theatre form through the processes of playbuilding (Bray, 1991; Tarlington & Michaels, 1995) or devising (Oddey, 1994) where they learn to apply the particular conventions of theatre forms, structures and styles in the creation of their own work. Formal study of playscripts and theatre forms is gradually introduced in the secondary school years:
Years 8-10 – Students work with increased independence in a range of more sophisticated forms e.g. documentary drama and scripted drama (Queensland Department of Education, 1991, p. 15)

and there are many texts which assist teachers in introducing students to scripts (see for example Ackroyd, Neelands, Supple, & Trowsdale, 1998a, 1998b; Fleming, 1997; Galbraith, 1994; Hulson, 2006; Kempe, 1990, 1998; Nicholson, 2000).

The role of the teacher

According to Burton (1991, p. 1) “over the past four decades drama in the classroom has gone through a sequence of versions or styles, each one made popular by a particular drama practitioner, and each version largely replacing the one that preceded it. The emphasis in each version has been on styles of teaching and types of classroom activity”. This emphasis on what the teacher does rather than what the children learn in terms of progressions of learning in drama contributes further to the challenge that Burton identified earlier about how to determine progressions of content and skill in drama. Since, as Fleming (1994) points out: “The emphasis has traditionally been placed on the teacher's grasp of dramatic form and ability to structure the drama rather than on the pupil’s” (p. 20), it becomes difficult to identify and describe levels of progression of student learning. Fleming (1997, p. 3) reiterates that common practice was “for the teacher to intervene and take over responsibility for the creation of drama. That approach still tends to persist; it is for the teacher to provide significant content and artistic form. A deceptively simple alternative would have been to teach pupils how to do the same”. Indeed.

Learning and drama

Burton (1991), drawing in particular on the work of Richard Courtney, talks of imagination, creativity, identification, and transformation as being intrinsic to learning in drama.

The dramatic imagination enables the child (and the adult in a different way) to see the relationship between ideas and to see their mutual inter-action, and that through impersonation and identification, he [sic] can comprehend and realise the world around him (Courtney, 1968, p. 56).

As such, drama requires requires the “special act of the imagination” (Burton, 1991, p. 7), that Bolton connects with Augusto Boal’s (1979) idea of metaxis, “the interplay between the actual and the fictitious” (Bolton, 1984, p. 140) or the “tension between the real and the fiction, and a recognition of that gap” (O'Toole, 1992, p.
Burton’s notion of creation in drama aligns strongly with the idea of metaxis i.e. drama involves “the participant/percipient duality in operation, where the same individual is thus creating a form of imaginative experience and observing the creation at the same time” (Burton, 1991, p. 15). Identification is “harnessed through the use of role” (p. 17) permitting “the participant to both think and feel as another person, to experience a range of cognitive and affective states not directly accessible to him or her. It involves an extension of the participant’s perception of the world, and his or her experience of it (p. 18) – projection through “identification [leads] to empathy” (O’Neill, 1995, p. 77); transformation functions to “transform knowledge through the creation of symbols” (Burton, 1991, p. 20) and where “experience and knowledge are both expressed in action, often involving forms of symbolic activity” (p. 20).

It is by working in role in a “transformational mental state – at once ‘not-me’ and simultaneously not ‘not-me’” (Woodson, 1999, p. 208) that students connect their learning in the drama process to the world at large. They are able to see the “me-ness” of the role and context in connection with the life roles they play and the contexts they inhabit. This transformational state links with what Neelands (2004) describes as para-aesthetic approaches:

*Intra-aesthetic approaches which isolate students’ experiences of drama from the broader social and cultural worlds in which they dwell may tend towards valuating, and therefore give primacy to, students’ artistic and technical skill development. Para-aesthetic approaches which acknowledge the social/artistic dialectic and which are intended to develop a broader range of social and cultural learning may tend towards giving priority and primacy to the personal and social development of the students* (p. 50).

O’Toole (1991, p. 5) points out that in the history of drama there have always been two uneasily coexisting purposes for drama: to celebrate or sustain a dominant ideology or mores, and to be a critical mirror of society. Those who support a traditional performing theatre texts approach (e.g. Allen, 1979; Hornbrook, 1989, 1991) would give primacy to “artistic and technical skill development” while those who align with what is termed process drama “seek to both unmask and to destabilise the comfortable stasis of [the] culture of power” (Neelands, 2004, p. 52). This would suggest a fifth “paradigm of purpose” beyond the four offered by O’Toole and O’Mara (2007), a critical/emancipatory purpose that underpins the work of Augusto Boal (1979, 1998), Theatre-in-Education, and Theatre-for-Development practitioners, and is evident in many of the published lesson plans and units of work.
of the role-based pedagogues mentioned above. (For some of the many examples of this orientation see Gattenhof, 2002; Grady, 2000; Neelands, 1997; O’Toole, 2005; O’Toole, Burton, & Plunkett, 2005; Winston, 2000)

**Organising drama learning.**

The Years 1 to 10 Drama curriculum guide (Queensland Department of Education, 1991) proposed that drama programs could be organised around three “central organising concepts” (p. 9) of learning in, learning about, and learning through drama. Learning *in* drama involves the three processes of forming, presenting and responding (p. 9). Learning *about* drama includes developing an understanding of the terminology, elements, conventions, types and purposes of drama (p. 12). Learning *through* drama includes learning about students’ own contexts and encounters with the world, as well as drawing on other areas from across the curriculum (p. 13). The Senior Syllabus (for Years 11 and 12) organised drama learning via the three processes of forming, presenting and responding, which were seen as “equally important” (Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1993, p. 4) for planning and assessment. These same processes became the “strand organisers” for the drama outcomes in the curriculum which is the focus of this study.

**Forming**

*Forming involves the management of a range of dramatic forms such as spontaneous dramatic play, improvisation, role-play, process drama, playbuilding and playwriting* (Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1993, p. 5).

Learning in “forming” is characterised by the student working as an artist in the creation of their own work as they explore ideas and issues. Bolton’s (1998) description of “making” in drama is similar to the understanding that underlies the Queensland documents. He offers ten characteristics of “making” (pp. 272-273) amongst which are:

- emphasis on “process” but a “product” is being made to be reflected upon during or after the drama;
- each individual’s contribution is part of a collective enterprise; and
- the participants identify with the underlying “laws” of the social context being created.
Presenting

*Presenting requires the development of acting techniques and skills associated with the preparation of an actor for performance.*

(Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1993, p. 5)

Presenting begins with an awareness of audience and the audience may be the participants themselves, for example in a process drama, or an audience outside the drama. Children’s “confidence in their ability to present begins with simple sharing in pairs and groups and progresses along a continuum through informal performing to classmates, to performing to other classes, to formal audiences (Queensland Department of Education, 1991, p. 10).

Responding

*Responding involves demonstrating knowledge and understanding together with reflecting upon dramatic action and meaning through analysis, synthesis and evaluation.* (Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1993, p. 5)

In this process students are encouraged to describe, analyse, interpret and evaluate their own dramatic work and the work of others. It is important to recognise that participants, or as O’Toole (following Bolton) terms them “percipients” (1992, p. 9), are involved in the simultaneous processes of perceiving as well as participating whether within a drama or as part of a drama audience. Hence participants are “always spectators; there is an ongoing reflective element in drama, which is part of its power as an art form” (Fleming, 1997, p. 2).

Progression in drama

*Art and music, it seemed, while sharing many of the creative arts process aspirations of drama, could respond more easily to a linear model of curriculum design than drama which had traditionally resisted such moves with the claim that the model ran in the face of the integrity of the “development through drama” paradigm. Certainly practices in drama did not fit in easily with a national curriculum which valued skills and propositional knowledge, criteria which are generally capable of being subjected to scrutiny by a “rational” model of curriculum design (Day, 1977).*

Making decisions about progression in drama asks us to pay attention to “when to teach?” and “what is the impact of teaching?” (Print, 1993, p. 1).
Writing this role-based drama curriculum, and following the particular outcomes approach developed by the Queensland School Curriculum Council, meant that it was necessary to provide a linear model of curriculum and thus make decisions about how learning might progress, i.e. what learning preceded important learning at higher and more complex levels, what followed on from what, and how to make the patterns and development clear for teachers so that they could use the documents effectively to plan for learning in their own schooling contexts. But how might it be possible to construct such a set of documents without distorting “the essential nature of the subject” (Fleming, 1994, p. 136) and where could advice about progression in drama be found?

O’Neill and Lambert (1982, pp. 11-12), provide some “bottom line” advice, saying that children must be willing to make believe with regard to objects; make believe with regard to actions and situations; adopt a role; maintain the make-believe verbally; and interact with the rest of the group. Courtney (1980, p. 181) identified “maturation” in four dramatic stages, i.e.: “The Identification Stage (0-10 months)”, “The Impersonation Stage – ‘the child as actor’ (10 months - 7 years)”, “The Group Drama Stage – ‘the child as planner’ (7-12 years)”, and “The Role Stage – ‘the student as communicator’ (12-18 years)”.

Bolton (1979, p. 136) suggests:

*there are also changes in behaviour that can usefully be observed over a period of time, changes that indicate progress in pupils competence in dramatic activity.*

These changes can be classified as follows:

a) **Attitude towards; expectations of drama.**

b) **Amount of effort, especially during an unrewarding phase.**

c) **Integrity of feeling.**

d) **Intellectual grasp of what is being created by whole group.**

e) **Sensitivity to the needs of others within the group.**

f) **Ability to select action and words that enhance the significance of the experience for oneself and for others, and, conversely, to receive from others.**

g) **Ability to work economically both in and out of the drama.**

h) **An awareness of form, particularly in terms of selecting or retaining focus and injecting or sustaining tension.**

i) **An openness to symbolic meaning.**

j) **Role identification.**

k) **Readiness and ability to evaluate and reflect on the work and his own contribution to it.**
l) Willingness to take risks, to try new territory, new forms.

m) Trust in the teacher; readiness to evaluate and criticise the teacher’s contribution.

The Arts 5-16’ (National Curriculum Council, 1989, pp. 66-67) proposes four principles of progression: 1) Complexity – issues dealt with by younger children can be revisited in more complex and sophisticated ways by more mature children; 2) Control – children should acquire increasing control of the means of dramatic expression and the forms it can take; 3) Depth – children should move progressively as they mature from receiving a broad range of drama experiences to exploring individual projects in more depth; and 4) Independence – children should become increasingly autonomous, capable of making and articulating their own judgements with regard to their drama work.

But the question remains about how to describe the progression from the beginning of learning in drama to the level of “skills that will enable [students] to control and manipulate the medium” (O’Hara, 1984, p. 126) and how to describe that learning in six progressive levels as required by the QSCC outcomes framework. As Fleming points out, “to describe progression in learning in successive stages can easily lead to distorted and oversimplified accounts. It is difficult enough to give a coherent account of human development; it is even more of a challenge to describe in a systematic fashion the learning which is to come about by virtue of being taught” (Fleming, 1994, p. 135). The last phrase is the key to the challenge. The curriculum cannot be based on the “natural progression” that is implied by Courtney. The curriculum is required to describe the learning that is evident through the actions of students as a result of learning experiences planned and implemented by teachers.

As both Fleming and Neelands point out: “It is the pupils’ progress in drama which needs to be described” (Fleming, 1994, p. 142) and this is evident through “what they make [and what they do] rather than on what they claim, or are imagined, to experience” (Neelands, 1997, p. 18).

Jonathan Neelands (1997, pp. 16-17) offers a framework of role development from “social” actor to “aesthetic” actor. His stages move from the “public self”, unable to accept role and which stays constrained within the social setting of the classroom, through the “public self” beginning to operate as a role and gradually attaining the capacity for role distance (with social or cultural attitudes “different from [the] habitual self”), and eventually to the stage where “the performer’s ‘self’ is masked by her physical manifestation of a ‘flesh-and-blood’ character”.

Richard Courtney suggested that in the “growth of symbolisation, there is a sequence with maturation: from (a) substitution to (b) signs to (c) symbols”
(Courtney, 1980, p. 34) and Neelands offers a pedagogic progression that takes Courtney’s sequence into domains representative of the directions of twentieth century Western theatre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Key Stage 2)</td>
<td>(Key Stage 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Frame (given circumstances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social actor</td>
<td>Aesthetic actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mimesis</td>
<td>Expressive interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Symbol (gestus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear narrative</td>
<td>Montage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illusionary</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centred (whole group)</td>
<td>Autonomous dramaturges (small groups)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(summarised from Neelands, 1997, pp. 20-21)

To gain more specific advice it is necessary to go to existing curriculum documents. For example Hornbrook (1991, p. 132-135), illustrating the curriculum in the UK, tells us that students’ progress can be identified by their capacities to identify with the characters and actions of a dramatized story (7 years old); participate in the presentation of stories or scenes of their own devising, take part in improvised scenes and act out “convincing” characters (11 years old); be comfortable experimenting with diverse theatre forms and styles and should be able to produce original texts which are themselves innovative and challenging, as well as rehearsing and performing unfamiliar scripts (14 years old); and, produce dramatic texts which are entertaining and post-provoking for an adult audience (16 years old). The curriculum supported by Hornbrook has been criticised because of its emphasis on learning about rather than learning through drama (Fleming, 1994, p. 138).

**Constructing a sequential drama curriculum**

Henry (2000, p. 46) points out that educators have not yet found a way to “critically approach concepts of sequence, progression and evaluation for drama education”. Fleming (1994, p. 142) agrees that the “question of progress in drama itself been largely neglected until recent years” and suggests this is:

*partly because of the emphasis on learning through drama but there are other factors to consider.*

1. **Drama is of necessity a group activity, and the question of individual progress has therefore been given less attention, because it is difficult to isolate what this means.**
2. The emphasis has traditionally been placed on the teacher's grasp of dramatic form and ability to structure the drama rather than on the pupils.

3. Ability in drama has for many teachers been seen as an implicit part of the process and not in need of specific focus either in theory or practice.

These factors have combined to make the issue of development in ability and drama appear to have little specific focus in practice or in much of the literature (Fleming, 1994, p. 20).

Of course any selection also implies rejection or exclusion and will involve “some degree of reduction or simplification” (Fleming, 1994, p. 136). However Fleming believes that attempts at delineating progression are worthwhile because of the need for assessment, which he states “is necessary in some form for successful teaching” (1994, p. 136) and because “pupils … need to have some awareness of the objectives of the work and the criteria for assessment” (p. 142). His second reason for describing progression is “to ensure that the curriculum is sufficiently broad, balanced and appropriate to particular age groups” (p. 136).

During the last twenty years a number of publications have provided detailed advice on progression in drama. “Time for Drama” (1985) by Roma Burgess and Pamela Gaudry, provided sample lesson plans and course outlines that made up a developmental drama curriculum from Year 7 to Year 12. This does not seem to have been drawn from any existing curriculum document and, since the authors were drama educators from Victoria, Australia, may well have contributed to the curriculum in that State by providing advice on progression in drama learning. More recently secondary drama educators have been able to access specific advice on progression from Joss Bennathon (2000), Bruce Burton (1996a; 1996b), Andy Kempe (Kempe & Ashwell, 2000; Kempe & Nicholson, 2001), Jonothan Neelands (Neelands, 1997) but these texts have been written in line with pre-existing curriculum documents. Primary drama educators can go to Ackroyd (Ackroyd & Boulton, 2001, 2004), Neil Kitson and Ian Spiby (1997) and Joe Winston (2000, 2004; Winston & Tandy, 1998) for exemplars of lessons and materials that illustrate progression. However these texts, too, have been written for existing curriculum materials which both support and constrain children’s learning in the art form.

In this chapter I have provided overviews of curriculum theorising and models of curriculum development as well as arts and drama education. The review focuses, in particular on theorising about learning and progression of student learning in drama since this was of particular importance to the study.
Chapter 4.

Framing the context: a postcard view.

Australia does not have a national curriculum. Instead each State Government holds autonomous responsibility for education. The history of this goes back to before the Constitution of Australia was signed in 1901 to when each state was a separate and self-governing British colony. All children between the ages of five and fifteen in Australia must attend school and hence each State government has to provide “free, secular and compulsory” (Queensland Education Act, 1875) education for them all. In Queensland students attend primary school during Years Prep to 7; followed by secondary school, Years 8 to 12.

The history of the preparation of this particular drama curriculum goes back many years, but a significant signpost along the journey was the Hobart Declaration (Australian Education Council, 1989) when the Ministers of Education from each state agreed on a “common curriculum” that all students in Australia would be able to receive as their entitlement to a quality education. The common curriculum included the arts as a defined key learning area of learning and specified the five arts forms of dance, drama, media, music, and visual arts. This initiative opened the gateway for the development of curriculum in the arts as an entitlement for all students, regardless of location, socio-economic status or ability. While most other states went ahead to offer curriculum documents that offered learning opportunities for students in one or other of the arts, the Queensland Minister of Education made the decision that the arts, including drama, was to be part of the common and core curriculum, which meant that every child in Queensland was entitled to learning, assessment and reporting in the five arts strands of dance, drama, media, music and visual arts.

Queensland is Australia’s second largest state geographically, and third in size of population. The state has an area of 1.72 million square kilometres and (in 2003) a population of approximately 3.6 million people. Nearly 50% of Queenslanders live in rural settings and 45% of the population changed address in the five years between 1996 and 2001 (ABS, 2003). The reason I mention the location, size and mobility of the population is to point out the diversity of schooling contexts in Queensland. Most large and urban schools are in the South-East corner.
near the capital, Brisbane, and range in size from around 300 to 2000 students. Outside the Brisbane area, while there are still some schools with several hundred students many are very small indeed, for example there are 133 one-teacher schools where the principal is the only teacher with a class of up to 20 students. Any task of curriculum development is a complex undertaking, but the task is to develop a central curriculum that is relevant and suitable for students who live in such diverse, and often isolated, settings and who may move locations two or three times during their schooling, then the job increases in complexity.

**The Australian context**

The shift to the creation of an Arts syllabus in Queensland was in no small way due to the push for a national curriculum in the late 1980s. For a time it seemed as though the Federal government would be able to gain agreement for a coherent curriculum across the six states and two territories of Australia. Changes from Liberal to Labor State governments lost them the initial agreement, but the education ministers for most states agreed to conform to the concept of eight Key Learning Areas (KLAs): English, Mathematics, Science, Health and Physical Education, Studies of Society and the Environment, The Arts, and Languages Other Than English. Each state gave opportunities for students to participate in learning in the five arts strands that were laid out in the National Statements and Profiles, though the interpretation, strand organisers and levels differed significantly from the National documents as a result of local concerns and the curriculum development processes that contributed to local development.

**The Queensland context**

Queensland has a unique system of curriculum design, implementation and assessment within Australia, as it is the only State without common public examinations in curriculum offerings at the end of schooling. Until the establishment of the QSCC (now QSA), curriculum development and design for the compulsory years of schooling was managed and controlled by the Department of Education. The “Shaping the Future Report” (1994) criticised the grip that the Department of Education had on curriculum development and led to the establishment of the Queensland School Curriculum Council (QSCC) in 1996, a new statutory authority that would proceed “at arms length” (QSCC, 1997c, p. 1) from the Department of Education and the government.

A brief introduction to the background of the QSCC is warranted at this point. This authority was established to work independently of (but collaboratively with) the Queensland Education Department (EQ), the Queensland Catholic Education...
Commission (QCEC) and the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland (AISQ) to develop syllabuses and syllabus support materials for the eight Key Learning Areas (KLAs) which were to make up the core curriculum in Queensland. Core implies essential learning for all students regardless of schooling sector, location, gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity, or ability. Education Queensland in actuality retained the real power over education in Queensland as it held the control of resources and funding for all government schools but the QSCC was invested with a degree of power, in curriculum development at least, directly by parliament under the aegis of Minister for Education. The QSCC was established to be an agent seeking consensus for change in curriculum development, sharing the control of curriculum development amongst the three implementing systems and tasked to design a coherent package of curriculum documents which was consistent in structure and focus across all key learning areas (and disciplines). However the QSCC was “unable to have any involvement in implementation … although it could develop support materials to assist teachers” (Dinan-Thompson, 2005, p. 147). The lack of capacity to contribute to an implementation plan had considerable impact on the curriculum development process and led to the development of a large suite of exemplar “support” materials to assist (and entice) individual teachers and schools to implement the curriculum.

The QSCC was part of a problematic and changing system. Elements within EQ were resistant to the QSCC having the “power” of curriculum development without the challenges of implementation in a large, complex and diverse arrangement of schooling situations, especially as that authority previously had been completely in control of the curriculum development process. Struggles relating to power, control and authority influenced the development of The Arts curriculum documents, as we will see throughout this document.

Prior to the establishment of the QSCC, Education Queensland (EQ) and the Board of Secondary School Studies (BSSS) were the only developers of curriculum documents for the compulsory years of schooling. The BSSS developed syllabus documents for Years 9 to 10 (from 1971 to around 1991) and EQ developed materials for the Primary years (1-7) and, in some disciplines (e.g. music and visual art) for Year 8. The BSSS consulted more broadly than EQ in the process of curriculum development and regularly included teachers and administrators from the two other systemic educational organisations on advisory committees and curriculum development projects. Because the BSSS was given the authority to “accredit” school programs (and hence validate student results) this authority directly translated into power over the curriculum offerings in schools. By denying accreditation to those
school programs which were perceived not to meet the required standard, the students graduating from those schools with "substandard" programs were potentially seen as achieving at a lower level than those from accredited programs and this had notable implications for university entrance. In 1991 the BSSS became the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (BSSSS) and concentrated solely on the final two years of high school (the non-compulsory years) ceasing the monitoring of programs in the Junior Secondary years. From this date on secondary schools could feasibly offer any courses of study they wished in years 8-10. There was no longer a monitoring authority or procedure in place.

When the Arts Curriculum Development project commenced in 1998, the plethora and varying statuses of the curriculum documents on offer were confusing, to say the least. It is worth noting that only those documents designated as "syllabuses" in Queensland have any legal standing in schools. This means that they are allocated time in the weekly timetable when teaching and learning in syllabus areas were expected to take place, and all government schools are required to report to parents about their students' progress in these curriculum areas. Historically, Visual Art and Music, only, have been compulsory in Queensland Primary schools, and these only in State schools. While all education systems (Education Queensland, the Catholic Education Council, and the Association of Independent Schools) are answerable to the Minister of Education, only in Education Queensland (State) schools are the syllabuses mandatory. Catholic and Independent schools can offer any of the syllabuses if they choose, but are under no compulsion to do so. However, at least in the post-compulsory years, these systems do take the syllabuses very seriously and provide resources and significant amounts of teacher professional development for implementation. The implementation of the BSSSS syllabus documents is advantaged by the fact that they connect directly to entrance to tertiary study. Therefore, if schools want their students to have access to tertiary studies through the arts, then they must offer the BSSSS syllabuses and ensure their school programs are accredited. It is not within the realms of this study to discuss the accreditation process or its benefits and disadvantages. Suffice it to say that the higher stakes of study in years 11 and 12 meant that more students had opportunities to study according to the various arts syllabuses in the final two years of schooling than in any of the previous years. Indeed, because it is a requirement of the senior documents that there be no expectations that students in Years 11 and 12 must have previously studied in any of the arts areas, there is no need for schools to offer learning in the arts before Year 11.
Appendix 4.1 lists the syllabus and curriculum documents in each of the art forms current at the beginning of “The Arts Curriculum Development Project” in 1998. Even a quick glance at this table will show that the most “supported” areas were Music and Visual Arts. The syllabus and support materials in these areas outweigh those in the other three strands significantly, especially if we focus on the compulsory (1-10) years of schooling and remember that only syllabus documents were given implementation support as they were the mandated documents for teaching, learning and reporting.

**Why such a syllabus**

The Arts curriculum development project was the first attempt to create a coherent arts syllabus within Queensland where learning in the arts was to be common across school systems. Existing curriculum materials had been developed and implemented independently, and in some cases haphazardly, during the 20th century. By 1998 the Queensland government had agreed to conform to the eight Key Learning Areas proposed by the Commonwealth government in a bid to move towards a national curriculum but reserved the right to design the curriculum “differently” within the Queensland context. This was consistent with moves both nationally and, at the time of this project, similar curriculum teams were at work in other States, and in New Zealand. The Arts Curriculum Development Project was charged with the specific task of designing an arts curriculum, within a pre-determined outcomes-focused framework developed by the QSCC, following the precedents established through the work of the Science and Health and Physical Education project teams due for completion in 1999. The new Arts curriculum was to attempt to produce documents which would delineate the learning in all arts strands for the ten compulsory years of schooling and which would encourage integration within and across the KLA.

**Designing the curriculum**

At the QSCC, The KLAs were paired and developed in sequence, with the intention being to have the flaws/processes in the design procedures worked out by the time the first pair, Science and Health and Physical Education (HPE), 1996-1999 were ready for implementation. Science and HPE were followed by Studies of Society and the Environment (SOSE) and Languages Other Than English (LOTE), (1997-2001); The Arts and Technology, 1998-2001; and Mathematics and English, 1999-2003. The QSCC was a short-lived institution as it was amalgamated with the Tertiary Entrance Procedures Authority (TEPA) and the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (QBSSSSS) in 2002, only seven years after it was established, to form the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA). All of the published
QSCC documents referred to in this study are now available on the QSA website (www.qsa.qld.edu.au/ysr1-10/).

The length of time allocated for syllabus development for each of the KLAs was three years (though this was commonly extended) and the syllabus development process was legislated to be one of open, wide and accountable consultation (QSCC, 1997a). The Arts project team generated and consulted with broad networks of interested individuals and organisations that they invited to comment on the developing syllabus and influence its ongoing progress. Chapters 5, 7 and 9 will provide details of the process.

The Council and the office of the Council

The model of curriculum design followed by the Queensland Government with the establishment of the QSCC is contestable. It is an example of taken-for-granted expertise of senior members of curriculum authorities without acknowledgement of the power disjunctions and systemic priorities which conflicted between the authorities themselves, and which were often oppositional to the “bottom-up” issues and concerns of schools and their consultative partners. Decisions made upon political imperatives are questionable in terms of their suitability and correctness in light of the collaboration that was enforced through legislation, but not always followed in practice. Evidence of power disjunctions, competing systemic priorities, and their influence on curriculum decisions will be highlighted in the chapters that follow.

The Council itself was set up with a legislated and intersystemic membership (see Appendix 4.2 for a list of the foundation Council Members). The inaugural Council Chair, from 1998, was the headmaster of an independent, private boys’ school from inner-city Brisbane. The second Chair, from mid-2000, was a senior executive from the Catholic Education Commission. Membership of the Council was drawn from the three systemic authorities as well as the teachers’ unions, and parent and community representative associations. It was to this committee that all of the internal documents in the office had to go for review. A subsidiary Curriculum Committee (see Appendix 4.3) was set up in 1997, following requests from the Council for more independent curriculum advice. After the establishment of the Curriculum Committee all documents went to the Curriculum Committee for review and advice, before being forwarded on to the Council in an attempt to pre-empt any problems with the documents and streamline the process.

One unusual element of the legislation establishing the QSCC was the consultation mandated within the legislation that bound the QSCC, in the attempt to
consider and represent the needs and interests of independent and religious schools (two major systems AISQ\(^1\) and QCEC\(^2\)) as well as State (government) schools (EQ). This was an attempt to accommodate the needs of the two independent authorities with those of the established government education department. While the Council reported directly to the Minister of Education, key decisions were influenced by the management structures and stakeholders within each of the three authorities.

The Council process of approval of curriculum documents was multi-faceted and many-layered, but also limited by the selection processes and structures previously established within the QSCC. The Council comprised a chairperson (nominated by the Minister of Education), the Director-General of Education, and thirteen other members nominated by representative educational bodies in Queensland. The Chairperson was able to hold office for not longer than four years, while for other appointed members the term was three years. The thirteen foundation members of Council included the Deputy Director of the Queensland Catholic Education Commission, and the Director of Education Services of the Department of Education. The Director and Assistant Directors of the QSCC attended Council meetings but were not empowered to vote.

The Council was a representative group and had a dual purpose, firstly to shape policy and directions for the office of the Council and, secondly, to act as arbiters of all documents and materials that the office produced. All official documents in both draft and final stages went to the Council for approval when it met six times a year. They didn’t always approve the submission, in which case the curriculum development teams were required to revisit the documents and make the amendments requested by the meeting of the Council. When a document was approved by the Council it then was forwarded to the Minister of Education. Once approved by the Minister and Cabinet any syllabus documents became legally binding and were mandated for all State Schools in Queensland to ensure the requirements for provision of learning and reporting were met.

The office of the Council was set up as a traditional bureaucratic hierarchy. The Director held the highest status and was the single most powerful individual within the office. Three Assistant Directors (Curriculum, Testing, and Corporate Services) were next on the ladder. Each of these regularly attended meetings of the Council. Next were four Principal Project Officers, who had direct responsibility for the establishment of each of the curriculum development projects and management of the project teams. The Principal Project Officers (PPOs) were invited to attend

\(^1\) The Association of Independent Schools of Queensland
\(^2\) The Queensland Catholic Education Commission
meetings of the Council when items pertaining to the projects they managed were on the agenda. Their responsibility was largely to report to the Council and they were rarely invited to participate in discussion and, as employees of the Office of the Council, were not entitled to either lobby or vote. Within the Office the PPOs and the Project Teams worked closely in conjunction with the Equity Officers, who were charged with monitoring the projects to ensure that issues of equity and access were addressed at every stage of materials development, and the Editorial team, who provided the templates and ensured consistency within the corporate “look” of all publications. The Project Teams (made up of between one and eight members) reported directly to their specific PPO and were responsible for ongoing consultation with the same representative groups as made up the Council itself, with the addition of discipline-specific professional associations.

The staff of the QSCC
All of the senior staff had come to QSCC from EQ. The Director and Assistant Director (Curriculum) had both been top level officers within the curriculum planning division in EQ. They brought with them their considerable professional expertise in the field as well as important personal networks and credibility. Both were personally committed to the idea of collaborative and consultative curriculum development and believed that expert teachers were best placed in the centre of the curriculum development process. The Council needed to employ “Project Officers” (POs) who were recognised as leaders in their field, and with depth and breadth of experience. As such, changing project teams, representative of all school authorities, were seconded to the Office for limited periods, to work on syllabus development or curriculum assessment materials. Consequently the staff of the office of the QSCC consisted of teachers seconded for the duration of each project and who worked as POs on the relevant KLA curriculum and, “Principal Project Officers” (PPOs) who operated as project managers. All the PPOs had previously worked as school or systemic administrators. They had spent many years in schools and had a grounded understanding of the diversity and complexity of school life.

Marsh and Willis (2003, p. 162) propose that teams undertaking curriculum development should have members with expertise in six areas: subject matter; pedagogy; curriculum design; evaluation; organisation; and writing. My experience in pedagogy, curriculum design and organisation emerged from my career as a primary teacher, a secondary drama teacher and Head of Department, and my work in curriculum development and evaluation for the BSSSS was recognised within and beyond the school community. My skills in organisation and writing were well
developed because of my experiences above. Where I felt I was lacking was that I had never undertaken any formal study of curriculum theory. However I am comforted by Schwab's argument (in Walker & Soltis, 1997) that curriculum decisions do not require a curriculum theory.

In terms of office personnel I was in no way out of the ordinary and all the project officers had similar skills and credibility.

At the beginning of 1998, the Arts Team was made up of four people: Linda Mackay3 (music teacher, head of department, experienced secondary teacher), Janis Boyd (visual artist and academic), myself (drama teacher, head of department, experienced at primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education), and Carolyn Harrod, our Project Manager (extensive background in early childhood and educational management).

**Existing staff and time allocations**

At our first meeting the Director of the QSCC, Jim Tunstall, explained a number of the parameters within which we were to work. The Council had earlier agreed on time allocations for each of the KLAs. The Arts had been allocated 300 hours for Years 1 to 3, 400 hours for the next four years, and 180 hours for Years 8 to 10. As a KLA we did considerably better than most, with the third highest time allocation following English and Mathematics (see Appendix 4.4 for the published table of time allocations (QSCC, 1997b).

Existing staff allocations were to be adhered to as well. Music was well supported, in primary schools, by trained specialist music teachers and itinerant instrumental music teachers working in the state school system. They, and the Queensland Teachers' Union, were understandably desirous of maintaining the status quo in terms of their employment. It was clear, however, that the training and employment of specialist teachers in the other arts areas was not on the list of possibilities. Thus, the syllabus was to be written for implementation by specialist teachers of music but generalist teachers of all the other arts strands in the primary school. This is obviously an inequity of resourcing but also the result of a long history of music being the most privileged art form in Queensland schools.

**The purview of the documents**

The documents that we were preparing were the syllabus and support materials for the arts. The systemic authorities retained the responsibility for assessment and reporting. We were to include minimal advice on assessment i.e. general principles of

3 I have used real names throughout this document where they are a matter of public record or when I have sought and been granted permission to do so. All other names are pseudonyms to protect the identity of the individuals involved.
assessment and planning, but no specifics. The Assistant-Director General of EQ was adamant that we would give no advice on assessment or reporting: “That is the system’s responsibility”. Neither were we to incorporate a particular pedagogy or philosophical approach. The documents were meant to be pedagogy-free and value-neutral to allow for schools to interpret the document in terms of their own (especially faith-based) philosophies and values. As Michael Apple (2004, p. 7) points out neutrality is impossible because schooling is not neutral in terms of its economic outcomes; and the selection of knowledge that goes into the curriculum is already a form of cultural capital contributing to the perpetuation of existing social and economic structures. However we were required to restrain from introducing or imposing alternative, socially-critical viewpoints or to take any particular political stance.

In an additional attempt to allow for diversity of interpretation in relation to specific schooling contexts, the support materials were expected to be exemplars (and exemplary) but not prescriptive, providing teachers with “options to adapt or modify the curriculum to the school’s context” (Print, 1993, p. 18). They were models of practice intending to assist teachers in their own planning and implementation of the curriculum but they were not meant to be followed slavishly. In short we were preparing the syllabus as a curriculum framework, which was to provide sufficient information for teachers to plan so that all students could demonstrate learning outcomes described in six developmental levels. The support materials aimed to give teachers sufficient advice and knowledge to provide quality learning experiences which would lead to common learning outcomes in the arts for all students in Queensland without being prescriptive. However the systemic authorities would provide advice on assessment, reporting and pedagogy. As we will see later, this posed particular challenges for us during the trial/pilot process when teachers were asking for assistance with assessment and reporting and were told that we could not help.

The development process was carefully constructed to eliminate personal bias and the imposition of any single view. As we shall see later in this document, that was an impossible task and individual views certainly did prevail. Even so, there was a sincere attempt to create all documents through a process of consensus.

The consultative process
For the QSCC, “Consultation [was] an essential component of the curriculum development process” and “effective consultation should occur early and throughout the decision-making process” (QSCC, 1997a, p. 1). In the same edition of Interlink
(the journal published by the QSCC) advice was provided about the undertaking of consultation:

- Each consultation needs to be designed to meet the unique demands of the situation and to identify and define clearly the issues being considered. Adequate time should be allowed to conduct the consultation process.
- Effective consultation requires openness about why people are being consulted, how they will be consulted, and how much influence they will have over decisions made.
- Those consulted need to be provided with comprehensive, balanced and accurate information.
- All interested parties should have access to the consultation process.
- All participants should be treated with dignity and respect.

These principles of practice underpinned all consultation procedures.

With consultation embedded in legislation the Council was a broadly representative body and, because there was a serious attempt at all levels of the organisation to follow the above principles, it was respected by the senior staff at all levels of AISQ and QCEC. This was somewhat galling for EQ who had previously had complete control of mandated curriculum in Queensland and was not required to consult with the Independent or Catholic schooling systems. In addition, as a consequence of the establishment of the QSCC, the curriculum design and development branch of EQ was no longer required, which meant that people lost their positions in Head Office as a result of curriculum development moving to the new authority. While there was a degree of resentment evident in many exchanges with EQ, QCEC and AISQ were delighted to be consulted and made it clear that they valued the opportunity to contribute to curriculum development. Representatives from EQ continually pointed out that they felt the process was imbalanced. EQ had to implement (and report on) the curriculum while the other authorities could choose to do so entirely or in part; EQ was required to provide free, equal and secular education (Education Act, 1875) in all locations in the state while the other authorities offered schooling in limited locations, usually close to major towns; EQ was the largest provider of education and employer of teachers within the State, therefore they believed they should have the greatest say in what the curriculum contained and how it was to be constructed. In reality they did. The representation on the first Council clearly indicates the political power which would hold sway behind the closed doors of the Council meeting room. The nominees of the Director-General were all
beholden to him in one way or another. The Minister took the advice of the Director-General when nominating members. And it would be a brave Parent or Union Representative who would run counter to the power and authority invested in the role of the Director-General of Education. In short, while discussions were frequently robust, EQ, generally held sway.

**Membership of Syllabus Advisory Committee**

Part of the legislation enshrining consultation required the establishment of a KLA specific Syllabus Advisory Committee (SAC). The membership of syllabus advisory committees was outlined in the Education act ("Queensland Department of Education (School Curriculum P-10) Regulation," 1997):

6.1 (1) Each syllabus advisory committee established by the Council must include the following persons –

(a) 5 persons nominated by the chief executive –

(i) one of whom must be a public servant employed in the government; and

(ii) 4 of whom must be practising teachers whom the chief executive considers to have expertise in the particular subjects for which the committee is established;

(b) 2 persons nominated by Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 1 of whom must be a practising teacher whom the Commission considers to have expertise in the particular subjects for which the committee is established;

(c) 2 persons nominated by Association of Independent Schools of Queensland, Inc., 1 of whom must be a practising teacher whom the Commission considers to have expertise in the particular subjects for which the committee is established;

(d) 1 person nominated by the parent groups who, at the time of appointment by the Council, is a parent of a student currently attending a year from preschool to Year 10 at a State educational institution or other school in Queensland.

(2) To remove any doubt, it is declared that subsection (1) does not limit the Council’s powers to appoint other persons to be members of syllabus advisory committees.

The Arts SAC was very broadly based (as can be seen in Appendix 4. 5) and had representation from all arts areas. There was a real attempt to make the voices on this committee heard and listened to, and the membership was constantly being
adjusted throughout the project (e.g. as members took maternity leave) to make sure that consultation remained broad and representative, with additional members being added at our request (see point 2 above) when gaps in expertise or experience were perceived. This meant that the committee grew and grew, thus becoming a number of voices with varying viewpoints, rather than a committee that reached consensus. In practice the team often made “best guess” decisions and checked them with the SAC later. The SAC was very supportive and keen to make the documents workable. There was only one phase of the project (see Chapter 7) when there was discomfort expressed by the SAC (in forms of questions about why changes had been made) and this was when, for a period of time, our PPO was “acting up” a level in the position of Assistant Director (Curriculum) and a replacement PPO was temporarily appointed.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I have endeavoured to contextualise the curriculum development process with information about the history and location within which the documents were developed. In the next chapter I will describe the development of the design brief.
Chapter 5.

Phase 1: Digging in Sand

On beginning work in February, 1998, the initial task for The Arts Project team was to prepare the design brief for the syllabus. The design brief provided the conceptual framework for the syllabus and curriculum support materials and had to be approved by a meeting of the Council before work on the syllabus “proper” could commence.

**Starting work as an Arts Project Officer**

Throughout this document, the personal details which will be constantly invoked are not intended to construct either a hero or victim narrative, but because those personal dynamics were a very important part, not only of the whole process, decision-making, managing of opportunities, influences and constraints but also a significant part of my positioned analysis.

The first few days of the job were the normal but unanticipated challenges of fitting out new offices with the fundamentals of phone lines, desks, chairs and computers. It was two weeks before we were fully set up and were able to establish a work routine. Even with the frustrations of not having somewhere to work, or any real understanding of what we were to do, this seemed to be a rather exotic and pampered way of working, far removed from the chaos that often accompanies the start of the school year. Our office was set up in what was euphemistically called the “Annex”, in fact the converted downstairs backroom (with no windows at our end of the room) of the offices of AISQ (the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland). The Annex was a brisk twenty-five minute walk from the MLC building where the main office was on the 27th floor with amazing views south and west over Brisbane. We were in an underground bunker, but after school it seemed like luxury.

*Linda and I sheepishly confided to each other that we feel guilty having such luxurious circumstances in which to work. A desk, each with a computer, access to a printer, no bells ringing every forty minutes so we have to rush to class, blocks of uninterrupted time without “uncooperative” students standing sullenly at the door, and to be able*
The Arts Team shared the Annex with The Technology Team. Both our projects commenced at the same time, and were to work to the same timelines. It was an advantage to have a parallel group to share issues and concerns about our respective tasks and we made a habit of regularly having morning coffee together and casually chatting about what we were doing and where we were up to. To a degree this compensated for the disadvantage of being distanced (literally and figuratively) from the main office where the Science, and Health and Physical Education (HPE) teams were one year from completion, and the Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE) and Languages Other than English (LOTE) were one year down the track. Each project was planned to take three years to design, develop, trial and produce the syllabus and associated curriculum support materials for the respective Key Learning Area. There was no room to accommodate us in the MLC building and this meant it was difficult for us to get to know the team members from existing projects and avail ourselves of their lived wisdom developed as a result of having worked through similar tasks. Although the office atmosphere was welcoming and we regularly attended meetings there, we were (or felt we were) outsiders and were not able to take advantage of opportunities for casual and passing chats which are so valuable for shared understanding and team building. When the Science and HPE teams finished their projects at the end of 1998 and we moved into the main office the entire dynamic changed, access to people and information was easier and we “belonged” to the group. It is easy to underestimate the importance of the location and emotional currency within a workplace.

**Responsibilities of the writing team**

Very soon after starting work on this project I began to feel out of my depth. The job seemed huge and the timelines very tight. Our first meeting with Carolyn on 5 February, 1998 established the research priorities of the design brief and allocated specific tasks to each of us. By the end of April we were to

- conduct focus groups;
- commission and receive papers from 3 eminent academics
- prepare an environmental scan of key documents;
- manage the establishment and first two meetings of The Arts Syllabus Advisory Committee; and
- prepare a draft of the design brief for review and revision before it was to be posted to the Council for consultation and approval.
At this stage the timelines seemed to crowd on top of one another and we had no way of anticipating the complexity of the tasks ahead. What we were sure of was that we had to find a way of gaining an understanding of what as many stakeholders as possible wanted in the documents we were to develop and that the future would hold a number of compromises. In my journal at this time I recorded, “I know we won’t be able to write the ‘perfect’ curriculum, perhaps even not the curriculum I want to write. But I am determined to write the best possible curriculum we can under the circumstances” (Journal, 1 February, 1998). This curriculum development project, like any other, was bounded by our personal and collective preconceptions, the constraints of the organisation and the contexts in which it would be implemented, and the time and social and political influences under which it was to proceed. We came to realise quickly that we would need “to search for the middle ground, a highly elusive and abstract concept, where there is no extreme emphasis on subject matter or student cognitive development or socio-psychological development, excellence or equality” (Ornstein, 2003, p. 9).

Preparing the Design Brief

The design brief was to be sent to the Curriculum Committee meeting (4 June, 1998) and the Curriculum Committee would provide advice to the Council at the Council Meeting (16 July, 1998). Internal procedures required that any materials tabled at meetings of the Curriculum Committee or the Council itself must be “signed off” for copying and posting at least two weeks before the meeting date, to allow the committee members to read the materials thoroughly, and consult where necessary before the meeting. It was at the Council meetings that the most significant decisions relating to the ongoing progress and development of the curriculum materials were made. If the design brief was endorsed by Council at the July meeting, then the remainder of the project could proceed (developing the syllabus, framing the outcomes, and designing curriculum support materials). However, if endorsement was not forthcoming, then the project team would embark on a process of revisions as advised by the committee. Team members were not permitted to attend the Council meetings (occasionally one of us was invited to attend for short periods in order to be available for questions) and all feedback was transmitted via the PPO, who did attend when one of the projects under her purview was tabled for discussion. We had heard from the members of the other syllabus development projects that not one of the design briefs of existing curriculum projects (Science, HPE, SOSE, LOTE) had been endorsed at the first tabling. The possibility of not pleasing the Council and having the design brief rejected certainly added a level of stress to the task because
we were all inexperienced curriculum developers, seconded for a short time on to the project. However, it would be fair to say that, at this stage of the project, we had little understanding of the consequences of a rejection at Council.

The bulk of the first phase of the project thus was from February to 23 May, 1998 when the second\textsuperscript{4} draft design brief was to go to Council for feedback before the formal (and we hoped final) submission to the meeting on 16 July. The design brief contained information about why to study the arts, how to study in the arts, what to study in the arts. It also needed to show evidence of extensive research and consultation. During this phase the project team established a consultative network that included members of an Arts Syllabus Advisory Committee (first meeting 7 April, 1998), commissioned scholarly papers on arts curriculum, and undertook an environmental scan by “reading and researching a range of texts and articles relating to arts curriculum, searching the Internet for related articles and curriculum documents from around the world, analysing relevant curriculum documents from other states within Australia, seeking public submissions, sending fax response forms to approximately 100 schools and individuals across a range of sectors and discipline speciality, holding five preliminary focus discussion groups with representatives of Primary, Secondary, Tertiary, Systems, and Professional organisations” (SAC meeting minutes, 7 April, 1998). And of course, we also had to write the document. It was evident that a significant constraint was going to be time (see Appendix 5.1 for the project timeline).

In this first stage of the curriculum development project we were establishing the “platform” (Walker, 1971) upon which the curriculum design would stand. Decker Walker proposed what he terms the “naturalistic” model of curriculum development and this model most closely aligns with the stages of this project. Walker’s model involves three phases:

1. \textit{establishing the platform}: developing an understanding of conceptions (beliefs about what exists and what is possible), theories (the relationships between existing entities), and aims (what is educationally desirable);
2. \textit{deliberation}: a process of considering both the ends and means while recognising that they are mutually determining (i.e. the intended ends influence decisions about what means should be employed to reach the ends, and vice versa), generating a range of alternative solutions, and tracing the possible

\textsuperscript{4} The first draft was developed very quickly in February and March, and sent out widely for consultation and review. Feedback on draft one provided advice, feedback and suggested revisions which were then incorporated into the second draft. The second draft was sent to the Curriculum Committee and the Council for their review and advice and endorsement to allow us to further consult and refine before the third draft: seeking permission to proceed to the syllabus development phase of the project.
consequences. The intent of this phase is to choose the “best” solution, because there will never be a single “right” solution.

3. **design:** making explicit the set of abstract relationships in a single entity, a “gestalt” (Walker, 1971, p. 53) presented in a schematic way.

His conception of platform suggests “both a political platform and something to stand on” (1971, p. 52) implicitly recognising the political/ideological basis of the curriculum. It refers to the assumptions that the curriculum developer accepts as the basis for the justifications of her choices. Part of the establishment of this platform for The Arts project team was to go through a process of investigation to uncover what existed in terms of arts curriculum documents, what theoretical frameworks informed these, and what were the expressed desires of stakeholders in Queensland. Thus our platform was constructed out of the driftwood of the environmental scan, focus group discussions, commissioned papers, consultative network, and the pre-existing decisions of the QSCC and Education Queensland. These practices were not set down in a manual or any form of procedural material but, rather, passed on to us by the PPO; one way in which the collective wisdom of the office was shared. The tasks were initially divided amongst the members of the team, though there was overlap.

Janis, because of her access to a network of academics, arranged for the commissioned papers, Linda began the establishment of the consultative network and I started the environmental scan.

**Establishing the platform: Focus group discussions**

The first step towards opening consultation was the holding of five focus group discussions 18-25 February, 1998 in Brisbane with primary teachers, secondary teachers, academics, members of professional associations and a sixth meeting in Toowoomba on 26 February to accommodate the views of teachers in rural settings. The meetings with school based personnel included representatives from each of the three systems. Because we could not access space at QSCC that was large enough to accommodate the groups, all Brisbane meetings were held in the headquarters of EQ in Mary Street. This could be interpreted as EQ signalling that they would support the work of the arts team at the QSCC but equally, and more likely at this stage, as an attempt to show that, while QSCC was going to develop the curriculum, EQ was still the senior partner.

The focus group discussions were free flowing in an attempt to allow participants to be open and imaginative in their responses. We asked the discussants to talk about, “What you would consider to be a suitable and meaningful Arts...”

---

5 See Appendix 5.2 for a list of schools in Queensland (by authority), 2001.
Education for students between the ages of five and fifteen”, and, “What is good about current arts practice?” We let the discussion range from there, intervening with questions seeking clarification only when required. We wanted to use open and unrestrained group discussions so that the comments and discussion would be as wide-ranging as possible.

Thank heavens, Carolyn is used to setting up and running research projects. She seems to be very clear and sure about the right procedures. My Masters didn’t prepare me for this. I am glad I am not having to contribute to the planning (Journal 19 February, 1998).

Establishing the platform: Environmental Scan

Undertaking an Environmental Scan involved reading and analysis of international and local curriculum materials. The purpose was to see what conceptual frameworks might connect with the Queensland context and also to see what content was selected and how the learning was organised. In 1998, very few international documents were available to us. Our project team had no funds to purchase documents from international ministries or departments and, more urgently, no time to wait for processing and posting, especially when we were unsure of their importance or relevance to our context. Therefore we were only able to access those documents which were available via the internet. The USA and Canada provided the most fruitful sources. There were no arts-based curriculum materials on the web in the U.K. and, while we had heard that a good arts syllabus existed in Scotland, we received no replies to email (or snail mail) requests about it. Neither could we find web-based arts curriculum materials from sites in Europe or the Asia Pacific region.

Establishing the platform: Commissioned papers

In February, 1998, the QSCC, on behalf of the arts project, commissioned four Australian arts educators to write papers which offered advice on the future direction of arts education in Australia, and for this curriculum document in particular. The writers employed to do the task were Jenny Aland, South Australian Department of Education, Employment and Training; Dr. Margaret Barrett, University of Tasmania; Janis Boyd, Griffith University, Queensland (a member of The Arts Project team, January-June 1998); and Associate Professor Lee Emery, University of Melbourne. As was the case throughout the project, the timelines were very tight for these papers which were delivered by the end of March. Lee Emery, whose background is in the Visual Arts, was noted for her involvement in the creation of the National Statements and Profiles for The Arts in Australian Schools (Curriculum Corporation, 1993, 1994), which had been criticised as being heavily weighted in favour of Visual Arts, outdated
and backward-looking (Boughton, 1993). The advisory board that contributed to this document had a membership of ten senior arts educators, with only one representative each of drama and dance. Performing arts educators, in particular, were concerned about the de-emphasising of performance and interpretation in the National Statements. Jenny Aland, also with a Visual Arts background, had been a significant contributor to the national documents and was a senior public servant with the South Australian Department of Education. Dr Margaret Barrett, a music educator from Tasmania, was widely respected, especially for her publications in the field of early childhood. Janis Boyd was a long-established Visual Arts educator in Queensland and had contributed to curriculum development in an advisory capacity in Queensland. The absence of voices from Dance, Drama and Media Education was notable in these papers and was identified during consultation:

We note that three of the commissioned papers are from art educators and one is from a music educator. It would have been better to have a more representative sample of academics approached to write papers. (QADIE, Fax response, 15 June, 1998)

When reading the papers one notices a high degree of consistency amongst the three visual arts experts with the occasional alternative position being presented by Dr Barrett (see pp.91-93 for more detailed discussion of this).

**Establishing the platform: Consultation**

The charter establishing the QSCC had emphasised the need for consultation and the Council had responded by developing a vision that included broad and accountable consultation:

The use of advisory committees and consultative networks is a very important element in the curriculum development process. Maximum statewide participation in the curriculum development process is fostered by:

- seeking the widest possible representation for syllabus advisory committees;
- encouraging participation in the consultative network by persons living outside south-east Queensland;
- making draft curriculum documents available for information and feedback via the Internet;
- offering, wherever economically and logistically viable, workshops or forums in provincial centres during the life of the curriculum project.

(Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1997a, p. 3)
In line with the "moral and professional responsibility to consider and respond to the views and interests of all the interested parties" (Walker & Soltis, 1997, p. 6) we started with the focus group discussions already mentioned, established a Syllabus Advisory Committee, and the above list of academics were approached to write papers advising us on possible directions for the curriculum.

**The Syllabus Advisory Committee**

The SAC was a representative group. As you can see in Appendix 4.5, representatives were drawn from the three education systems, Education Queensland, the Queensland Catholic Education Commission, and the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland. In an attempt to accommodate the complexity of the "milieu" (Schwab, 1973) the committee also drew representatives from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait community, teachers from far-north and far-west Queensland, parent associations, the teachers’ unions, special education, the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors, and the various arts. Many of the representatives had multi-faceted responsibilities. For example Kevin Cox was a voice for *primary* teachers in *Catholic* schools in *Northern* Queensland and Sue Davis was a voice for *secondary* teachers in *State* schools who were *drama* teachers. The SAC met four times a year and the cost of travel and teacher-replacements ("supply" teachers to cover the classes of those at the meeting) was met by the QSCC, as part of the Arts Syllabus development budget. Committee members were posted the agenda with all the relevant documents two weeks before the meeting so that they would have time to read and be prepared, and were sometimes asked to seek advice from their own networks on particular issues that arose from the meeting. This was a highly influential advisory group and made a significant contribution to the structure of the syllabus. For example at the meeting on 29/04/98, the SAC agreed that we would develop a syllabus with “process outcomes” rather than content outcomes and decided on a set of three organisers (engagement in arts making; expression through arts products; and reflection on both products and processes). This decision is interesting in retrospect as Marsh (2004, p. 29) reports that one of the criticisms of OBE was for its heavy emphasis on content rather than processes. As we will see in the Trial/Pilot phase (Chapter 9) the advice of the SAC was not always followed when internal decisions or the constraints of the editing/publication process took precedence. Indeed, at the same meeting on April

---

6 This decision was regarded as ‘a nice try’ by our colleagues in the science team, ‘but you’ll never get it through Council. We wanted process strands and we weren’t allowed to have them’. (Journal, 5 May, 1998). Later, when the Design Brief, with our ‘process’ strands was passed by Council without a hitch, some of the Science team members were so angry they could barely speak to us.
The SAC had recommended that Sourcebook Guidelines should be organised in Bands of schooling and published as a complete package for each band (lower primary, middle primary, upper primary, lower secondary) but this did not eventuate.

**The On-line Consultative network**

Despite the formal consultation offered by the focus groups and the ongoing commitment to the SAC, we were concerned that many voices would be omitted. This was particularly important in a State the size of Queensland. Consequently we attempted to broaden our consultative base. Advertisements were placed in EdViews (the free paper that went to all government schools), The Catholic Leader, the AISQ newsletter and The Courier Mail (Queensland’s state-wide newspaper) asking for interested parties to register to provide ongoing feedback to the project. From responses to these advertisements we set up an on-line Consultative Network which quickly grew to 212 members. Having the consultative network on-line meant that distance was not an issue and we could send out large documents (at no cost) for people to respond to. The main advantage of this was the inclusion of regional teachers and administrators. In addition this was a self-proposed group which meant that individuals could respond and provide advice on their own behalf without having to go through more formal channels and being constrained by their representation of a professional association or community group, unless they registered precisely in order to do this. We were able to send these members of the on-line consultative group updated information at each stage throughout the project for their interest and review. While most of them had some advice to offer in the initial stages of the project, responses waned (or confidence increased) and nothing much came in at later stages. Anecdotal evidence from personal conversations indicated that respondents may not have bothered making comments because they thought we were on the right track and felt comfortable with leaving us alone.

**Me:** Hey, C, we haven’t heard from you for a while. No feedback on the draft syllabus?

**C:** What? Oh no … it’s great. You guys are doing a great job. I didn’t need to tell you anything.

**Me:** Actually, we do need to hear that you like it. Otherwise all we hear from are the people that don’t and if the majority like it … the ‘squeaky wheels’ drive the changes. (Journal, 4 December, 1999)

Any written advice from this network was tabled and discussed at our weekly team meetings. As part of our accountability we were expected to show that we had given due consideration to all suggestions, even ones that we regarded as foolish or
taunting such as a response to our first fax survey: “There is no art but music! Nothing else should be taught!” However some suggestions came to fruition e.g.

*A brochure in plain English for parents could be published as an advocacy document prior to implementation in primary school and for entrance into subject selection in secondary school.* (Secondary drama teacher, fax response, 3 August, 1998)

led to the provision of brochures as Word files on the CD-Rom for both primary and secondary schools as part of the in-service package.

We considered having additional focus group discussions in rural and remote Queensland, or running teleconferences at the office which could connect representatives from diverse locations in the state. However there were several problems with these options. Transporting the arts team to a range of locations and in a timely fashion was both cost- and efficiency-prohibitive because the vastness of the location would mean we had to fly everywhere, and we would be out of the office for large blocks of time. And, at this time Telstra charged around $1000 for a teleconference so that, too, was regarded as too costly. Moreover, though this was not discussed at the time, the people who were likely be invited or permitted to participate in such consultation would probably be administrators rather than teachers and any advice could have been skewed in line with administrative, efficiency-driven concerns. Education Queensland would have been further advantaged in such consultation as there were many fewer Catholic Schools and scarcely any Independent Schools in remote and rural locations.

**Professional associations**

An obvious choice for inclusion in consultation was the professional associations for each of the arts areas. They were all significant and ongoing consultative groups; most important because the associations were representative of their membership, and in some cases, set up their own consultative network for members. Thus they held both the authority of subject area expertise and the power of being representative of large memberships. In addition representation was assured on the SAC which was to meet, formally, four times per year. And thirdly, the outcomes writing teams were nominated by the professional association.

In the case of drama the ongoing connection was one which suited my personal choice as well as the organizational arrangements. QADIE (now Drama Queensland) was the only drama association involved in consultation for the curriculum development. The second association, The Speech and Drama Teachers’ Association was invited to join in the consultation but remained silent. This may have
been because members of that association saw little relevance in a school-based curriculum. They had their own, very prescriptive syllabus materials, from the Australian Music Examinations Board (AMEB) or Trinity College, London, and Speech and Drama teachers either worked with individuals or small groups in private speech studios, or in a few private schools as part of the co-curricular offerings.

Having only one association to provide advice made my job much easier as there was less likelihood of contradictory advice or principles of practice. QADIE was a very proactive association, internationally recognized for its spirit of collegiality and dedicated membership following the success of the IDEA World Congress held in Brisbane in 1995. The passion for quality drama education and capacity for collaboration that was so evident when this organization of around 400 members hosted a drama in education congress that drew nearly 1100 delegates from more than 50 nations, once again came to the fore in this curriculum development project.

At the time I was a member of the Executive of QADIE, remaining so throughout the entire project, and was thus both in tune with the ideas and concerns of the membership, as well as advantaged by having easy access to the advice of the QADIE management committee at our monthly meetings. From the beginning of my time on the project, I decided to try and make myself a conduit for the professional association rather than drive the decision-making process. To this end, I would often absent myself from the voting, and sometimes the discussion, of specific aspects of the documents, in the belief that I should not try to steer the professional association’s response but, rather, let the association guide me as the writer of the documents. As an example I was not involved in the preparation of the QADIE proposal for writing the outcomes. I felt it could be perceived as a conflict of interest if I advised the professional association on what was being sought from the outcomes writing consortium.

The participating professional associations proved to be the strongest, most rigorous, and most regular respondees during consultation. To a large extent this relied on the personal relationships between individuals on the project team and the respective association. My position on the Management Committee of QADIE, from 1995, and as Vice President from 2000-2003 gave me a good deal of credibility within school communities. Ironically it was also the consultation that caused me the most angst. These were my friends and colleagues whom I respected and valued highly. I was keenly aware of the importance of what we were trying to do with the documents and constantly worried that I wasn’t up to the job in terms of the future of drama education in Queensland. But there was an enormous amount of trust and
respect on both sides and the documents undoubtedly were the result of many people’s input and the collaboration and consultation that QADIE supported.

The QADIE contribution was particularly valuable as it was broadly consultative as well. The management committee and the outcomes-writing team drew on members from remote school locations as well as city schools, from government, catholic and independent schools, from pre-school, primary and secondary teachers. When there were suggestions that came throughout the program that I did not agree with or that I did not feel were in line with the direction of the syllabus, I was always able to seek advice from the QADIE committee.

It is important to recognise that the nature of representation may well be limited. Professional associations in arts education tend to draw their membership from secondary educators because that is where the trained and specialist teachers work. Membership is based on the payment of annual fees. Primary “generalist” teachers have many more demands on their time and their pocket, so are more likely to join organisations that support the “basics” or core learning areas of English or Mathematics or Science. So one can, and should, ask if the representatives of the professional association are truly representative of teachers in primary schools, i.e. do they have an understanding of their concerns and teaching contexts? Indeed, are they representative of all teachers? Or just those that have paid their fees because they see a value in joining the association? And to what extent are these representatives going to consider the needs of students? At all levels of schooling? At all levels of ability? And in all locations?

Education Queensland

The Head Office of EQ housed a Visual and Performing Arts unit, headed by Ann Carroll. This unit, because of its placement within the education department had the potential to be a great ally or a formidable foe. Neither the Catholic nor the Independent schooling sectors had departments or staff with especial responsibility for Visual and Performing Arts, so the EQ section was the authoritative voice. We, the arts team, knew that in terms of the Council and in the wider community, they would be listened to rather than us, simply because the Visual and Performing Arts (VPA) Unit had been a significant curriculum developer for so long and had established a reputation for giving advice on arts education. The EQ VPA unit had been established since the early 1970s but with a Music Advisor and Art Advisor only (apparently the position of Drama Advisor had been gazetted as well but never filled) and, over the years, the unit had been responsible for the preparation of some fine curriculum materials. So the sense of EQ as the authoritative voice was well
grounded. In contrast, Linda, Janis and I were new to administrative circles, were only seconded for a short time, were working for a new and not-yet-credible authority, and were developing a syllabus in line with Outcomes-Based-Education – a new paradigm, warmly embraced by the Catholic education system (who had hired Bill Spady as a consultant), regarded with suspicion by EQ, and scarcely considered at all by the Independent schools, who knew they could chart their own course if they chose. Ann Carroll was a very strong and successful advocate for music but was thought to be ambivalent towards drama. In the development of previous drama materials, she was rumoured to have been a significant stumbling block against which any requests for support for drama had foundered. However, whatever her earlier reservations may have been, she appeared consistently professional and consultative throughout this project.

Our consultations and meetings with the personnel from EQ were both formal and informal. Ann Carroll had headed the unit for more than 25 years, and three members of her staff were especially involved throughout the project: Val Layne (Senior Policy Officer - Music) had been in Head Office for 22 years; Deb Cohen (Senior Policy Officer - Visual Arts) for 6 years, and Sue Elmes (Senior Policy Officer - Drama) for 6 years. I had a strong friendship with Sue Elmes as we had known each other and worked together for more than ten years. Val was a close friend of Sue’s so the positive aspect of our friendship flowed over to her. Ann Carroll liked me and was particularly in favour of my involvement in the project because I had my teaching qualifications in “speech and drama”, through both the Australian Music Examinations Board (of which she was Chair) and Trinity College of London. She really wanted a speech and drama focus rather than a drama-in-education focus and thought I would contribute that. In fact I didn’t as my bias was firmly towards contemporary drama education practice rather than speech and drama. While Ann gave no indication that she was unhappy with me and the direction in which the drama section of the syllabus was heading, it is quite possible that she was influential in the selection of my drama colleague at the beginning of 1999 when the team was expanded. The new drama colleague had no connection with QADIE but was a member of the Speech and Drama Teachers’ Association and a practising speech and drama teacher as well as being a primary school deputy principal.

We worked hard at building a positive social relationship with the team from EQ through meeting for dinner and drinks or coffee, mainly due to Carolyn who saw the strategic benefits of this, and thus established a foundation of trust which stood us in good stead. There were occasions when the subtext may have contained elements of distrust. For example a directive came from Ann in early February, 1998
that she was to be the first point of contact with EQ and that we were not to email or phone our colleagues there without her prior approval. As the year progressed, this procedure relaxed to the extent that it was not followed at all and communications between us and our colleagues in the VPA unit were open and frequent. To give Ann her due, she was keen on us preparing an ARTS syllabus and understood, probably more than anyone else the systemic implications of what was going on. We never got to meet the “men-in-suits”, as we called the administrators at Assistant-Director level and above. Maybe this was a good thing anyway. They would have taken little notice of the “all-female” arts team. I remember John O’Toole talking vividly of the days in the 70s when he and Brad Haseman would take the men-in-suits out for drinks to persuade them of the value of drama in education. The beer-fuelled discussions worked in those days as drama began to gain a foothold in the curriculum and in teacher training. Curriculum development on a platform of beer and testosterone? Perhaps. But what is significant is that the value of personal relationships, established and built in informal and social settings were important factors in both these examples of attempts at curriculum change.

**Taking advantage of other opportunities**

I was particularly thankful for the large network of friends who were happy to chat both formally and informally about the materials. Many of these are tremendously respected in terms of the local, national and international drama community and their professional practice and theorizing has informed both curriculum development and classroom practice in Queensland for many years. Personal consultations with these friends and colleagues often took advantage of ad hoc opportunities as we met in school settings, theatre visits or just for coffee. I will be eternally grateful to John O’Toole, Brad Haseman, Sandra Gattenhof, Christine Comans, Sue Elmes, Howard and Joan Cassidy, Shay Ryan and Claire McSwain who offered the most constructive and ongoing support. Brad was particularly helpful when we were struggling with a definition for aesthetics and Claire (a primary teacher-librarian who was passionate about drama and who taught it to all year levels in her Sunshine Coast school) was my port-of-call when I needed to check what primary students would be able to do. Howard and Joan lived in Yeppoon, a 7-hour drive from Brisbane, but would make regular visits to the capital and always make time to meet with me for a coffee and discussion of the latest developments and drafts. The questions raised over coffee about terminology and levelling and content helped me to clarify my own thinking and anticipate some of the problems of interpretation that teachers in remote locations might encounter with the new materials. Sandra, because of her primary teaching background and her connections with artists in her
current position with the Queensland Arts Council, added a richness of understanding of contemporary performance work with young people. My good friend Shay, a Head of Department at what could be a “tough” school towards the west of Brisbane, “kept me honest” (her words) about what could be expected of junior secondary school students.

**The Human Dimension – personal relationships within the office**

While each of the Assistant Directors, and the Director himself, had an “open-door” policy and was warm and friendly, it was clear that they worked very hard and their time was valuable. All official documents or consultation went upwards through our PPO, Carolyn to the Assistant Director (Curriculum), Barry Salmon, to the Director, Jim Tunstall and back down to us in reverse order.

My time working at the QSCC was one of the most positive and enjoyable (though hardworking) periods of my career. Despite the organisational hierarchy the entire office worked as a collaborative community with all views being listened to and valued. To a large degree this atmosphere was due to the leadership of those in the top positions.

The Director, Jim Tunstall, was a career educator. He had risen through the ranks of primary teaching to become a principal and then a regional director before moving to the curriculum development branch of EQ, where he stayed in a senior position until taking the directorship of the QSCC. He was the first Director and it was to a large degree to his warmth and openness that we would owe the amenable and collaborative atmosphere of the office. Jim was dedicated to hearing the voices of teachers and the community and this commitment manifested in the pattern of community consultation that characterised the work practices of the QSCC. It was his desire to get feedback “from the ground” that led to community forums on Equity, Lifeskills and Open Learning being held throughout the state. Of great benefit to our project was his interest in and commitment to learning in the arts, dating back to the 1970s when he joined the curriculum planning division of EQ. On a personal level his wife was an ex-drama teacher so his support for drama, in particular, was grounded in an understanding of its potential. The Assistant Director (Curriculum) Barry Salmon, also a career educator, had moved from being a primary teacher with special interest in Mathematics and Science, straight to the curriculum planning division until moving to the assistant-directorship of the QSCC. While Barry was not someone who valued and understood learning in the arts in the same way as did Jim he, too, was committed to open and ongoing consultation and his amicable nature also added to the approachable relationship with the senior management. Our direct
manager, Carolyn Harrod, PPO for LOTE, the Early Childhood Curriculum Guidelines, and The Arts was one of the most genuinely collaborative and caring individuals I have ever worked with. She went to extraordinary efforts to ensure that every piece of feedback and advice we were given on the curriculum was carefully considered and anyone who spoke with her knew that their thoughts were valued. The office community was fortunate to have leaders of this calibre. The office itself became something of a haven, as the same qualities of respect and value were not always shared in the wider educational community.

The physical distance of the Annex from the main office produced an emotional distance. We were not really part of the community of the office and, while we talked about how we were grateful to be able to work uninterrupted, we also missed out on feeling as though we were part of the community. This emotional distance ceased to exist when we moved to the main office in the beginning of 1999 and it was only then that we became conscious of how important being in the same building and on the same floor was in establishing a group identity. I will talk more about this in Chapter 9.

Taking a leaf out of the “beer, beards and boots” model that John O’Toole and Brad Haseman had used to such good effect in the 1970s, we worked hard at developing good personal relationships with the personnel from the VPA unit in Education Queensland. We arranged to have after work drinks and the occasional restaurant meal with them. Every couple of weeks, on Friday night, we would meet in the piano bar of a nearby hotel for after-work drinks. Mostly this was to unwind at the end of a long week. On quite a few of our Friday drinks we would be joined by Ann (the head of the VPA unit) Val and Sue, and our wine bar collegiality helped to diffuse any tensions that may have emerged. We didn’t discuss work at these times, instead using the time to relax and talk of family and general chit-chat. It is only in retrospect that I have come to realise how valuable these meetings were, especially with regard to Ann who could have been, and sometimes was, suspicious of the directions in which we were heading. I believe that the positive personal relationships we developed held us in good stead during busier and more stressful times on the project. I have emphasised the importance of good relationships between ourselves and EQ personnel and indicated the influence they had over all decisions because their influence directly connects with responsibilities.

**Implications of the materials as syllabus: location and delivery**

The fact that this was intended to be an arts syllabus for all students had significant implications for the decisions made at every stage of the curriculum development
process. That there had been national agreement for the five strands (Curriculum Corporation, 1993) was advantageous to us in arguing for the same. Previously music and visual arts were the only mandated art forms in schools in Queensland. Literature was very much seen as the purview of the English Language Arts syllabus and there was no chance of us taking that on board despite arguments (Abbs, 1989b; Greene, 1977) that literature belongs in the arts. In addition, at the time of this project, only 60% of students in Queensland secondary schools took an elective in any of the arts offered. If this syllabus was to be mandated, it had to be appealing and accessible to all, therefore to be significant to the 40% of students who did not currently undertake study in the arts in secondary schools. This was why we were able to include media. It was seen to be a valid argument that all students should have access to an ongoing arts education and there was a widespread perception that Media was less “confronting” than Visual Arts (where you had to be talented) Music (where you had to be able to play an instrument) Dance (where you had to have a developed kinaesthetic sense of rhythm) and Drama (where you had to “perform” in front of others). So really Media was the net to capture those students who were uncomfortable with each of the others. This was a compromise within the particular context of this decision-making process and was not the widely held view of arts educators with broader perspectives who desired access to learning in all art forms for all students.

In early, informal, discussions with the VPA unit at Education Queensland it was suggested that we could have only the four established disciplines (Dance, Drama, Music and Visual Arts) in the syllabus. Concerns were raised about the cost of equipment that would have to be supplied to schools for a Media/Film curriculum to be delivered. At this point I was the loudest voice in favour of the inclusion of Media as a strand. The existence of a Media curriculum guidelines document published by Education Queensland (1994) certainly helped my argument, as well as the need to accommodate the interests of all students (see above) but this was countered by claims of high cost and insufficient numbers of trained teachers. I have to say that I argued for Media to be one of the strands though I strongly believed we should offer a strand oriented towards film rather than Media. It seemed to me that the aesthetic focus was stronger in Film than the more “instrumental” and semiotic focus of Media Studies (existing media curricula and work in schools seemed to be driven by a television and press industry perspective) and also I believed that advances in technology were moving so quickly that soon every family would be making and editing their own material. With third generation mobile phones and related technologies just a few years later this has proven to be the case. However
there were concerns about having to supply all schools with cameras and editing equipment if we went down the “film” track, so media it was. If we were constructing the curriculum at this present time, I would say that it would be more focused toward Digital Media, animation and interactivity.

From the beginning of the project it was very highly in question as to whether the Department of Education in Queensland would sign off on a syllabus (i.e. mandated) document. This placed an enormous amount of pressure on the curriculum development team to come up with a document which it was possible to mandate in all government schools throughout the State. Hence the document was to be written so that it was possible for it to be taught and implemented with existing resources (including teachers with no specialist training) and in school contexts that varied from one-teacher schools in remote rural locations, to aboriginal community schools, to inner-city urban schools with large multi-cultural populations, and so on.

**Existing staff and time allocations**

An early directive from EQ (Internal memo, 20 February, 1998) made it clear that the, “Employment of specialist teachers of music and instrumental music is established and is not to be impacted by curriculum initiatives”. This position was, understandably, supported by the Queensland Teachers’ Union as the music specialists were a significant proportion of their membership.

The particular circumstances of music certainly impacted on the potential for the music outcomes to be at the same level with the other art forms. While all the other arts strands had to be able to be taught by generalist teachers with little or no specialist training in any arts strand, music was to be taught by specialists and the “standards” were not to be watered down. Going back over the minutes of Arts SAC meetings I see many references in Music to the syllabus being “in line with current practice”. There was an ongoing concern that the syllabus would demand a lower standard in music and while “standards” was the discourse, in reality the underlying assumptions were that music should be taught by specialist teachers, and while there has been a long tradition of training and employing specialist music teachers for State schools in Queensland it was made clear that this would not extend to any other arts area.

Some schools, in both the State and private sectors, had started to employ arts specialists to take classes during “non-contact time”. The introduction of “non-contact time” for primary teachers, after a long campaign by the Queensland Teachers’ Union (QTU), in combination with the devolution of decision-making to schools under the “school-based management” structure, made the employment of
alternative “specialists” possible. School administrators were now empowered to employ specialist drama or other qualified arts teachers to teach classes in order to provide the required non-contact time for their teachers. This meant that there was a growing body of arts specialists who were employed on a part-time basis by schools to provide arts-learning for students. One disadvantage of this approach is that, since non-contact time provides general class teachers with time for marking or preparation, they do not participate in or observe the arts classes and so any potential for professional development or co-teaching is lost.

**Feedback from consultation**

The questions that we were given to begin the initial consultation (see p. 75), first with “expert panel” focus groups, then with nationally recognized “experts” who were commissioned to write guiding papers, and finally with teachers in schools were deliberately imprecise to allow for the widest variety of responses and the free-flow of ideas in discussion. As a result of this the responses were certainly wide-ranging and also imprecise. At first it was difficult to sift through and uncover specific concerns about arts education. However common themes did emerge, and were reinforced in responses from all three consultative groups. In fact responses were remarkably consistent. Perhaps this is, in part, a result of asking people who are embedded in the processes of teaching and learning at a particular time and place and in a particular context. As one would expect major consistencies lay in that everyone agreed that learning in the arts was important and that our students did not get enough of it. Responses from faxes, focus group discussions and the commissioned papers showed that what teachers and parents really wanted was more of the same, but better and with better resources and with better trained teachers.

**Commissioned papers**

Each of the commissioned papers sent messages that highlighted the importance of the arts in contemporary society. Aland offered four key messages: one that the arts help us make and communicate meaning about our world; two that they contribute significantly to our aesthetic, cultural and emotional life; three that they play a pivotal role in shaping social and cultural identity; and four, that they operate as a dynamic social and cultural force. Barrett (p.1) emphasised the nature of non-discursive knowledge as represented in the arts, Boyd (p. 3) that the arts are cultural products, and Emery, the importance of carefully planned, regular and “increasingly complex” arts learning experiences to develop qualities of discernment and judgement and that:
Arts experiences are the right of every student, no matter which gender, race, socio-economic level or religion (p. 7).

Emery (pp. 2-3) suggested that learning in the arts contributes to three forms of knowing:

1. aesthetic forms of knowing (“learned knowledge” of forms in an increasingly complex field);
2. symbolic forms of knowing (the symbol systems and languages of each of the arts);
3. culturally constructed ways of knowing (the hierarchical status applied to arts works by artists dependent on gender-centric and ethnocentric prominence);

and the threads of each of these are evident throughout the four writers. Boyd, Aland and Emery suggested the need for specialist teachers and specialist facilities in primary schools, while Barrett asks:

[Is] what we ask of the primary generalist arts educator “expertise” in terms of high-proficiency in discipline-specific knowledge and skills? Rather should we be promoting in these teachers sufficient working knowledge of each of the arts forms to facilitate children’s early experiences within these disciplines, and to identify and access resources (human and material) that will build upon these initial experiences? In a conception of arts education that encompasses the latter, the teaching of the arts in primary settings may be seen as a collaborative enterprise between generalist, specialist and a wider arts community, in which the balance of this relationship is determined by the needs of the children and the materials and ideas which they are working (p. 4).

All bemoaned the state of pre-service teacher education in the arts as being insufficient:

How much knowledge can a pre-service teacher learn in a 10-week subject that encompasses three-week blocks of Visual arts, Drama and Music? (Boyd, p. 8).

And all four of the commissioned writers had a good deal to say about integration, offering salutatory warnings:

Emery: Requiring extensive planning and cooperation between individual art teachers, integrated arts programs can result in “staff burnout” and fragmented learning experiences for students (p. 9).
and [E]xtended cross curricular programs can also lead to contrived programs in which the arts are seen to illustrate or serve experiences in other areas. For this reason each art subject needs to be allowed sufficient time in the curriculum for students to develop mastery within the particular knowledge base that frames the arts forms (p. 10).

Jenny Aland acknowledged the “increasingly blurred” distinctions between contemporary arts practices but cautioned that:

*each of the five arts forms has its own characteristics and body of knowledge and … each makes its own distinctive contribution to learning. In a schooling context what this means is that one arts (sic) form cannot be substituted for another. In other words learning about, in and through one arts form cannot be generalized into thorough and informed appreciation and practice of another* (p. 2).

Boyd warns:

*Curriculum integration is not simply an organisational device requiring cosmetic changes or realignment and lesson plans across various subject areas, rather it is a way of thinking about what schools are for, about the sources of curriculum, about the uses of knowledge* (p. 6).

However this stance was challenged by Barrett, who stated:

*It is imperative that arts educators actively seek connections between the arts disciplines in order to advance their own and their students’ capacities to grapple with the multiple ways in which artistic meanings are constructed and reconstructed in a range of settings* (p. 6).

These same issues were taken up by the focus groups and the consultative network.

**Focus group discussions**

The transcripts of the focus group discussions provided us with information about areas of concern, as well as material for consideration for the rationale of the syllabus.

Emerging themes included:

1. integration –from all groups came the desire to respect the integrity of the individual discipline but with the hope that there would be opportunities for students to work across disciplines *how the existing discrete art forms fit together in a meaningful way and watch these change shapes* (18 February, 7 See Appendix 5.3 for an extract from a focus group discussion.
1998) and if it is to have the support of classroom teachers who are already feeling snowed you'd have to give them ways and means of integrating (24 February, 1998).

2. standards versus achievability - I would hate it to be a completely touchy, feely exposure experience and not actually teach something (24 February, 1998) and just because they run their fingers through paint doesn't mean they've really done anything artistically (18 February, 1998)).

3. specialist versus generalist teachers (and issues of teacher preparation) – fear of the “expert model” – people who love the arts but won't teach them because they feel unskilled or untalented (23 February, 1998).

4. documents to be specific and clear but flexible rather than “recipe books” - sometimes what can happen is that if you take a recipe book and it’s given to a naïve person who happened to have no skills in that language … it can be almost detrimental rather than enriching (28 February, 1998).

5. in-service and teacher-training - We need to change the training of primary teachers or else we need a lot more funding of in-service of teachers in that school context (24 February, 1998).

6. supporting a “have-a-go’ mentality - hey, I'm not sure but let's have a go – we want to develop that inquisitive sort of skill (28 February, 1998).

7. all arts - I would want them to experience as well as be exposed to all aspects of all of the arts disciplines (24 February, 1998).

Additional common threads throughout all the meetings were access to artists; issues of gender and culture; and the importance of experiential learning in all art forms, especially the opportunity to create.

**Fax Surveys**

As part of the initial consultation phase we sent one hundred fax surveys to representative schools throughout the state and asked them to respond by 27 February, 1998. Fax was the most reliable technology at this stage. Many country schools did not have access to the internet and thus we could not use email. In the duration of the project this situation changed and most schools and individuals were accessible by email by the end of 2000.

By using the same questions as the focus group discussions, we attempted to signal to teachers and school communities that we were interested in maintaining good practice where it existed, and did not intend to bring in a completely new curriculum. We also wanted to indicate that the focus was to be on a learning

---

8 See Appendix 5.4 for the initial fax survey.
continuum for all of the compulsory years of schooling and not delineated into Primary and Secondary blocks.

We received fifty-four responses, ten from state schools, thirty-nine from non-government schools, three from universities and two from professional organisations. There is an interesting disparity here in terms of the number of responses from state schools, by far the largest proportion of schools. It is difficult to know why there were so few from the government schooling sector, except possibly, that the non-government schools were more efficient at passing the fax survey on to the specific staff member they knew would respond. This is a rare instance in this whole curriculum development process when the voice of the government schools was outnumbered.

Many of the responses contained comments that were arts discipline specific, with the authors indicating their subject background. The following issues and concerns were significant because of the number of times they recurred in individual responses.

1. **Discrete disciplines versus an integrated approach.** Sixteen of the responses were strongly in favour of maintaining separate subject disciplines. Comments included: not “arts muesli”, “curriculum designers must acknowledge that the arts are distinctly different disciplines”, “[we need] a focus on skills and processes at first in discrete subjects and then cross-curricular”, “keep the integrity of the disciplines”, “meaningful arts education [happens when] there is respect for the separate disciplines”. Twenty-one responses used the word *integration*, although there was no common definition of the term or an explanation of how it may apply to arts education. Integration was used variously to describe the consolidation of some, or all, of the arts subjects into one “fused” subject, the inclusion of arts studies in the whole school curriculum in individual units of work, the fusing of arts learning with other KLAs, or the blending of arts content into a thematic approach. One respondent pointed out:

   *If we mean integration to mean a complete mingling of the four forms taught in the present curriculum, then drama is the area which more readily and easily accommodates the other art forms. However, integration often means that one art form is studied each term.*

Another suggested the need for:

*an issues-based integrated Arts curriculum with emphasis on personal development, performance, communication and the ability to “sell themselves” in the real world.*
None of the schools or respondents was able to propose a model for integration in either primary or secondary school. Eighteen responses recommended leading to increasing specialisation during the ten years of compulsory schooling. Most responses (39) came from secondary schools which may have impacted on this resulting concern with specialisation. While the majority of responses suggested a resistance to integration, others saw it as essential and there were requests that the curriculum materials include exemplars that modelled curriculum integration, both across arts areas and with other KLAs.

2. **Specialist teachers** Thirty-six responses made specific mention of the word “specialist” and used it in a positive sense as being desirable. Two models were proposed: 1) a teacher with subject-specific expertise within the school who can offer specialist tuition to students and professional support for generalist classroom teachers, and 2) a specialist teacher who teaches the one subject in more than one school. In essence concerns focussed on the capacity for the individual, generalist teacher to teach the skills, techniques and subject-specific knowledge that are unique to each art discipline. Sixteen responses wanted primary specialist arts teachers; while two believed that the arts should be taught by generalists “to show arts is (sic) accessible to all”.

3. **Meaningful learning.** Forty-nine responses made specific reference to the need to develop skills and to maintain meaningful learning “in” as well as “about” the arts, with “a focus on skills and processes at first in discrete subjects and then cross-curricular.” Learning in the arts has been a common thread within curriculum documents in Queensland and Australia. Arts educators have embraced the concept that arts-learning best takes place through “doing”, through active engagement in arts-making processes. These responses indicated too the widespread belief that, without subject-specific skills, achievement in the arts would be minimal. Little mention was made of content as separate from process or skill development. Responses emphasised the importance of the development of skills specific to a particular art form, and the inclusion of relevant development of processes.

4. **Sequential learning.** Thirty-five responses emphasised the importance of a “developmental”, sequential “spiral” program with increasing complexity appropriate to individual children’s developmental needs and which offered variety rather than repetition.

5. **Resources.** Twenty-nine responses referred to the need to provide adequate resources. Some responses referred to the teaching space needed and asked
the project team to consider the expensive facilities and equipment required by some art forms.

6. **More than one art form.** Twenty-one responses referred to the need to allow students the opportunity to study more than one art form. These responses specifically referred to Years 9 and 10 and expressed concern about school decisions to limit student choice. Personal experience of the timetable’s influence on the organisation of the curriculum in individual schools clearly influenced these responses.

7. **Teacher training and professional development.** Twenty-two responses mentioned the importance of substantial pre-service training in the arts and nineteen referred to the need for continued professional development. Teacher training and in-service are closely related to the issues of “expertise” and “specialist” teachers and the comments on this issue indicate a high degree of concern about teacher confidence in delivering meaningful education in one or more of the arts. This issue links to the concern about specialists, especially in primary school. Some respondents were worried that they (generalist teachers) could not teach the arts and others were concerned that, without specialists, the quality of learning would be diminished.

8. **Articulation to BSSSS Syllabuses.** Twenty responses made reference to post-compulsory schooling and the importance of a smooth transition from compulsory to post-compulsory education in the arts. Teachers were keen to see links between the materials we were developing and the existing and “tried and true” documents that were in place for years 11 and 12.

9. **Access to professional artists.** Twelve responses referred to the provision of live performances, visits to galleries etc. as an important aspect of arts education. They emphasised the need for students to access and participate in experiences where they were exposed to work of high quality, and also to see that some people make a living from working in the arts.

10. **Technology** Eleven responses referred to technology. Most related specifically to electronic technology and computers in the visual arts or in the context of Media as a subject. In the main the responses were concerned about the cost of establishing and maintaining resources, and in-service for teachers.

While some of the issues were outside the domain of the Council (e.g. pre-service teacher training, continuing teacher in-service, access to artists-in-residence or access to live performances) it was important to consider the wider implications of these in the preparation of the syllabus, sourcebook materials and initial in-service materials. Ongoing consultations and discussions made it clear that sourcebook
materials needed to be comprehensive, detailed and accessible to the generalist teacher regardless of location or school environment. We would have to try to construct “stand-alone” documents which were flexible and sufficiently responsive to satisfy the needs of the full range of learning environments for The Arts. In addition we needed to allow for a variety of interpretations in terms of the lived curriculum of the classroom that requires a deep understanding of context. The majority of responses requested that the arts be taught as discrete disciplines with an emphasis on meaningful and sequential learning in each of the arts areas. Resources (including access to technology) were seen as a significant issue, as was access to more than one arts discipline as an elective subject in the lower secondary school. Even though a number of responses requested specialist teachers, it was unlikely that schools or systems would be able to provide these. The documents had to be written for the generalist teacher in primary schools with an acknowledgment that specialist teachers are available in the lower secondary schools. It was apparent that there was an expectation of smooth articulation to the BSSS Senior Syllabuses. Sourcebook materials would have to allow for flexible delivery and encompass a range of possible implementation decisions made within the scope of school-based management.

Apart from the first-stage consultation procedures described above we established more formal and regular procedures such as the Syllabus Advisory Committee.

The Syllabus Advisory Committee
All meetings of the SAC were full-day meetings. Some members flew in from the north and west of the State and funds were made available for “supply teachers” to substitute for the classes of teachers who attended. At the first meeting, on 7 April, 1998, the majority of time was spent in explaining principles of OBE and the mandated areas that would be included in the syllabus: literacy, numeracy, lifeskills and the “valued attributes of a lifelong learner” (to be elaborated in Chapter 7). The Committee was informed about key issues that had emerged from the first stage of public consultation and the rest of the meeting was spent in discussion of possible strand organisers, which had been taken from the review of existing curriculum documents. At this stage we were seeking a set of common organisers that could be used across the five arts strands. For example the Australian National Statement on the Arts used three strands: creating, making and presenting; arts criticism and aesthetics; and past and present contexts. The committee was given a selection of
twelve sets of organisers\(^9\) and worked in groups, recording on a PMI (plus, minus, interesting) template, responses to the provided materials.

The committee could not reach consensus on any of the proffered organisers in the current form and offered some suggestions for future development. Agreement was reached that communicating and interpreting should be part of the rationale and that contexts should be embedded throughout the document. A clear message was given that user-friendly language, appropriate for parents and classroom teachers, must be used. Some discussion centred around whether we need three strand organisers or whether two might be more appropriate (SAC meeting minutes, 7 April, 1998).

A second meeting was held on 29 April, 1998. The two meetings were held close together so that we could use the advice of the SAC to provide feedback on the first draft of the design brief which was underway. This meeting was complex, focused a good deal on use of terminology and discussion was detailed and heated. One of the decisions that we had to make was to determine whether to use "strands, disciplines, forms or areas" for the five arts e.g.

*Forms does not work well because it has particular meaning in each arts area; Disciplines might be daunting for primary educators, discipline is the publicly accepted term; suggested strands; said internationally literature supports disciplines; suggested that discipline is an outmoded term; several participants support areas; pointed out, we cannot use strands in the Queensland context, because the KLAs are defined as strands.*

*Meeting voted to use areas.* (SAC meeting minutes, 29 April, 1998)

We had analysed the feedback on strand organisers from the previous meeting and offered three possible strand organisers: engage (explore, make, create), express (create, present) and reflect (respond, evaluate).

The committee agreed: we will offer a process model, and if we have time to write a concept model. We will offer that as well. The team is asked to revisit the national documents. The model offered will be:

\[
\text{ENGAGE/EXPLORE/MAKE/CREATE;}
\text{EXPRESS/CREATE/PRESENT;}^{10}
\]

\(^9\) See Appendix 5.5.

\(^{10}\) You will note that CREATE is in both the first and second line of the model. This was to accommodate the performing arts (dance, drama, and music) who wanted to acknowledge the individual and collaborative creation that takes place in performance as well as in the devising, structuring and rehearsal phases.
REFLECT/EVALUATE.
The decision to offer a “process” model of outcomes is an example of how the arts were allowed to vary from the office position, which was to organise outcomes according to concepts. In the committee discussion the selection of a process model was driven by a desire to draw strong links with existing senior syllabus documents. This was the greatest argument in our favour for retaining processes as the organisers of the outcomes. There were already a large number of accredited senior syllabus documents, working well in schools, and which were accepted widely in the education community, including ranking for university entrance. It was therefore hard for the QSCC to argue that syllabuses could not be organised in this way. I recorded in my journal:

There is a very clear direction from the committee that we should interface with Years 11 and 12. Hence we can argue for process strands. No need to adopt the National Statements but they want us to embed aesthetics, communication, and past and present contexts across all strands (Journal, 29 April, 1998).

Other issues discussed and agreed at this meeting were that we would:

- separate the trial and pilot phases. The trial will be one semester, followed by a pilot of one year. Special schools, primary and secondary schools, high-top schools, with and without specialists will be used;
- provide Sourcebook Guidelines in bands of schooling rather than art forms;
- use the organising framework on page 22 and the provided description of level statements and core learning outcomes;
- write extension learning outcomes within the arts forms rather than across discipline areas;
- offer all five art forms in primary schools with specialisation in secondary school.

Caroline reported that submissions very strongly suggested that in early school years children should experience all arts forms. With the allocated time, the proposed model of increasing specialisation was to allow students to achieve to at least the current level. Some discussion about blocks of time being used for intensive development. Concern was expressed for itinerant students. Proposed we maintain five art forms at all year levels of primary school. supported this on the basis of the scan of Ed Queensland schools. The implications are the core outcomes will need to be minimal. flags the possibility of having
The reference to p. 22 was to the proposed layout of the outcomes in the syllabus (see Appendix 5.6) which was eventually modified during the trial/pilot process but was used in the first draft of the syllabus. This committee continued to be very hardworking, read the materials we sent in advance of meetings, consulted within their own working context and provided detailed advice and feedback at all stages of the curriculum development.

Voices from the shore

Consultation beyond the SAC continued throughout the design brief development stage as it went through its various iterations. Following the two SAC committee meetings and advice received from the consultative network the second draft of the design brief was endorsed by Council for further consultation on July 16, 1998 and was sent out to the consultative network for review and comment from the period of July through August. Forty-four responses (almost none overlapping with first survey responses) to the revised document were received: six from systemic representatives, four from academics, twenty-eight from government schools, eight from independent schools and six from catholic schools, and two were unaligned responses. The third draft was posted to Council in August and we received the go-ahead to proceed to full syllabus development at the Council Meeting on September 3. See Appendices 5.7 and 5.8 for the feedback forms that were sent to all members of the consultative network.

Once we had documents such as the design brief to send for review the advice from consultative groups became more specific. It seemed that it was easier for teachers to write in response to materials that were provided. Many individuals sent back the entire document with annotations throughout. The “response surveys” asked the respondents to comment on the sections of the design brief that contained background information about the arts, the presentation of the learning outcomes and the three key concepts that the committee had agreed would be the outcomes organisers and asked for further advice.

I will use the QADIE response (15 June, 1998) as an example of the detailed feedback we got to the first draft of the design brief.
The background: this section does not really do what one would expect a “background” section to do. … You would expect to read something about the history of Arts education in Queensland and arts education in general (major concepts, issues etc)

OUR RESPONSE: this seemed to have been a misreading of the background section, which was simply intended to frame the document within the work of the QSCC. This advice led to no changes in the document.

Purposes of arts education: the actively positive framing of the first four paragraphs presents a view that all arts education achieves those things where as that is often not the case (for example learning through the arts does not always promote tolerance, or empower individuals, provide personal fulfilment etc.) – we might hope it does, but for some students it can be disempowering.

OUR RESPONSE: We modified the text to include “may” and “can” instead of “does”.

Learning in the arts: it is important to outline the distinctness of each of the five areas but also important not to imply that all integration of the arts is inappropriate.

OUR RESPONSE: We framed the possibilities for integration in a more positive way.

We have suggested a definition of drama:

Drama is the enactment of real and imagined events through roles and situations. Through drama students engage in dramatic play, role-play, process drama, characterisation, and playbuilding, creating and shaping their own work. Students express themselves in drama through interpreting, planning, rehearsing and presenting dramatic performances, both live and through the use of recording technologies. Students also reflect on their drama and the dramatic works of others, analysing various elements utilized and the contexts in which the works have been produced or performed.

OUR RESPONSE: This definition replaced the one in the text.

Every response to the draft design brief was openly discussed at our weekly meetings and whenever it was possible to do so, we modified the text to incorporate the input from the consultation process.

Emerging issues

It will be clear from reading the responses detailed above that there were a number of issues commonly raised by all consultative groups. These include integration,
specialist teachers, teacher preparation, and access to meaningful learning in all the arts areas. I will discuss these in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter 6:
Collecting shells 1: influences and constraints at the Design Brief stage

In this chapter I discuss influences and constraint that emerged during the development of the design brief.

Integration:
We were directed to consider an "integrated arts" syllabus by higher levels of EQ and QSCC but this was resisted (not in so many words) by Ann Carroll who was not at all a believer in integration. An internal report from the Visual and Performing Arts (VPA) section within the Teaching and Learning Branch of EQ of which Ann Carroll was the director, with recommendations for the design brief, stated their position unequivocally:

> It is inappropriate to conceptualise learning in the discrete disciplines of art, dance, drama, media and music as an “integrated” subject such as “The Arts”. Learning outcomes should be explicit for the specific art forms (Internal memo from the Visual and Performing Arts Team, March, 1998, p. 3).

They went on to say that “learning in one art form does not substitute for learning in other art forms and there does not appear to be any evidence from Australia or overseas of successful implementation of a subject called The Arts in which learnings and outcomes from across the art forms are merged”.

The Assistant Director, who had passed on the request for an integrated arts syllabus from the Council, made it clear that he was personally in favour of this direction. This was a conflicted position even within EQ. While the Assistant Director and his colleagues at a similar level within EQ emphasised their desire for integrated arts, the only reason we were given was that it would be easier to implement. By this one can infer they meant cheaper to provide with physical, material and human resources. Rather than integration being seen as the practice of enrichment of learning by connecting complementary areas and activities, it seemed that the
administrators were looking for a “composite” syllabus which would have one outcome statement, for all of the arts, under each organiser. Integration is a term that was much bandied about but not defined, nor was there any advice available about what this might look like or how to conceptually frame such a document. Within the arts education community itself, integration is a fraught topic. Many educators did not want to include learning in other art forms because it would take valuable time from their own area. Such a position was clearly supported by an academic from Griffith University who wrote:

RECOMMENDATION: That the traditional arts – Visual arts and Music be taught in depth with a revised syllabus, and the other art forms such as media, dance and drama be taught optionally or become parts of other KLA’s e.g. Dance move back to Physical Education & Media & Drama move back to Language Arts (Fax response, 27 February, 1998)

Maybe he was proposing integration, for Dance, Media and Drama at any rate. For arts educators, who have seen examples of “integrated learning” manifested as moving while singing (dance) and using facial expression during the song (drama) and then colouring in a picture (visual arts) the problem is compounded by both the desire to promote authentic learning where learning in the arts is assimilated within learning contexts, hence integration as in real life, and the suppression of any aesthetic or artistic learning as above.

The request for an integrated arts syllabus was framed as a hope that we should aim for a single set of outcomes statements at each level that could apply to all the arts strands. However this was not supported by any of the discussion groups or fax responses. In most cases respondents wanted to preserve the discipline-specific and were adamant that, except in early childhood years when multi-modal exploratory play is vital for “learning how to learn” (Wright, 2003a, 2003b), the knowledges intrinsic to each of the arts must be established in a specialised way before they can be applied in an integrated way.

Noddings (Noddings, 2006a, p. 290) points out that current school curriculum organisation around traditional disciplines is not likely to change in the near future but that “every discipline can be stretched from the inside to provide richer, more meaningful studies”.

At this stage we began to consider the possibility for the Sourcebook Guidelines created in parallel to the syllabus to suggest suitable examples of learning experiences structured to include more than one art form, or appropriately integrating an art form with other key learning areas e.g. media education and “Viewing” in
English. This would be a job for later in the project when we had complete sets of outcomes. The EQ report pointed out too that:

*Teachers often very successfully structure learning experiences so that outcomes that are drawn from a number of key learning areas or art forms are achieved within the same lesson or unit of work. The outcomes achieved through these experiences should remain true to the specific nature of the key learning area or art form. For the children the experience can be integrated, while the teacher can very clearly identify the discipline or subject outcomes* (Visual and Performing Arts Team, Suggestions for the Arts Syllabus for Years 1-10, March, 1998, p. 3).

**Specialist teachers**

The need for specialist teachers was a resounding cry from many submissions, though predominantly from primary teachers:

*From a primary point of view, the necessity to retain the services of specialist teachers is paramount* (Primary teacher, fax response, 24 February, 1998).

This concern links with the desire for quality learning experiences for students and the lack of pre-service and in-service preparation for teachers. It had been made clear that there would be no specialist short courses for other arts teachers, as were provided for music, and neither would the systems consider the hiring of specialists. Throughout the project we hoped that the development of the syllabus would provide a spur for the unions to lobby for more arts in teacher preparation programs and the universities would see the need for more arts-focused courses to prepare teachers, but neither of these wishes became reality.

**Meaningful and sequential learning**

Many responses focused on the importance of meaningful and sequential learning, for example from one academic:

*From my vantage point as an early childhood educator, I want to stress that the arts education program in schools should incorporate opportunities for children to build knowledge over time through active engagement with a wide variety of high quality materials and appropriate artistic experiences* (Academic, fax response, 28 February, 1998).

From a primary educator:
Meaningful arts education aged 5 to 15 depends on where they can experience success. The activity must be age and ability appropriate, and involve using a wide range of different materials (Primary teacher, fax response, 25 February, 1998).

And from a secondary educator:

The arts subjects need to be recognised as areas of serious study within the curriculum, not just for the particular skill which is fostered but also for the breadth and depth of cultural/social awareness which they promote (Secondary teacher, fax response, 24 February, 1998).

This issue was one that we could attempt to address with the curriculum. The outcomes framework is one that supports developmental and sequential learning. The knowledge and skills and understanding inherent in each outcomes statement (i.e. what students know and can do with what they know) is built up over time and in a range of contexts. Similarly, outcomes do not stand alone. To plan and work with the outcomes in the curriculum it is necessary to understand the developmental sequence that is built into the structure. The outcomes at any one level are designed to “nest” within the outcomes at the next (see Fig. 3.1 p. 36) building up in each level in terms of complexity and control. If the outcomes that were to be designed did, as was intended, describe the learning that was essential in each arts area, then it was to be hoped that the syllabus itself would provide sufficient advice about what would constitute meaningful and sequential learning. This would be supplemented by the curriculum support materials in the form of the Sourcebook Guidelines and modules where, we hoped, we would be able to deal with quality and appropriateness of the experiences and address issues of cultural and social awareness. I will expand on this in Chapter 9.

**Resources and technology**

Resources and technology offered a double bind for us. On one hand we had no influence over the provision of resources (including human ones) and on the other, we were very conscious that many schools were sadly under-resourced in terms of space and consumables. I remember as a primary teacher being told that I could have 20 large coloured sheets of paper for my Year Ones for the entire year. Sadly arts learning can be expensive to resource. No more expensive than science, or physical education, but we had to acknowledge that we were much further down the scale of priorities for most school principals (who control the budget) than either of those two areas. Technology offers many opportunities to save money. It was one of the reasons we chose to establish an on-line consultative network after all but this,
too, is expensive to set up and maintain. The challenge for the curriculum writing team was to prepare a syllabus and support materials that could be implemented with limited, or minimal, resources.

**More than one art form**

The selection of art forms was also a contested area. Many responses from Visual Arts and Music educators showed their concerns that the “newer” art forms would take time and resources away from their own areas:

*A broadening of the arts offerings for schools with the inclusion of other “arts” would dilute the educational advantages afforded by the visual arts curriculum* (Secondary teacher, fax response, 24 February, 1998).

and

*Accommodating all five arts in the primary school curriculum is difficult. While regrettable, I see few alternatives to primary school students gaining experience in drama, media and dance through other subject areas … in other words, in the primary schools I would argue for the status quo* (Primary principal, fax response, 24 February, 1998).

The status quo being that Music and Visual arts were the only arts areas supported by both resources and mandated time in the curriculum up until the end of Year 8. This inequity was widely recognised and caused much chagrin to those of us who worked in the less “supported” arts. Note this submission from an academic:

*There could be more genuine parity among the arts – music and visual arts still have systemic priority, especially in primary schools* (Academic, fax response, 23 February, 1998).

Throughout the development of the curriculum there was never any real pressure from anyone at a systemic level to minimise the access for students to learn in the arts. The SAC, the Curriculum Committee and the Council all endorsed the importance for students to access learning in all arts strands. The compromise that was made to allow for a selection of one or more arts area in Years 8 to 10 was purely a pragmatic one, recognising that not all schools could possibly timetable a selection from all five arts strands at this stage. It was not purely a constraint of the timetable, though that was a significant consideration, but also awareness that, at that time, there were not enough qualified teachers to teach all five areas. We hoped that once the curriculum was approved for general implementation, the pressure for more arts learning opportunities would come from the students and their parents, and larger schools, at least, would have to respond by opening up the selection. Diversification would follow. Harris and Marsh (2005) have criticised implementation
procedures that allow for diversification, considering that these ‘weaken’ core curriculum concepts and content. I would argue curriculum-as-plan documents that allow for diversification are strengthened by enabling teachers to enact the curriculum-as-lived, drawing on their situated knowledge of the curriculum materials and the learners under their care.

**Teacher training**

As a fax response from a secondary music teacher so succinctly put it, “The teacher is the best resource”. This concern was definitely outside the purview of the office. It was recognised that there was a need for more teachers to have opportunities to learn arts pedagogy. The following, rather plaintive, request from an academic put the position aptly:

> Though in-service and pre-service education is not the province of the QSCC, can the syllabus in some way address the neglect and avoidance of arts education which is the result of chronic under-resourcing of arts teacher education, and the constant low prioritising, so that teachers have little confidence (Academic, fax response, 5 August, 1998).

While this was an area that came up constantly throughout the project it was not one upon which the QSCC had any influence. The Director wrote, on our behalf, to the universities to ask that they consider enhancing their provision in pre-service teacher education but, to my knowledge, not one responded or made changes to their programming. We hoped that the Union would lobby on our behalf (we were all members after all) but this issue was not seen as a priority though, as I mentioned previously, it was used later as a reason for placing a ban on syllabus implementation towards the end of the project. By this time we knew that there were some things that were not going to change. Teacher preparation was one. The implication for the syllabus was that it had to be written for implementation by generalist teachers, at least in primary schools, who had very little arts pedagogy in their repertoire. We attempted to redress this with the provision of extensive support materials.

**Access to artists**

The Queensland Arts Council offers a touring program of music, dance and drama performances that travels to even very remote areas of the State but access was infrequent and often costly for rural schools. Some funds were available for artist-in-residencies through Education Queensland and the Priority Country Area Program (who ran, for example, The Flying Arts School) but these were few and far between.
This issue shows the concern that educators felt both about students having access to quality arts products, other than their own, and access to people whose job it was to make art. Consider this fax response from a primary teacher:

*There was some discussion as to where the statement “understand the personal and career related skills developed in the arts,” would be placed. Clearly, the secondary teachers wanted it to be a discretionary outcome, whilst I, as the primary representative, thought that it belonged where it is now. I strongly advocate that this statement needs to be embedded across all levels. If teachers are offering rich tasks that are real-life experience focused, then students will begin to develop a deep understanding of what artists do in the “real world.” I don’t believe that year one students, for example need to articulate what forms of employment are available to them as adults. Nor do they need to understand how what they are doing now will effect [sic] them at a later age. However, knowing what artists do, helps to give students a purpose for what they are doing and an understanding of how their tasks and what they are learning about, first into their world as they know it* (Primary teacher, fax response, 22 May, 2000).

Arts and cultural products and cultural tourism contribute approximately $18.2 billion per annum to Australia’s economy, and in 2000-2001 Australia exported $478.1 million in cultural goods (National Centre for Culture and Recreation Studies, 2003). By any reckoning those are significant amounts. Someone must be producing these products and teachers were rightly concerned that students had limited access to the information that many people lived and worked as artists, and to the diversity of artistic products that many of us take for granted.

**Linkage to senior secondary documents**

This issue of connections to the existing senior documents was raised to signal that teachers wanted to see tangible connections with the senior syllabuses. Both Linda and I were members of the BSSSS Arts SAC so we had a very good understanding of current (and in-process) documents. Throughout the development and trial/pilot phases secondary teachers, in particular, were comforted that they could see the links to the language of the senior secondary documents. However this restricted us in our attempts to find strand organisers that would work in common across all the arts areas. The reason we wanted to do this was, in particular, to help teachers plan for integrated learning. The overwhelming desire of secondary teachers to see the
same organisers as the senior documents made our search for common organisers in vain.

*Impositions and political changes*

Would the system stay with an outcomes approach? From the beginning of the project this issue was continually in question and certainly contributed to the ongoing cynicism of “just another curriculum change” that pervaded the school communities. At the Curriculum Committee meeting (26 March, 1998) the minutes recorded that there was discussion on the issue: *KLAs may soon be outdated by rapid change.* Despite assurances from the new Minister, the Curriculum Committee minutes recorded:

> The acting chair reported on the minister’s visit and address to Council that the minister had confirmed that an outcomes based approach would be maintained. He stated that the current government supports this approach. … He stressed that parents and community should find learning outcomes accessible and have a clear understanding of the expectation implicit in the learning outcomes. … The minister confirms that the Council would remain an intersystemic entity, and he encouraged greater convergence in the underpinning philosophies of the BSSSS and the QSCC

(Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 10 September 1998).

There was a good deal of uncertainty and distrust about EQ’s commitment to the outcomes-based syllabuses developed at the QSCC. This distrust was well-founded. The Government, as can be seen by the above quote, was in support of outcomes-based syllabuses but EQ did a good deal to undermine that commitment. During 1999 we began to hear a good deal about “New Basics” as a preferred curriculum organiser and New Basics began trialling in selected Education Queensland schools during 2000. By 2001 the architect of New Basics, a University of Queensland academic, had been appointed as Assistant-Director-General of Education. I will discuss this in more detail in Chapter 9, but suffice it to say that EQ’s disinclination to support the work of the QSCC was manifested in many ways and added a significant amount of tension to the task of curriculum development. Both QCEC and AISQ were fully supportive of the curriculum materials that were being developed by QSCC, and QCEC had invested heavily in providing in-service in planning and assessing with outcomes for all teachers in Catholic schools. But because of the greater power of size and financial resources, EQ was able to undermine the curriculum initiatives that had not been instigated by their own authority.
Content of the design brief

The first draft of the design brief (April, 98) used three strand organisers: Engagement in, Reflection on, and Expression through arts experiences. The majority of the responses from secondary educators to the first and second draft of the design brief gave positive feedback on these organisers, though some Visual Arts educators indicated a preference for two, to align more directly with the senior syllabuses. However a number of responses from primary teachers indicated that they found it difficult to distinguish between “Engagement in” and “Expression through”:

_The network has concerns over the clarity in the differences between Engagement Strand 1 and Expression Strand 3. In primary school it would be very difficult for most teachers to differentiate between the 2 because they both suggest “making” products. We as a network feel that 2 strands are enough_ (Art teachers network, fax response, 3 August, 1998).

Responses of this nature caught the attention of the Assistant-Director who was concerned about the number of outcomes that teachers would be required to work with. This may well have been as a result of negative reactions to the Science and HPE syllabuses which were near completion and which had been criticised for just this issue. This was exacerbated by concerns raised at the Curriculum Committee meeting on June 4:

_There may be too many outcomes statements generated from this syllabus that may cause problems for teachers' workload._

(Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 4 June, 1998).

Accordingly we were directed to reduce the number of organisers from three to two. To assist teachers who wanted to work in an integrated way in their classrooms we decided to collapse the three organisers above into “Engagement” and “Reflection”. This was done without consultation with the SAC though it was put up for endorsement at the next meeting on September, 10. By then we thought it was a fait accompli as the two organisers, Engagement and Reflection, were discussed and unanimously supported at the Council meeting on July 16. However these organisers were to change yet again, but that is a story for the next chapter.

The same committee meeting provided detailed feedback on the design brief:

_Advice from the Curriculum Committee_

- _the purpose and the background should be written in plain, everyday language with more emphasis on the unique contribution of the Arts to the_
This was a common theme and we continued through the many drafts of the design brief and later the syllabus to clarify and de-jargon the document. We also provided a glossary of terms in the final package of curriculum materials.

- **reduce the number of paradigms in the document;** This was a valid criticism. Perhaps in an attempt to make sure we did not leave anything of importance out of the document and in order to keep it minimal and readable (the first draft was 37 pages long, but the appendices extended the document to 178 pages) too many ideas and concepts were included. There was too little time to really grapple with what we were writing, as much of our effort was spent on simply getting to the end of the task.

- **state a clear set of values, ethical standpoints and evaluative criteria to encourage inclusion and socially critical practices;** A strong emphasis within the office, this was reinforced by the employment of two “equity” officers who were appointed in September, 1998. These officers contributed a great deal to the developing curriculum materials, especially during the trial/pilot and publication phases and connected the documents with the socially-critical stance of reconceptualist theorists.

- **assessment section needs to provide more guidance;** We were aware of this but were hampered by the directive from EQ that we were not to provide advice on assessment. However the Director made a decision that more advice on assessment needed to be provided and three Project Officers (I was one) were chosen to develop a “Policy and Guidelines on Assessment and Reporting” that the QSCC would publish. This document provided useful advice on planning, assessment and reporting and much information therein was used to expand the assessment section in the syllabus, the Sourcebook Modules and the Initial In-service Materials.

- **the rationale for the organising strands (as process strands) needs to be made clearer as they are inconsistent with other syllabus documents and are likely to cause some confusion for teachers;** This points to one of the challenges that all project teams following Science and HPE faced. The template had been established by these two projects and all ensuing projects were required to justify any inconsistency (deviation) from the “office” template. In this particular case, we were able to establish that the linkage to the Senior documents was sufficient validation for our use of “process”
strands as opposed to the “concept” strands which were used as organisers for all other QSCC prepared syllabuses.

- **the concept of media as an art form may create some problems for primary teachers:** This links to my earlier comment about the functional and semiotic emphasis on media education.

- **the implications for time allocation need to be thoroughly examined for this syllabus:** See the next chapter for further discussion of time allocation.

- **the emphasis on integrated learning may need to be lessened.** This was contradictory advice to all our earlier consultation (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 4 June, 1998).

### Time

The issue of time has three aspects. First, there was a concern that primary teachers would have difficulty in adding learning in the arts into an already crowded timetable.

> The biggest barrier to adequate delivery of arts programs is inadequate time allocation. This has been exacerbated in the primary context by the inclusion of additional discipline areas (media, drama, dance) under the umbrella of arts – with no increase in time allocation previously allocated to visual arts and music (Primary teacher, fax response, 5 August, 1998).

And:

> Sounds wonderful but I can’t help wondering when we are going to find time to be able to do all this, keeping in mind the other key learning areas that also have to be covered each day (Primary teacher, fax response, 3 August, 1998).

But from other primary teachers there was a desire to:

> Give the Arts the time the subject deserves (Primary teacher, fax response, 3 August, 1998).

A second aspect was the limited amount of time that was available for consultation. For the most part this was intensified by the timing of the consultation. The QADIE response to the draft design brief, forcefully expressed their unease:

> We would like to draw attention to the fact that a consultation timeframe of less than one month when many teachers are heavily involved in assessment does not really allow for “wide” consultation. For example we have only sent copies to targeted QADIE members and asked for written feedback, but have not had extensive meetings
or discussion with our members which a longer timeframe would allow (QADIE, fax response, 5 June, 1998).

This was reinforced by comments from individuals such as:

*The Queensland School Curriculum Council timeline does not allow for considered feedback from classroom teachers. The Council needs to take into consideration that the end of May/June is the busiest time in the school calendar as teachers assess, write reports and conduct parent/teacher interviews while preparing new units of work and teaching them* (Secondary teacher, fax response, 15 June, 1998).

The timing of consultation continued to remain a challenge, as did the time allowed for responses to what would become increasingly complex documents. This may help account for the gradually diminishing number of responses that we received at each stage of the project.

Even internal memos acknowledged the lack of sufficient time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo: 12 June, 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline for finalisation of the Arts Design Brief</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July-7 Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The timeline for the second round of consultation is probably unrealistic since Council members are unlikely to be able to consult and compile their feedback in a period of 3 weeks. A 1 day turnaround on feedback is also probably unrealistic for Jim. However, if we miss the August meeting the next Council meeting is in October.

The third aspect of time that was problematic was my own. After the first couple of weeks settling in to the job we began working at a tremendous pace.
I am so tired. And I never seem to get anything done during the day. So much time answering emails, so much time attending meetings, so much time organising meetings. I should be doing a lot more reading but the only time I have to do that is now, at night. And I am brain-dead! I can’t absorb anything. Am worried that we haven’t enough broad-based theoretical stuff in the design brief. I hope the pace slows down soon (Journal, 2 May, 1998).

The pace did not slow down. In fact towards the end of the project this first phase seemed like a vacation period. Consultation takes an enormous amount of time, certainly if it is done thoroughly and with respect for all contributions. When I returned to teaching after my secondment to the QSCC a colleague, the Head of Department for SOSE, said to me, “I don’t know what you lot did for so long in there. Three years to write a syllabus! – I could do that in six weeks!” He was right. Any experienced and knowledgeable teacher should be able to write a document that looked like our syllabus if they were given six weeks to do that. But he was also very wrong. The syllabus that an individual could write in any length of time is a “personal” document only, in that it draws from personal experience, knowledge and biases and is limited by that. In response to Michael Apple’s (2004, p. 6) questions about curriculum content, Whose knowledge is it? Who selected it? Why is it organised and taught in this way? To this particular group?, the individual syllabus writer can only answer: mine; I did; and because I said so. In contrast the ambition of the collaborative curriculum developers was to be able to answer: “ours (the teachers of Queensland), we did, because we collectively decided that it would be so; and the group depends on the context and each will be taught differently because the syllabus supports us in doing that”. This was a valiant ambition, and to a significant degree, impossible to achieve. Any curriculum decisions are limited by the knowledge, biases, preconceptions, and ideologies of those making them, and shaped by the social, political and cultural contexts in which they are situated. In the case of this particular project they were additionally limited by the necessity to consult, the management of time, and the particular micro-politics which existed within and between the three systemic authorities responsible for education within the State.

The consultation process seemed to be a matter of making comfortable compromises. In May we had completed the first draft of the design brief and sent it out for consultation before it would be revised and go to the Council for endorsement for further consultation. As I have said before, not one of the design briefs had been passed by Council at the first submission. We had worked very hard to try to exhibit to the Council that the document was a product of wide consultation and was also
grounded in an awareness of contemporary curriculum documents and arts education theory.

In the three months between starting the first focus groups and the delivery of the first draft of the design brief we had documented the results of:

- 100 fax surveys
- four commissioned academic papers
- an analysis of 20 arts curriculum documents previously published in Queensland
- an analysis of seven arts curriculum documents from other states in Australia (including the National Statements and Profiles in the Arts)
- an analysis of seven arts curricula from international sources
- five focus discussions

and

- created an annotated bibliography of 45 texts on arts education.

The Arts SAC had been established according to Council guidelines and held two meetings which were to provide the basis for the syllabus. An on-line consultative network had also been established.

We had also taken especial care in creating a positive and collegial relationship with our colleagues at EQ, resulting in their support for the direction in which the materials were heading. This undoubtedly facilitated our progress through Council.

Reflections

This was an experience where I was “learning on the job”. My curriculum development experience in the past had been mainly school-based, except for the work I had done for the BSSSS, and involved interpretation of an existing syllabus for implementation in my own school context. In these situations there is often one person who writes the school program, as in the case of my colleague above, or a small group who usually break the task up and prepare a section each. Unlike the curriculum we were developing, at no stage is any school based document subject to the critical review that every draft of this arts curriculum, and every response to that draft, was to undergo. Instead of being certain in my “expertise” as I was at a school level, I became aware of how little I knew: about how many schools and students were outside my experience and understanding; about what an education in drama really means; about how to design a curriculum, not for my familiar students and school, but for all those students and schooling contexts that I knew nothing about, “other people’s children” (Grumet, 1988). The work was manageable. It was busy
and intense but I have always been a hard worker. What I began to worry about was whether I was going to do a “good enough” job, not for me, but for the students who deserved the best possible arts education. It was this worry that caused me to wake in the middle of the night for the next three years and check a reference or write down an idea in the notebook I began to keep on the bedside table.

**Imposed changes**

In the pages above I have given an example of one of the “imposed” changes that we had to make: the shift from three sets of organisers to two. I found this deeply unsettling. On one hand we were entrusted with a process of accountable consultation but with this instance I began to see that a good deal of power over the content of the curriculum resided within the office itself. As I will explain in Chapter 9, we became more savvy about managing the micro-politics of the office and managed to manoeuvre some of our own deeply held convictions through, but this was the first sign of an internal block to the document that had been prepared in consultation with so many.

**What was achieved**

We had avoided writing an “integrated arts” syllabus because the majority of the responses were so vehemently against it. The desire for integration was framed as a wish for a single outcome statement that would suit all the arts. Responses from consultation insisted that this was insupportable and we were bound to respond with integrity to those responses. My own predilections were attuned with the final result which was to describe “essential” learning in each of the arts areas but to provide exemplar materials for teachers to plan for integration in their own school contexts, and in the hope that “as understanding and appreciation for multiple ways of knowing grows, there [would be] greater likelihood of a more synthetic, integrated curriculum [being] developed” (Eisner, 1998a, p. 107). We hoped that the overarching strand organisers of Engagement and Reflection would assist, and that commonalities would be made apparent via the modules prepared by the arts team and project officers from other Key Learning Areas.

We were concerned that the Council might block the design brief because we were using “process” rather than “concept” strands but hoped that we had marshalled enough arguments to convince the meeting that the “processes” were a valid way of organising learning. In fact we met all deadlines and passed at the first round. This was unprecedented.

*Decision number (C980711)* The Council decided that the second consultative draft of Years 1 to 10 The Arts Curriculum
Development Project be noted and endorsed for further consultation. (Council meeting minutes, 16 July 1998)

**Decision number (C980908) The Years 1 To 10 The Arts Curriculum Development Project Design Brief (Draft Three) was endorsed by Council.** (Council meeting minutes, 3 September, 1998)
Chapter 7.

Phase 2: building sandcastles

Once the design brief (second draft) was approved at the Council meeting on 16 July, 1998 the pace and complexity of the job increased. The first significant personnel change happened when Janis Boyd left the team in June as her six month contract was concluded. My contract had been extended for the life of the project so this meant that Linda and I made up the entire Arts Team at this stage. Carolyn remained as the Principal Project Officer in charge of the Arts project, retaining her other responsibility as manager of the LOTE project and her office was still in the MLC building while we remained at AISQ House, some distance away.

Figure 6.1 Suite of documents

The Syllabus was not to stand alone, but would be the compulsory component of a “suite” of documents (see Fig. 6.1). The syllabus was both the focal point and the framework for the curriculum. In addition to this central and mandatory document the Arts Project team was to prepare support documents which aimed to assist teachers in understanding and implementing the syllabus. The first amongst the support documents was the Sourcebook Guidelines. In this book teachers would find “elaborations” of the outcomes as well as advice for planning and assessment.
Additional to the Sourcebook Guidelines would be 60 modules (12 for each arts strand)\(^\text{11}\) which offered examples of planned learning experiences, with advice on assessment, photocopiable masters and worksheets. These were meant to be models of practice rather than “teacher-proof” materials that should be implemented exactly according to plan. Another printed document to accompany the Syllabus and Sourcebook Guidelines was the Initial In-Service Materials. This book was planned to be an independent and self-managing course of study that would lead teachers through a set of seven chapters which would deepen their understanding of the syllabus and processes of planning and assessment. All of the documents would be reproduced on a CD Rom which was to be distributed free-of-charge to all teachers in Queensland. The CD Rom would also contain video footage of students demonstrating the outcomes and additional materials not in print.

**Planning the next phase**

The outcomes development phase had three interlinked facets: one - the outsourcing of the writing of the core and extension learning outcomes and level statements; two, ongoing consultation and refinement of these outcomes during trials in schools; and three, developing the “elaborations” of the outcomes which would be part of the Sourcebook Guidelines to accompany the syllabus. Pivotal to the development of the outcomes was the decision of who was to write them. The established practice of the office was that the outcomes writing be “outsourced” i.e. taken up by individuals or groups outside the office. This differed from the practice followed by EQ and the BSSSS who either used in-house curriculum writers, often seconded teachers like myself, or employed an individual (or group) to work on a short-term project to develop the curriculum, closely supervised by permanent staff. The QSCC had decided to open the curriculum writing task to public submission, sending out “invitations to offer” and requiring evidence that the curriculum writing party would be able to consult broadly throughout the State. I will elaborate on this process later in this chapter.

The next challenge for Linda, Carolyn and me was to write the first draft of the Syllabus following a similar process of consultation as had contributed to the drafts of the design brief. The Sourcebook Guidelines, Modules and Initial In-service materials would all be developed concurrently with the trial and pilot in 2000. See Chapter 9 for a discussion of the trial/pilot process.

\(^{11}\) See [http://www.qsa.qld.edu.au/yrs1to10/kla/arts/modules.html#drama](http://www.qsa.qld.edu.au/yrs1to10/kla/arts/modules.html#drama) for hotlinks to the full set of drama modules.
New developments as a result of Council decisions

The Executive\(^{12}\) of the Council had met on June 18, 1998 and signalled shifts in the organisational direction of the syllabus document. This may have been due to the appointment of the new Minister for Education, Dean Wells, who had taken up the portfolio in June. Such changes of personnel, particularly at the powerful level of Minister or Director-General of Education, also made it possible to make changes to existing practices, under the semblance of a “new broom”. Another new broom was soon to arrive in the person of Terry Moran, who took over the position of Director-General of Education in August, 1998.

The most noticeable change was the introduction of core content. To date the syllabus documents had not included statements of content as the content was understood to be inherent in the “know” of the “know and do” of the outcomes. The new Minister for Education was uncomfortable with the lack of specificity that what might be perceived to be a “contentless” syllabus could signal. His concern stemmed from a desire for consistency of learning throughout the State and the large numbers of transient students. He wanted assurances that students who travelled between schools would have access to the same learning as those who did not. Consequently we were directed to develop a single-page statement identifying the core content that must be covered in the ten compulsory years of schooling. This could not be simply a “wish list” of possibilities or what was desirable but a statement of what was considered essential content for the field, and had obvious implications for resources and implementation. The core content described what would be expected for all students to “know”. Since the outcomes statements were framed as demonstrations of “what students know and can do with what they know” one would assume then, that a list of core content would have been axiomatic in the outcomes. However the Minister had requested a single page statement that delineated the content and his directions were followed. See later in this chapter for a discussion of the iterations of core content.

Council Endorsements (with provisos)

At the Curriculum Committee meeting 30 July, 1998, “It was decided (CC980706) to recommend to Council that the Years 1 to 10 The Arts Curriculum Development design brief be endorsed”. The meeting reported that the:

\(^{12}\) The Executive was made up of the Chair of the Council, the Director of the Council, the Director-General of Education (or nominee), the CEO of the Association of Independent Schools in Queensland (or nominee), and the Director of the Queensland Catholic Education Commission (or nominee).
draft [was] much easier to read; engagement and reflection headings have unanimous support; legislation states that the Director-General has to develop an implementation plan to allow schools to implement the syllabuses; outcomes have to be culturally appropriate; outcomes to be based on knowledge and understanding that currently exists; big implementation issues for the primary school; the content of each art form – more explicit (p. 8) and include the languages of the learning area; the codes, conventions and symbols need to be explicit as core learnings; expertise of teachers will be stretched. (Personal notes on feedback from Curriculum Committee meeting, Journal 30/7/98)

I will explain some of these comments, briefly.

- **legislation states that the Director-General has to develop an implementation plan.** The Director-General of Education was required, by legislation, to implement the syllabus. This comment gave us a degree of confidence tempered with some distrust. This was a public statement to reinforce the intention to implement but we were aware that there were undercurrents about EQ’s commitment to implementation (discussed previously), and discussion must have been taking place “behind the scenes” to even make implementation an object of discussion at this meeting.

- **outcomes in the syllabus that are culturally appropriate.** This was in response to criticisms of the early drafts steering in the direction of “high art”. Readers wanted to see that this was going to be a syllabus that was accessible to all.

- **big implementation issues for the primary school.** The only art forms compulsorily taught in primary schools were music (generally by a specialist teacher, trained in music and the pedagogy of music) and visual art. Neither of these had been assessed or reported on apart from general comments like “enjoys art” and “can sing in tune”. Comments and questions about implementation always related to the employment of specialist teachers to teach the arts and the lack of training for generalist primary teachers, which was mentioned by many of the responses to the consultative drafts of the design brief. Many samples of feedback to the Arts team expressed concern about primary teachers not knowing how to teach all the strands. The real crux of the issue was not only that teaching of dance, drama, media, music and visual arts would now be required, but that also it would have to be assessed and reported on. While no feedback explicitly talked about
assessment and reporting, it is evident that, in an outcomes framework, the focus must be on the students demonstrating the outcomes and it would no longer be “good enough” for the arts to be relegated to “wet weather Fridays” as drawing and colouring in for enjoyment rather than learning. The message that we were not to deal with issues of assessment and reporting and that these were the province of the implementing systemic authorities was made very strongly and so the QSCC staff did not bring up issues relating to this. But, to my mind, that was the heart of the matter. If this syllabus went to general implementation, then all students must have access to the learning experiences that allowed them to develop the skills, knowledge and understanding required for demonstration of the core learning outcomes rather than learning experiences that were merely fun and enjoyable, and schools would be required to report (and therefore methodically assess) arts learning and progress by students. Teachers would be challenged to manage such changes in assessment practices, felt nervous about assessing in the arts (though this was never explicitly acknowledged) and schools, or perhaps the systemic authorities, would have to find a way of reporting that was meaningful and accessible to parents.

- content of each art form needs to be made more explicit on page 8. This refers both to the desire for explicit content and explanations of that content for teachers so that they knew what to teach.

The design brief was tabled at the next meeting of Council (3 September, 1998) producing the following discussion, into which I have interspersed explanatory comments:

The acting chair of the Curriculum Committee confirmed that the curriculum committee had endorsed the design brief. There are however, a number of implementation issues noted by the curriculum committee that require consideration by the school authorities. Discussion related to:

- core learning outcomes need to be written so that they realistically describe what could be attained by all students (page 18). This referred to, “For Levels 5 and 6, core learning outcomes will be written in terms of what is achievable in one arts area in the minimum time allocation”. The decision to allow students to specialise in one arts area in secondary school rather than continuing to study all varied significantly from the policy of existing QSCC documents, in which students were expected to demonstrate all of the outcomes at every level. This decision had been made at the first Arts SAC (7 April, 1998) and was in line with the pressure to conform to existing practices.
i.e. students studied each of the art forms separately in existing programs in Years 9 and 10. No arts educators wanted to lose ground that had been fought for in the secondary school timetable so the compromise was that students would have opportunities for learning in all the art forms in primary school and then be able to elect to specialise in one or more at secondary level. This compromise was forced upon us, to a large degree, by the time allocations but also allowed us to open up some options for student choice i.e. not all students would be interested in studying all the arts into their junior secondary years. It also was a pragmatic decision. Smaller schools and rural schools would not be entitled to the staff numbers that might make it possible to offer all the arts in the secondary years. The specialisation at Levels 5 and 6 meant that these schools could offer one or two strands and meet the legislated requirements. We were aware that, as a result of this decision, some schools would design the timetable to allow students only one arts choice, but there was little we could do in relation to school implementation issues, and compulsory study in one arts area was a significant step forward as Education Queensland informed us that 60% of students studied an arts subject as an elective in Years 9 and 10, a figure that was likely to be lower in Catholic and Independent schools, because these school systems were not compelled to offer learning in the arts. The opportunity for 100% of students to study in a single arts area seemed an acceptable compromise.

- **the need for school authorities to provide advice to schools regarding whether students will be required to undertake studies in the arts after year eight.** The document we were preparing was to be a syllabus and part of the core curriculum and hence part of the entitlement of every child attending school in the compulsory years. Many secondary schools, particularly in the Catholic and Independent sectors, did not offer learning in the arts as part of curriculum time and would have to do that as a result of this syllabus. Advice on how to fit arts learning into the timetable would come from their senior management.

- **facilitating a seamless integration into senior schooling;** This was a caution to link with the existing QBSSS documents (Council meeting minutes, 3 September, 1998).

---

13 Most Catholic and Independent secondary schools did offer Visual Arts in curriculum time, but Music and Speech and Drama were often taught by instrumental music or speech teachers who ran classes on a fee-paying basis. Parents paid additional fees if they wanted their child to study a musical instrument or ‘speech and drama’. Some Catholic and Independent secondary schools offered no arts learning at all.
Writing outcomes ... but how?

One of the challenges for the arts project team was to develop a clear understanding of the nature of outcomes and how to write them so that we could support the outsourced writing teams. However we were not provided with any professional development in Outcomes Based Education and this was a significant disadvantage as our understanding was not far in advance of the writing teams. As part of our induction into the office we were given a few sheets on OBE to read but most of the understanding that we developed was picked up ad hoc as part of office discussions. It took me ages to understand outcomes, and I am not sure that I did, even when I was working with the outcomes writing teams. At least I didn’t understand them enough to explain them clearly to the outcomes writers.

My curriculum, planning and teaching experience was grounded in an “objectives” model which focused on understanding of content and which was assessed according to criteria and standards. Hence teachers were responsible for planning learning experiences that developed learners understanding of content, but it was possible for students to achieve results at different levels. And certainly possible for some students not to achieve very much at all. However the unit of work was completed and the entire class moved on to the next section of content, regardless of how much they had learned or how well they had achieved in the previous unit. The need to describe learning in terms of outcomes which all students could achieve and which they could revisit constantly for consolidation and further development was a significant paradigm shift, not well understood by those of us who were imbued with existing practices of planning and assessment.

The media team (my charge) kept writing learning experiences rather than outcomes and I couldn’t help them to see the difference. The first phase of the project – the design brief – did not focus on outcomes at all and so an understanding was not necessary. By the time we began working with the outcomes writing teams it may well have been forgotten that we had no professional development in this regard and were learning as we went along. What we were constantly told was that they:

- were statements of what children “know and can do with what they know” as a result of planned learning experiences.
- must be demonstrable by individual students and in more than one context
- that 80%+ of students had to be able to demonstrate the outcomes within the given time allocation
and this, together with the outline sheets we had been provided with, and the conversations we had with each other and our colleagues was the basis of our understanding.

**Commissioning the outcomes writers**

The subject professional associations were presented with “an invitation to offer” on 3 August, 1998 and had until 17 August, to present their proposal to the Principal Project Officer, Carolyn Harrod. This timeframe gave Carolyn a sufficient interlude to put into place the administrative procedures necessary to accept the appropriate offers, arrange payment, and arrange “briefing” meetings with the successful outcomes writings consortia that would allow them to commence work as soon as possible and meet the office deadlines. Each writing consortium was notified of their approval as soon as the Council decision was made. From this time they were required to submit the complete draft of the outcomes by 26 October, 1998. Payment was an initial $5000 on production of the materials, with a further $3000 to be paid for refinement of the materials in response to feedback during the trial and pilot processes. The final payment would be made on 8 May, 2000.

The specifications of the task stated that the writers were to provide:

- the scope of the content of learning in the specific arts area, described in levels;
- the core scope of the specific arts area (what is essential to be achieved by Year 10);
- core learning outcomes in each of two strands in the specific arts area, described in six levels (Level 1 to Level 6);
- discretionary learning outcomes in each of two strands in the specific arts area, described in six levels (Level 1 to Level 6)

(Specifications from the “Invitation to Offer” see Appendix 7.2)

**Timelines and consultation**

The first outcomes writing meeting was held on 8 September and representatives from the writing consortia from all five arts areas attended. The meeting focused on clarifying expectations and providing advice to the consortia about the task ahead.

The outcomes writers employed by the project were to work with the advice of members of the Project team to develop outcomes according to the format and

---

14 See Appendix 7.3 for QADIE’s proposal.
15 Engagement and Reflection
16 The successful applicants were AUSDANCE, QADIE, ATOM, QATA (representative professional associations for dance, drama, media and visual arts). The music consortium was made up of a group of individuals who were members of one or both professional associations for music, ASME and KMEIA.
practices developed within the QSCC. The budget was calculated on the “guesstimate” that it would take an individual 25 days or 5 working weeks to write the outcomes. The writing teams were notified following the Council meeting on 3 September. They were advised to start with “aiming for the totality of what is possible for learning in the area and then focus down; to start with the broadest possible description and then refine down to the skeleton of the field. Writers could choose to align content with outcomes by including a specific example” (Journal, 8 September, 1998).

Professional associations were the only groups that had been invited to submit offers hence the representatives were all members of the executives of the various associations. Because Music had more than one association the consortium was representative of both. In the previous chapter I raise questions about authenticity of representation of professional associations. However these associations did have political “clout” in terms of their registration and membership and thus were regarded as the most suitable candidates for writing the outcomes. As part of the response to the “invitation to offer” each group was required to show evidence that they were capable of linking with an extensive and state-wide network which would be involved in the consultation. There was, however, no accountability measures built in to the writing process to check whether such consultation did, in fact, take place.

I was the officer responsible for working with the outcomes writing teams for Drama (QADIE) and Media (ATOM) and each of these undertook the process in a quite different way.

The QADIE process

QADIE was the only organisation that facilitated the active participation of teachers at all levels of schooling by establishing an “outcomes writing symposium” and opening this up to the membership.

Each of the other consortia involved a key writing team of three or four people who wrote the outcomes and then sent them out for consultation but QADIE organised a series of all-day meetings/workshops to write the outcomes and attempted to be as inclusive as time and funding allowed. The fees paid to the outcomes writing team were used, in part, to pay for teacher-release so that schools could “buy-in” a substitute teacher if necessary to allow the participants to attend the symposium. I had decided to distance myself from the symposium and the writing to avoid a conflict of interest. On reflection, this may have been more than an attempt to preserve my integrity. I wanted the outcomes to be truly a reflection of the shared
The 21 QADIE members who worked on the outcomes development were drawn from primary (P), secondary (S) and university (U) educators (see Table 6.1). The first two days were held in the school holidays when teachers were free to attend. The final two days were regular school days and QADIE funded “supply” teachers to replace those working in schools to maximise their involvement.

This group worked with large sheets of butcher’s paper, brainstorming and sharing and then refined ideas onto overhead transparencies. Towards the end of each day they shared the results of the morning’s work for general feedback and discussion. Even though I attended each of the workshop days I went as an observer and adviser and did not contribute to the outcomes creation. My task was to help the group towards an understanding of what outcomes were and to remind them that the outcomes would form the basis for planning and learning and assessing in drama.

The group was intensely aware of the need to write outcomes that would be understandable by generalist primary teachers and decided to include as much detail as they could to assist in this regard. An advantage to the group was having, as part of the membership, Debbie Wall and John O'Toole. Debbie had written the previous teaching materials provided for drama in the P-10 years, *Drama Makes Meaning*.

### Table 6.1 QADIE outcomes development workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Tuesday 29/9</th>
<th>Wednesday 30/9</th>
<th>Friday 9/10</th>
<th>Friday 23/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Gulikers (P)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Weddell (P) (U)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Brain (P)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire McSwain (P)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gattenhof (P)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Dunn (P)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Hamlin (P/S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie Readman (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Williams (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Peet (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Elmes (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Evers (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Wall (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Davis (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Williams (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrianne Jones (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Brasch-McPhee (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Wise (S)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Toole (U)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Lee (U)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Comans (U)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Queensland Department of Education, 1991). John was an advisor in the preparation of that document and a co-writer of the first Senior Drama syllabus, also prepared during 1991 and 1992. At the end of the first two day workshop the outcomes-in-development were placed on the QADIE website and were emailed to the QADIE membership for their feedback, which was taken into account for the next two workshops. This was truly a collaborative process which valued the lived experience of the teachers working in schools and placed considerable value on their pedagogical heritage. It was an example of harnessing what Bruner (1996) calls “distributed intelligence” where what any person knows is not only stored in her mind but in books, computers, personal and social habits and other people’s memories. The entire group’s rich and diverse knowledge of the drama form was harnessed in the co-creation of the drama outcomes. All materials were submitted by the deadline of 23 October, 1998.¹⁷

**The ATOM process**

In contrast the ATOM¹⁸ consortium, preparing the Media outcomes, was made up of three academics who were all members of the executive of their professional association. This group met together, and with me on two occasions, to create a set of outcomes that were then sent (electronically) to selected members of the association for feedback and comment. I was not a participant in the feedback process and so cannot comment on the amount of consultation that took place, or to what degree the feedback from the consultation group was incorporated in the developing outcomes. The two meetings that I attended were early in the process. At these we grappled with an understanding of outcomes and how they should be phrased.

The Media outcomes writing group devised the outcomes themselves, both by meeting and by working alone and emailing drafts to each other. When they had a set of outcomes which they felt were suitable, they emailed them to members of ATOM throughout the State for their feedback.

All groups submitted the outcomes by the due date:

*Madonna reported that the outcomes writing teams had all submitted the material to complete their contracts. The process had involved three full-day meeting/workshops with the outcomes writing teams. All teams underwent a process of writing/discussion/rewriting/modifying. She congratulated the teams on their hard work and particularly commended their willingness to rewrite and openness of*  

---

¹⁷ See Appendix 7.4 for the QADIE submission.  
¹⁸ Australian Teachers of Media
attitudes in the process. There was a notable preparedness to accommodate a range of points of view. All outcomes writing teams had met the established deadlines (SAC minutes, 28 October, 1998).

The first set of drama outcomes

The first set of drama outcomes were tabled for advice at the Arts SAC meeting on 28 October, 1998. The committee commented that the drama outcomes were “clearly developmental” but asked us to “de-jargon” them. The QADIE consortium had, on my advice, included details about the elements of drama and possible contexts for drama. This meant that the first set of outcomes was a collection of large and complex statements and the list of “elements of drama” in each outcome was daunting to those readers who did not know the field. There were good reasons for the detail. We had been told that the outcomes must be able to “stand alone” in terms of comprehensibility and for the purposes of planning. Because, at this stage, there was no other place in any of the documents to locate key details that indicated the “levelness” and complexity of each outcome, this information had to be evident within the outcomes themselves, which certainly made them cumbersome statements. For example the very first outcome at level one stated:

Students create and accept roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore stories from personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.

This may make sense to a drama educator but, in the attempt to include all necessary information, the outcomes were daunting for those who were not drama trained.

In the next section of this chapter I will illustrate the process of change that the outcomes underwent as directives came from the Minister, from within the Office, and feedback came from teachers during the trial and pilot.

Even at the above meeting of the Arts SAC we were given contradictory advice about whether there was too much or too little specificity. Some people liked the detail and could follow the stepping up between levels while others were clearly daunted by the length and complexity of this first set of outcomes.

Early signals about changing the outcomes

At the December 4, 1998 Curriculum Committee meeting a message from the minister warned that:
In countries where curriculum materials are written in very specific learning outcomes, teachers have difficulty working productively with the curriculum materials because of the volume of learning outcomes (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 4 December, 1998).

This comment contributed to the ongoing process of review and refinement to reduce the number and complexity of the outcomes.

Even earlier we had been given a clear indication of concerns about the number of outcomes from the Queensland Teachers’ Union:

The QTU will not support a curriculum in which the outcomes expand beyond a realistic capacity to achieve them in the time allocation. Fulfilling the objective set in lines 13-15 on page 7 [2nd cons draft] is absolutely essential to teacher and QTU support for the syllabus. In the case of the Arts syllabus, the expansion of increased emphasis in 5 Arts areas may require reduction in the number and extent of outcomes in traditional Arts areas, and the acceptability of this needs to be specifically considered (Queensland Teachers’ Union letter to team, 3 August, 1998).

The drama outcomes and the process of change

I will use the set of outcomes at Level 4 to illustrate the influences and changes that were accommodated during the eighteen months that the document was out for review and under trial in schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.1** Students create, negotiate and sustain a range of roles and relationships drawn from school/community issues, historical and fictional contexts.  
4.2 Students manage focus, time, space, language, movement, and use mood and symbol in contributing to the creation and shaping of dramatic situations, roles and narratives using dramatic conventions and where appropriate incorporating basic scriptwriting.  
4.3 Students present rehearsed, devised and scripted drama using voice, movement and characterisation appropriate for a specific audience and space. | **4.4** Students identify and evaluate learning and understanding developed in and through drama.  
4.5 Students evaluate the handling of dramatic elements and skills in their own work and that of others through reporting and other genres, making supported critical judgments using appropriate drama terminology.  
4.6 Students examine the purposes and types of drama within particular cultural contexts. |
The project team’s hope was to resist changing the set of outcomes for the trial conference. This was possible for drama as responses from the SAC indicated they were understandable and developmental. Outcomes in the other arts areas were not so well accepted and went through a re-writing process before the conference in February, 1999, but the drama outcomes went into the trial draft syllabus unchanged. This was not to be the case in the ensuing few months as a number of changes were imposed both from within the project team, from consultation, and from political imperatives.

An unexpected change of staff came about due to the ill-health of the Director. His condition required him to take several months of leave and consequently the Assistant Director, Barry Salmon, took over his role for this period and our Principal Project Officer, Carolyn Harrod, acted “up” a level as Assistant Director (Curriculum). The replacement PPO, Marie Edwards, came from the Catholic Education Commission. Marie had previously worked on the SOSE curriculum for the QSCC and was therefore familiar with office procedures and the implications of an outcomes approach to education. Some of the changes that I am about to describe came about directly as a result of the changing personnel within the team; others were initiated by the Minister, and others were shaped in response to feedback from teachers during the trial and pilot phases of the project.

At the “Engaging the Imagination” trial schools conference on 11-12 February, 1999, the draft syllabus was presented to the participating teachers in the trial schools. For the next 8 months we were to work closely with those teachers and listen to their advice and feedback about the practicability of working with the outcomes. We continued to meet with the SAC to discuss ongoing drafts of the syllabus and ask them to ratify any changes that were made. The on-line consultative network remained active too, but as we will see, the changes in this phase of the project came largely from within the office itself.

Marie commenced work in mid-March and soon signalled that she planned to instigate changes to the draft outcomes. From the beginning she indicated her concern about the number of outcomes and requested us to reduce them. She pointed out that the “main issue raised by schools at first cluster meeting was assessment” referring to the number of outcomes (Team meeting minutes 16 March, 1999). She asked us to look at the “family relationships” between levels and to cut back on the numbers of outcomes at each level. I was uncomfortable about beginning such a rewrite at this stage. The trial had been in progress for just one

---

19 A pseudonym.
month, and it would seem that we needed to allow time for the teachers to either come to terms with planning and implementing the outcomes or tell us that they were unworkable in their current state. While some feedback from the SAC had requested clarification of “jargon” and less complexity in the outcomes, the drama outcomes had been well-received. A good deal of concern had been expressed about the media and visual arts outcomes being unclear, and there was some criticism of the music outcomes being too “specialist” in their orientation, but drama and dance seemed to have been acknowledged as being acceptable first drafts. However the pressure increased to rewrite: “Outcomes need to be checked and re-written where necessary. Put work on elaborations on hold pending trial feedback.” (Team meeting minutes, 23 March, 1999) and the following week I noted in my journal: “Marie wants outcomes reworked. To be done in-house” (Journal, 3 April, 1999). This was an additional problematic. All previous decisions had been made with the widest possible consultation but we were now requested to use the team’s expertise only, and make the changes internally. Advice began to come in from the consultative network:

The drama outcomes appear to have a clearer sequence to the outcomes and would appear to ‘nest’ within one another without too much difficulty. However there are problems in the structure of the drama outcomes in terms of the complexity of them for teachers to use and work with. For example “Learners negotiate in and out of the drama, a range of dramatic roles and relationships, applying the elements of language, space, place, movement, time, situations, roles and narratives.” This outcome is at level 3. For a teacher in year 5 to decide that his/her 30 students had demonstrated achievement of this outcome would be a monumental task in itself (AISQ response, 16 April, 1999).

And from a drama/dance teacher

I had no difficulty understanding KLA details. Drama and Dance align very closely to current practice and philosophy of secondary school drama and dance. Document clear as to strands, rationale, outcomes etc. (Secondary teacher, fax response, 7 May, 1999).

At the QADIE management committee meeting (22 April, 1999) I was asked about the rewrite of the outcomes and had to respond that I had been asked to place a hold on consultation. This caused me a great deal of discomfort. I was forced to deliberately exclude my expert colleagues as I was rewriting. The QADIE
management committee was very unhappy about this decision and pursued the issue with the Council. My QADIE colleagues understood that this was a decision not of my choosing and were quick to point out that they trusted my work and my intent but felt angry that decisions within the Office meant that they were excluded from the process of revision.

Teachers in schools were coming to terms with the outcomes and making changes to their planning. At none of our meetings in schools did teachers raise concerns about the drama outcomes. In fact, the first evaluator’s report (June, 1999) reported that the drama outcomes “provide an excellent framework for planning work units and programs and assessment tasks” (p. 7). However the Executive summary of that same document stated amongst its conclusions:

11. The core learning outcomes in their current form have the potential to be practicable for teachers and suitable for a wide range of students.

12. Unless wording of the core learning outcomes is considerably simplified, many teachers will need guidance and support in order to interpret them accurately and use them effectively (p. iv).

The contradictory advice meant that each arts strand was banded together in terms of an office position. While I argued that the responses to the drama outcomes had been positive, unlike the responses to some of the other areas, we were all required to rewrite and to do this within a common framework.

At the team meeting (4 May, 1999) we agreed to write strand specific level statements. This was an attempt to avoid losing the detail and richness of the first set of outcomes. The original Level Statement was a generic one for each level and encompassed all of the arts. Writing strand specific Level Statements allowed us to move some of the complexity from the outcomes to the Level Statement. At this meeting we were directed to reduce the number of outcomes:

*Team needs to attempt to reduce the number of outcomes in each strand to approximately 20 e.g.*

- **Level 1**: 2 outcomes
- **Level 2**: 3 outcomes
- **Level 3**: 3 outcomes
- **Level 4**: 3 outcomes
- **Level 5**: 5 outcomes
- **Level 6**: 5 outcomes

(Team meeting minutes, 4 May, 1999)
This was a confusing directive to say the least. Why this particular set of numbers? Why only two at Level 1 and five at Level 6? How could the “nestedness” and family relationships between outcomes at levels be shown in this pattern? I was distressed and upset by being asked to make these changes seemingly so arbitrarily but I had no choice but to follow the directions I was given. In addition I found it personally challenging to be denied access to my professional network of drama teachers. I made the changes as required, though I kept 3 outcomes at Level 1, arguing that the nested relationship had to be paramount. The June 4, 1999, Arts SAC meeting was tense. The members of the committee were challenging and concerned about the lack of consultation that they perceived within the project.\textsuperscript{20} The new draft of the outcomes was seen to lose the focus on engagement and reflection that had previously been agreed to. Following this meeting the QADIE management committee decided to write a firm letter to the QSCC expressing their concerns about the lack of consultation.

Another event following the June 4 Arts SAC meeting was the request from Education Queensland that we inform them of all the meetings we were holding with schools so that they could also send a representative. It seemed that this was being done to check up on us. The positive relationship we had established during the development of the design brief was becoming frayed, and the earlier feelings of suspicion and distrust were once again emerging. This may well have been compounded by the fact that Marie came from the Catholic Education Commission while Carolyn was ex-Education Queensland and had a good deal of credibility there.

The Acting-Director met with the team on 30 June, 1999 and pointed out changes in direction from EQ. As we will see later in this chapter, this was a period of great upheaval in terms of the relationship between EQ and the other sectors. The changes of Minister and Director-General had either produced increased antagonism, or allowed the undercurrents that had always existed to emerge more clearly. Barry reported:

\textit{Over the last six months the EQ view of the syllabus as the bare bones has shifted to a position of the current syllabus documents not being specific enough. That is the rationale for the EQ development of statements of content. The situation now appears to be in a transformative stage where the Council is moving away from general statements to more specificity.}

And

\textsuperscript{20} See Appendix 7.5 for the minutes of this meeting.
In the current situation, it cannot be assumed teachers use the whole package as QSCC intended. Therefore there is a need to write outcomes and related materials so they are integrated and teachers will see and use them as a whole. The non-state sectors, though, are intending to use the whole set of materials.  
(Team meeting minutes, 30 June, 1999)

At this meeting we agreed to use the common outcome organisers of “create”, “present”, and “respond” for each arts area. This was eminently suitable for drama as these were the same organisers of learning in both the Senior Syllabus (Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1993) and those proposed in the Curriculum Guidelines for drama (Queensland Department of Education, 1991). The outcomes began to be reorganised into three strands and once again, at the team meeting on August 10 we were asked “to look seriously at the complexity and density of the outcomes”.

The next SAC meeting ratified the three new organisers:  
It was decided by majority vote (17/21 people) that common organisers such as “create”, “present”, and “respond” would be used to organise the core learning outcomes in each strand (SAC meeting minutes, August 20, 1999).

The same meeting voted to keep engagement and reflection:  
Members voted to test the level of comfort with the view that Engagement and Reflection are most appropriately used for providing advice for planning programs and Create, Present and Respond are used as organisers for the outcomes (18 people voted agreement) (SAC meeting minutes, August 20, 1999).

I think this was an example of an unwillingness to discard agreements that had taken so long to make and which were the result of extensive consultation and shared discussion. However it added an unnecessary layer to the syllabus. Now we had two overarching organisers for planning and an additional subset of three organisers per strand. However the committee continued to cling to Engagement and Reflection for some time. During the trial and pilot it became apparent that they were no longer necessary and they do not appear in the final draft of the syllabus, except as statements within the rationale.

Looking back at responses from the earlier drafts of the design brief we could find evidence that this decision would be greeted positively, especially from primary teachers, which was ironic as the primary motivation behind having two strand organisers was to make planning easier for primary educators.
I think that there will still be difficulties and traps for the writers if the strands are collapsed into two instead of retaining three. The two strand (sic) may be suitable for primary school which clearly sets them up for action and reflection in and through the arts, but would not translate comfortably with the senior syllabus. I am aware that the notion of forming has been a difficult one for teachers to understand and assess, but it has helped to clarify that education in the arts in (sic) not just about performing/showing/displaying and reflection. Perhaps the strand names could be Engagement in the Arts, Action in the Arts (playing, performing, displaying, showcasing, exhibiting, broadcasting) and Reflection in the Arts. I feel that this would assist primary teachers plan and implement in a more fluid manner, understanding that the three parts (engagement, action and reflection) are all necessary for a well rounded arts experience and that the three parts do not work in isolation or in any hierarchical order, but simultaneously (Primary drama educator, fax response, 3 August, 1998).

And

The Engagement Strand has too much in it, and to primary drama teachers, the processes involved in creating and forming drama will be lost into presenting. I would like to see three strands, with forming and creating activities separated from presenting and performing (Primary teacher, fax response, 3 August, 1998).

The following outcomes went into the “Pilot draft for editing August 1999” version of the syllabus. This document went through an editing process before being printed to be distributed to the trial schools and the additional pilot schools at the conference in October, 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR4.1 Learners sustain a range of roles and relationships through improvisation and roleplay. They build, shape and manage dramatic action and narratives by applying choices about focus, place, time, language, movement, space, mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4.2 Learners rehearse and present devised and scripted drama using voice, movement and characterisation appropriate for a specific audience and space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4.3 Learners identify, describe and evaluate the learnings and understandings developed in and through drama experience. They evaluate the handling of dramatic elements and skills in their own work and that of others, making supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Students” in the original submission had been changed to “learners” on the advice of the Early Childhood representative on the team. This had happened before the trial conference in February though the rest of the outcome remained unchanged.

This set, however, varies noticeably from the first. In the original set the create strand was made up of two outcomes and I was tasked to reduce these two to one. Because we had decided to use strand specific level statements instead of a generic arts level statement, I moved some of the text to the level statement in an attempt to retain the integrity of the QADIE submission. The phrase “from school/community issues, historical and fictional contexts” went to the level statement, as did the introduction of scriptwriting techniques. Because “create” and “negotiate” in relation to role were used in earlier level outcomes it was not necessary to repeat them at this level. The nestedness of the outcomes meant that an outcome at one level was “held within” the related outcome at the next so there was no need to repeat. I kept the list of “elements of drama” (focus, place etc.) though, as can be seen from the AISQ comment above readers of the outcome felt the list made it overly complex. I wanted to keep them for two reasons: one, we needed to show a step up in complexity between levels, and though we know the elements are interwoven in practice, I believed it would be helpful for teachers to have specifics to focus on. My aim was to retain the intent and the inherent standard of the original outcomes while modifying the language in order to make them as clear as possible.

The present outcome needed very little change except to place “rehearse” prior to “present”.

To condense the original three respond outcomes into one I removed the “reporting and other genres” as that did not seem essential to the outcome and the mode of responding could be left to the teacher. I put the two outcomes together, as I had done with 4.1, not realising that I was breaching a fundamental principle of OBE i.e. that each outcome should contain one “know” and one “do”. Outcome 4.6 became a discretionary outcome at level 4.

However the changes were to continue:

*We must be aware of whether we are putting too much into the outcomes* (Team meeting minutes, 24 August, 1999),

and a month later we were asked “Can we review outcomes to stick to one major idea in each outcome?” (Team meeting minutes, 21 September, 1999).

The next set of revisions refined all the outcomes into one sentence and tried to offer only one “know and do”. The changes have been underlined in the following
Again I tried to retain as much as I could of the original outcome. This set began my mini-battle with the editorial team. I had written “roleplay” and the editor changed it to “role-play” because she believed that was common usage. I had to find published evidence to prove to her that “role play” had become “role-play” but contemporary use was “roleplay” – thanks to Cecily O’Neill for that last. These changes were made in the editorial process and it wasn’t until we saw the printed copies that I realised that some of my chosen text had been changed by the editor, for example, “movements” instead of “movement” as an element of drama. Following this I made representation to Carolyn that we should be consulted about editorial changes before publication as some of the language was specifically used within each arts strand and an editor might not know the nuances of the terminology. From here on the editing was, in part, done as a collaboration and the same editor was used throughout so that she became aware of the specifics of the terminology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR4.1 Learners sustain a range of roles and relationships through improvisation and role-play shaping and managing dramatic action and narratives by applying choices about language, space, place, movements, time, symbol, focus and mood.</td>
<td>DR4.2 Learners rehearse and present devised and scripted drama using voice, movement and characterisation appropriate for a specific audience and space.</td>
<td>DR4.3 Learners evaluate the learnings and understandings developed through drama experience, making supported critical judgements about the handling of dramatic elements and skills in their own work and that of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Trial/Pilot Conference “Creating Connections” was held on 11/12 October, 1999, and we were freed from rewriting till the end of the year. However changes in the intentions of Education Queensland began to cause confusion for us and for our work:

*The director reported that the work of Professor [redacted] is questioning the level of specificity in learning outcomes, while the Minister is in favour of greater specificity* (Council meeting minutes, 7 October, 1999).

This “work” was the introduction of “New Basics” as an initiative of Education Queensland as part of the “2010” plan. I will talk about this in more detail in Chapter 9 but this quote indicates the level of confusion about future directions which would emerge as a significant tension for the remainder of the project.

---

At the Team meeting (11 January, 2000) we were directed to change “learners” back to “students”. This was an internal office decision to retain consistency with the other, already published, syllabuses from Science and HPE.

The second evaluator’s report in January 2000 asked us to further refine and simplify the language seeking:

*Continued effort towards increased specification in content, levels and outcomes and ongoing simplification of layout and language*  
(EdData, 2000a, p. vi).

In March, 2000 we were requested to provide the Core Content in six levels. This had previously been provided as a single page statement of the complete content to be covered in the ten years. The levelling made it possible to remove the details of the elements that had been specified in each level of outcomes and made the simplification of the outcomes a much easier task. By this stage I was rarely able to, or needing to, consult with my QADIE colleagues so I went ahead and continued to refine the outcomes on my own, knowing that consultation would still be available to me if I needed it. By this time, as well, I had such a deep and thorough understanding of each of the outcomes and the developmental sequence that I felt much more confident in making modifications, believing that I was still retaining the integrity of the originals, but being the only person who, by working with them so consistently and constantly, had the complete picture in mind.

A final check before the original outcomes writing teams came back to the office for final revisions on May 4 was to “map the outcomes against the cross curricular priorities. Level statements [were] to be [written] in short paragraphs and [to] signal organisers. Use gerunds for strand statements” (Team minutes 2/5/00). This meant that we were to check that we could connect the outcomes with the KLA outcomes in the syllabus, as well as the “cross-curricular priorities” of literacy, numeracy, lifeskills and a futures perspective. To my relief the drama outcomes were easily mapped into the required grid.\(^{22}\)

On 4 May, 2000 the original writing consortia came together to read and check the final set of outcomes. They were asked to look for consistency and clarity; ensure that links were apparent between the outcomes and core content; and to create new discretionary and cross-KLA outcomes for the final draft of the syllabus. On Tuesday, 9 May the new outcomes were submitted to the team. On Thursday, 11 May, we met with a large “equity” group representing the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, multicultural educators, and specialists in remote education.

---

\(^{22}\) See Appendix 7.6
and those with specific concerns of gender and low socio-economic status. This was the final check before the draft syllabus was quickly edited and readied by 26 May, 2000 for posting to the Curriculum Committee. Here is the penultimate set of outcomes at Level 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR4.1 Students select dramatic elements and conventions to collaboratively shape improvisations and role-plays.</td>
<td>DR4.2 Students present devised and scripted drama using acting skills appropriate for a variety of purposes and audiences.</td>
<td>DR4.3 Students make supported critical judgements about the application of dramatic elements, conventions and the context of their own work and that of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Curriculum Committee meeting concluded:

*It was agreed that the Curriculum Committee recommend that the Council approve the Draft Years 1 to 10 The Arts Syllabus.*

(Council meeting minutes, 6 June, 2000)

This meant that the same draft could be sent to the Council meeting on July 20 where:

*It was agreed that the syllabus, sourcebook guidelines, sourcebook modules and initial in-service materials should be released contemporaneously if possible.*

*Decision number C000713. The Council decided to:*

1. *approve the Years 1 to 10 The Arts Syllabus for publication, subject to editorial changes during the publishing process;*
2. *ensure that every effort be made to ensure that the sourcebook guidelines, sourcebook modules and initial in-service materials be available for release within the agreed timelines. Unanimous.* (Council meeting minutes, 20 July, 2000)

We had met all deadlines and gained approval from Council at the first round; again this was unprecedented within the office. The second point, above, was made with an awareness that there was unlikely to be a substantial implementation plan and that teachers would be greatly benefited by getting the entire package at the one time to assist in understanding the documents and being able to plan efficiently with them.

After this there were only minor editorial changes made prior to final publication. As you see, I was able to convince the editor that “roleplay” was a real word, and “performance” was substituted for “acting” for consistency with the Core Content tables.
Core content

The decision to include core content had come as a direct request from the Minister of Education and passed down to Carolyn and the other PPOs via Barry Salmon. The Minister (Dean Wells) was deeply concerned about equity of access to learning for all students in Queensland and made requests for more and more specificity throughout his tenure. He discussed his concerns with the Director and followed up with formal submissions to the Curriculum Committee and Council meetings e.g.

\[\text{The minister expressed his concern about equitable access to}\]
\[\text{learning, and in particular that mobility across the state should not}\]
\[\text{disadvantage students. He felt that this concern could be addressed}\]
\[\text{by increasing specificity in syllabus documents} \text{ (Curriculum}\]
\[\text{Committee meeting minutes, 10 September, 1998).}\]

He reiterated this statement with a message to the next Curriculum Committee meeting clarifying that

\[\text{learning outcomes describe understandings, not specific knowledge}\]
\[\text{and the specificity sought by the minister is likely to appear in core}\]
\[\text{content} \text{ (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 4 December, 1998).}\]

As the core content tables do not fit readily into these pages I have placed them in Appendices 7.7-7.10. Please refer to them as needed as you read the following text.

The core content and the process of change

There had been a number of indications that content was an issue of concern to the new Minister and Director-General. In October, 1998, the Council meeting minutes recorded:

\[\text{Education Queensland had advocated for a minimalist view of}\]
\[\text{syllabus content because it was mandatory for Education}\]
\[\text{Queensland to implement these syllabuses for all students}\]
\text{(Council meeting minutes, 8 October, 1998).}\]

This sent a signal to the Office to prepare for changes. Soon after the meeting of the Curriculum Committee confirmed a new attitude towards content:

\[\text{The Assistant Director further reported that in order to provide}\]
\[\text{greater specificity in the syllabuses the Council has decided to}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR4.1  Students select dramatic elements and conventions to collaboratively shape improvisations and roleplays.</td>
<td>DR4.2 Students present devised and scripted drama using performance skills appropriate for a variety of purposes and audiences.</td>
<td>DR4.3 Students make supported critical judgements about the application of dramatic elements, conventions and the context of their own work and that of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
include a section called the scope of the core. ... The scope of the core is not sequenced. It will describe the core content through which schools can choose to deliver the learning outcomes. Schools can sequence the core content to best accommodate the needs of their students (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 22 October, 1998).

At this meeting the draft SOSE syllabus had been tabled. The presentation by the SOSE team had indicated that:

Teachers prefer to have content specified. If content is deficient, teachers will use textbooks and not the syllabus. Once the content is specified it may be possible to take the content out of the learning outcomes (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 22 October, 1998).

These discussions resulted in a decision from the Council meeting on 11 November to include a single page statement of the entire core content (for each strand) to be covered in the 10 years of schooling. This was included in the first consultative draft of the syllabus, posted on 16 November, 1998. To prepare this list of content I referred to the “core scope of the content” that had been provided by QADIE in its initial submission and kept the text intact though the layout was slightly modified. See Appendix 7.7 for the first Core Content table.

I was invited to attend the Curriculum Committee meeting on 4 December, 1998, to present the draft syllabus. Members of the committee noted that core content was included. The Assistant Director explained to the committee that this was a directive from the Minister and that:

Learning outcomes describe deep understandings, not specific knowledge, and the specificity sought by the Minister is likely to appear in the core content (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 4 December, 1998).

The layout (see Appendix 7.8), but not the content, was changed for the Trial Conference in February, 1999. The new layout was a result of “playing around” with drafts to try and find a more pleasing “look” that would still contain the full range of content. At this stage the layout of the drama content and that of other areas differed significantly with the result that the Arts SAC meeting directed us as follows:

The team is to re-work the core content tables with particular emphasis on consistency. The core content should reflect and contribute to the key learning area outcomes (SAC meeting minutes, 5 March, 1999).
Further discussion at this meeting focused on how the same terminology was used differently in the arts strands. “Media”, as an example, was a problematic term, being used to both define the arts area within the syllabus, and as an element within the field, and meaning something entirely different within the visual arts. The discussion in the committee went round in circles with representatives (not of their own area) saying, “Can’t you just call it …?” To which each area specialist responded that it was a considered term with particular meanings in the area. Consensus was not reached about common terminology but this was the impetus for the development of a Glossary of Terms to be published alongside the syllabus. When writing my journal that evening I went to my edition of Alice Through the Looking Glass and recorded:

“I don't know what you mean by 'glory';” Alice said.

Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. “Of course you don't – till I tell you. I meant ‘there's a nice knock-down argument for you!’”

“But 'glory' doesn't mean ‘a nice knock-down argument','” Alice objected.

“When I use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, “it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less.”

which captured the tenor of the discussion perfectly.

The next draft of the core content for the Pilot draft of the syllabus in September, 1999 (see Appendix 7.9) was a very different version. Each arts area attempted to follow the same format. The dense text, originally at the top and explaining the processes of forming, presenting and responding, had been removed and was placed in the Rationale section of the syllabus to precede the outcomes as a result of feedback from the school cluster meetings I held in Mackay and Rockhampton:

Team to begin preparation of strand specific statements of new organisers. Feedback from Mackay/Rocky cluster meetings (Team meeting minutes, 10 August, 1999).

This gave us more room on the page and additional detail could be provided. On the left-hand side of the page we listed the three processes and described related content on the right. Also on the left was “role”, “elements of drama”, “drama conventions” and “forms and styles” with lists of content beside each of these headings. “Drama conventions” was an addition to this draft, for two reasons, one that “components” was an important concept for media and dance and we were seeking commonalities – “conventions” was a comfortable compromise; the second was that non-specialist drama teachers were telling me that they needed more help.
with the structuring of drama learning activities, and the use of drama conventions as described by Neelands and Goode (1990; 2000) were an additional way of helping teachers to plan. Details of conventions became a part of the core content from this date.

At the 25 November meeting of Council the SOSE team presented a revised version of Core Content, delineated in levels to parallel the outcomes. Council responded positively to this new version of content, in part to circumvent the emerging criticisms from Education Queensland about the lack of specificity within the content of the syllabuses, and also to try and hedge off the incursion of “New Basics” which was gaining a great deal of publicity. The internal office feeling was that if we could be more specific about content within the syllabuses, teachers would feel more comfortable with familiar “discipline” areas of study that were sequenced in some detail. Discussion continued within Council and the Curriculum Committee and in April, 2000 we were directed to level core content:

What is key to the decisions of “leveling” core content is that it connects with the relevant outcomes at the same level.

Implications for teaching, learning and assessment centre around the fact that students need to be able to demonstrate understanding (mastery?) of the content independently of teacher and peer support and in a range of assessment contexts

(Team meeting minutes, 20 April, 2000).

I had to make decisions about what content at which level and that “students need to be able to demonstrate understanding (mastery?) of the content independently of teacher and peer support and in a range of assessment contexts” was key to making those decisions. This was not a list of content to be taught but a list of content that students had to show knowledge and understanding of within their demonstration of the outcomes. I drew on my own experience of teaching drama at primary and secondary school levels as I tried to decide when all students would be able to show mastery of particular elements in the drama process. I phoned around to my friends and colleagues and asked questions like, “When do you reckon the kids get to manage tension in their own work? When do they initiate symbol and manage it well within self-devised text? When should we introduce script?”

By April 20, 2000 we had another draft syllabus, this time incorporating the levelled core content, which was sent around to the consultative network resulting in the following responses:
Yay!! For the first time we have a page that captures the nature of what is to be explored through drama. This page really could be used as the basis for whole school planning -> a seamless drama curriculum (QADIE representative, fax response, 4 May, 2000).

and

While I am not as familiar with drama, having read the core content, I feel that the content is highly relevant, sequential and developmentally appropriate (Primary teacher, fax response, 22 May, 2000).

The Core Content (see Appendix 7.10) quickly went through a range of iterations in the next month as we readied it to send to the Curriculum Committee in May and the Council in June for, what we hoped would be approval. I will now track the changes in forms and styles at Levels 4, 5 and 6 from April 20 till publication as an illustration of the decisions that were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 20, 2000</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student devised scenarios</td>
<td>process drama</td>
<td>documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chorus drama</td>
<td>realism</td>
<td>non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readers theatre</td>
<td>collage drama</td>
<td>theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published scripts</td>
<td>clowning and physical comedy</td>
<td>forum theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written: character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>improvisation</td>
<td>written: play review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written: character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>written: program notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the May 4 draft we introduced shaded arrows in the background of the table to indicate that the content was developmental throughout the levels and that content from previous levels should be revisited, where appropriate as part of the planned learning experiences. I added some explanatory information, in brackets, to assist teachers. “And scripts” was added to Level 4. This decision was as a result of feedback from colleagues at upper primary and lower secondary level. I had asked when they thought we should introduce scripted text. This raised a number of issues as there were very few quality scripts available that were suitable for young, Australian students. Published Australian scripts generally had “adult themes” and “language”. I was concerned that, if we introduced “script” earlier than the upper levels of primary school, teachers would use the scripts that were published as part of reading schemes. These may have been good for developing reading skills, though that is contested, but they certainly were not good dramatic texts. For lower secondary classes, at this time, teachers generally used very short extracts from published plays or some of the short plays published for young people in the UK.
Although there were some very well-written and interesting plays\textsuperscript{24} the language, the social context, and frequently the situation within the script was outside the experience of students in Queensland. Fortunately this situation has changed. Currency Press now publishes a comprehensive list of plays for youth theatre and children’s theatre, and Playlab Press in Brisbane has published a number of plays for young people by local playwrights.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{May 4, 2000} & \textbf{Level 4} & \textbf{Level 5} \\
\hline
- readers theatre & - process drama & - documentary drama \\
- student devised scenarios and scripts & - realism & - non-realism (abstract and poetic forms) \\
- chorus drama (ritual and ceremonial) & - collage drama & - theatre for young people \\
- published scripts & - clowning and physical comedy & - forum theatre (teacher as joker/facilitator) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

For this early May draft I had taken out the written component because it did not seem to fit within forms and styles but I could not find anywhere else to place it, and teachers gave me feedback that it was important information to include, so I put that back in to the May 9 draft which was the one that went to the Curriculum Committee.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{May 9, 2000} & \textbf{Level 4} & \textbf{Level 5} \\
\hline
- student devised scenarios and scripts & - process drama & - documentary drama \\
- chorus drama & - realism & - non-realism \\
- readers theatre & - collage drama & - theatre for young people \\
- published scripts & - clowning and physical comedy & - forum theatre \\
- \textit{written: character profile, plot outline} & - \textit{improvisation} & - \textit{written: play review} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

For the next draft I moved improvisation from Level 5 to Level 4 because the Level 4 forming outcome included improvisation. I moved “student devised scripts” to Level 5, because, while it is certainly possible for students at the upper levels of primary school to write scripts based on their practical work, the core content had to be \textit{independently} demonstrated in conjunction with the outcome and I was not sure that all students at the end of their primary school years would be able to do this. With more dedicated time to study drama as a specialty subject in the Junior Secondary years, it seemed a much more feasible placement.

The content below was in the Council penultimate draft, posted to the Council in June, 2000.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Level 4} & \textbf{Level 5} & \textbf{Level 6} \\
\hline
- student devised & - \textbf{student devised} & - documentary drama \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{24} See for example the Dramascripts series published by Nelson Thomes.
Before the syllabus went for editing at the end of the year I added "short scenes in correct layout" at Level 6. This was in response to feedback from secondary school teachers, who wanted that included as the next development in script-writing.

Edited syllabus, 8 March, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• improvisation</td>
<td>• clowning and physical comedy</td>
<td>• documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• published scripts</td>
<td>• collage drama</td>
<td>• forum theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• student devised scenarios</td>
<td>• process drama</td>
<td>• non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written – character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>• realism</td>
<td>• theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• collage drama</td>
<td>• forum theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• process drama</td>
<td>• non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• realism</td>
<td>• theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student devised scripts</td>
<td>• written – short scenes in correct layout, play review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• written – program notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The description of the above changes is intended to give a glimpse into the decision-making process. It would be far too complicated to go through each change of each section of content at every level. But I hoped to indicate the consultation and concentrated work that went into each section of the core content text. At each stage I was conscious that students would be all required to demonstrate all of this content independently and in a range of contexts. It was the minimum requirement.

**Level statements**

Originally the level statements were meant to frame the learning for all of the arts at each level. Later the emerging office position became that the level statements should summarize the learning outcomes and would possibly be used for reporting. This meant that they had to become arts area specific rather than the generic statements in the first draft of the syllabus. In my discussion of the changes to the outcomes, above, I indicated that I used the opportunity to modify the outcomes and the level statements as a way of moving some of the complexity of the outcomes to the level statements. The level statements changed less than the outcomes and the core content. I will explain below, once again focusing on Level 4.

**Level statements and the process of change**

The first set of level statements were generic and, for the most part were adapted from the National Statements and Profiles in the Arts (Curriculum Corporation, 1993).
Level Statements 4
Draft for trial conference

Learners at this level have developed more complex skills in each of the arts areas. They apply skills and processes to create arts works and use many of the symbols systems, notational systems and forms of each of the arts areas appropriately. They recognise and analyse arts elements in their own works and those of others and discuss their basic ideas. They use a range of presentational skills to plan, present and/or perform works for different audiences or purposes. Learners show an awareness of different social, cultural, historical and economic contexts and look for clues to identify the context or time in which works were made. They show an awareness of the diverse nature of the arts in Australia and some understanding of their origins.

In June we received the first evaluator’s report which advised (EdData, 1999, p. 12):

In the trial version of the syllabus, single statements were provided at each level to cover all of the five art forms. This strategy had mixed success as indicated by the ratings. (6 responses rated at Very High or High, and 6 responses were Moderate to Low)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the level statements go right across the five art forms and therefore are very general. This means I would read them but not use them.
- There is no such thing as a common art language and there should be … if we want to have non-specialist teachers implement the syllabus then the language has to be consistent across the art forms.
- I feel there has been no serious research into developmental psychology and developmental learning in framing the level statements. When does a child become capable of certain learnings? There is no comparability in how they apply across the five art forms.

This added impetus to the need for strand specific level statements. I was grateful for this because, as I have said before, it allowed me to reduce the complexity of the outcomes by placing some of the ideas that were common across all the outcomes at a level into the level statement. It was also useful to be able to use the level statement to explain the processes of learning in drama. Here is the drama-specific level statement developed for the Pilot conference draft of the syllabus.

Pilot draft, September, 1999.

Learners, individually and in groups, apply dramatic elements to build, shape and manage dramatic action drawn from school and community issues, and historical or fictional settings. They present devised and scripted drama for presentation to a specific audience. They begin to use script writing techniques. Learners use drama terminology when making critical judgements about drama experiences.
The next two drafts make the links with the core content more explicit by including the forms and styles. We had also decided to break the text into the three processes of forming, presenting and responding to attempt to make those links clear to both experienced and inexperienced teachers of drama. “Learners” was changed to “students” in line with the internal office style.


Students, individually and in groups, work with published scripts, and student-devised scenarios and scripts. They collaborate to select and apply dramatic elements, including mood, focus and symbol, and conventions to shape and manage dramatic action. The stimulus for drama work is drawn from school and community issues, and historical or fictional settings. They present devised and scripted drama to entertain and inform a specific audience, including other year levels, family and friends. They adapt vocal expression and movement to convey characters within range of performance spaces. Students use drama terminology when making critical judgments about their own drama and that of others.

The small change in the next version was made following a colleague from the office, a complete drama novice, who read the text and said, “Do they only perform to one audience throughout this whole level?”

27 June, 2000

Students, individually and in groups, work with published scripts, and student-devised scenarios and scripts. They collaborate to select and apply dramatic elements, including mood, focus and symbol, and conventions to shape and manage dramatic action. The stimulus for drama work is drawn from school and community issues, and historical or fictional settings. They present devised and scripted drama to entertain and inform specific audiences, including other year levels, family and friends. They adapt vocal expression and movement to convey characters within range of performance spaces. Students use drama terminology when making critical judgments about their own drama and that of others.

The syllabus was approved by Council in July and from then we worked with the editor, collaboratively this time, to refine and clarify. She asked me to be specific about what I meant when I had written “work with” student devised scenarios and scripts. We included “published scripts” to distinguish those from student-devised scripts. We indicated “selected” conventions “as appropriate to the selected form or style” because, when she asked me to explain what conventions were, my explanation involved the connections between the conventions and the form or style of the drama. And “settings” was changed to “contexts” to avoid the confusion of the “setting” of the play.

1 September, 2000

Level 4

Students individually and in groups, prepare and interpret student-devised scenarios and scripts, and published scripts. They collaborate to select and
apply dramatic elements, including mood, focus and symbol, and selected conventions as appropriate to the selected form or style to shape and manage dramatic action. The stimulus for drama work is drawn from school and community issues, and historical or fictional contexts.

They present devised and scripted drama to entertain and inform specific audiences, including other year levels, family and friends. They adapt vocal expression and movement to convey characters within a range of performance spaces.

Students use drama terminology when making critical judgements about their own drama and that of others.

This was the final copy.

**The syllabus document**

The syllabus itself is the smallest document in the suite. At sixty pages, and with the drama outcomes on only four of those, it is partnered with the Initial In-service Materials (88 pages) and the Sourcebook Guidelines (121 pages plus 60 modules).

The design features, content and developmental timelines and processes of all of these were in place when we began the project in January 1998, having emerged from the work of the earlier project teams.

**The syllabus template**

The syllabus was not only made up of the sets of outcomes and core content. The creation of the rationale was another area of work that gained a great deal of attention. The template for the syllabus and some of the rationale section was generic text that had been developed by the preceding curriculum development projects but a considerable amount of the text within the rationale was arts specific. The rationale aimed to describe the essential learning in the area, and give reasons why learning in the arts was important.

The document, in all its drafts and in the final published format contained:

1.1. The **nature of the key learning area** which was to take a maximum of one page and intended to describe “the nature and purpose of the KLA or subject and its place within the context of the “whole” curriculum” (QSCC, 1997c, p. 1). This was the section that received the most scrutiny and a cynical part of me thinks that was because it was the first page of the document which our respondents read when they were fresh, or the only part they read because they had little time. The subheadings of this section of the syllabus are “a part of everyday life” where we tried to indicate the pervasiveness of the arts in our day-to-day world e.g.:

*The arts influence decisions and choices made every day about such things as our clothing and appearance, our natural and built*
surroundings, music, television programs and movies. The arts entertain, record events, promote ideas, provoke responses and stimulate discussion. They provide opportunities for us to create, reflect, challenge, ritualise, critique and celebrate (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002b, p. 1).

And we also sought to emphasise the benefits of learning and thinking in the arts: Students develop breadth and depth in a range of learning styles and modes of thinking. They access the perceptual, cognitive and imaginative domains in unique and challenging ways. These attributes enable students to explore and construct meanings.

(p.2)

1.2. The “contribution of the key learning area to lifelong learning” (QSCC, 1997d, p. 3). Under this heading came the “valued attributes of a lifelong learner” that had been decided were essential by the Council for previous syllabus documents. By the time we had arrived to commence this project, the “7 attributes” had been long established. Bill Spady would call these “transformative outcomes” (Spady, 1993, 1994; Willis & Kissane, 1997) implying they were transdisciplinary statements of life roles. For each of the attributes we provided arts-specific text, signally how the arts contributed to the development of these qualities. The valued attributes were:

- **a knowledgeable person with deep understanding.** In the text under this heading we emphasised the importance of procedural knowledge, “Knowing how is as important as knowing about” (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002b, p. 3) which aligned with our decision to use processes as the conceptual organisers of the strands.

- **a complex thinker.** The text here talks about thinking “inductively, deductively and intuitively” (p. 3) as part of the processes of engaging in and reflecting on arts experiences.

- **a responsive creator.** This text is something we “slipped through” the editing process and the internal office policies. The phrase in all other published documents and works-in-progress within the office was a “creative person”. From the beginning of the project Linda and I felt that the phrase was wrong. It stood out from the others by using the key word “creative” as an adjective, and how could we develop a person? Csiksentmihalyi (1994; 1996) and Gardner (1993) both point out the complexity and situated nature of the creative act. According to
Csiksentmihalyi, “Creativity is the result of the interaction between three subsystems: a domain, a person, and a field,” (1994, p. 143): domain signifying the particular symbolic system, and the field belonging to the social system in which the person operates. During our discussions about this in the first few months of the job we came up with the phrase “responsive creator” to denote that the process of creation occurs within a context and either as a result of prior experiences or in response to current circumstances. We wrote definitions and changed the text within our documents and were told to “change it back” as this was generic text that was common to all publications and had been agreed to by the Council. However we felt very strongly about this, and Linda and I were the ones who actually wrote and edited the Rationale section of the syllabus, so we kept the text as “responsive creator” by changing it at the last minute in the final draft of the syllabus before it went to the printer. Our small insubordinate stance is now published (uniquely in this syllabus) as part of the suite of documents produced by the QSCC. The text under this heading talks about students “responding to multiple experiences and ideas in the diverse world around them. … They may combine processes and components from the arts disciplines in innovative ways. Students may rework and transform existing ideas and works to produce something new and original” (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002b, p. 3).

- an active investigator. This text caused the most dissension within the team. From my perspective as a drama educator, it made perfect sense, because investigation of ideas, issues, and texts is the basis for the way I was used to working. However music did not find this quality a comfortable fit. Media and visual arts saw investigation as embedded in their ways of working too, and the dance educator was ambivalent, feeling it was part of the process, but not an essential part. However it was “set” text within office documents and was therefore included. The explanation under this heading included, “students construct meanings as they explore, describe and predict,” (p. 3) which aligns strongly with the work of drama educators.

- an effective communicator. The explanatory text includes, “involving the symbol systems, languages, forms and processes of the arts as they formulate, communicate and justify opinions and ideas” (p. 3). With this
text we tried to emphasise that the arts themselves are modes of communication.

- **a participant in an interdependent world.** The text focuses on understanding and valuing diversity and acknowledging the possibility of personal action: “Students develop an enhanced understanding of themselves as members of cultures and societies with pasts, presents and futures to which they can contribute” (p. 3).

- **a reflective and self-directed learner.** “Students come to understand their own learning styles, developing the self-discipline to work independently, to persevere with projects, and to plan to accommodate the unpredictable” (p. 4).

1.3. Defined the “cross curricular priorities” namely literacy, numeracy, lifeskills and a futures perspective. Each of these sections had a generic paragraph or two to start them off and were continued with arts-specific information.

1.4. Contained statements of assumptions about “learners and learning” that we were to use, almost without editing, although we could slightly modify or add details if we felt necessary. Any changes to these, however slight, had to be approved by the Assistant Director and the Director, rather than the usual consultation process. We made no attempt to change or add to these as they were statements that we could comfortably live with.

1.5. Described “learning in the arts” which was, of course, Key Learning Area specific. Because access to artists in schools was such a point of discussion in the early responses to the design brief, we added a heading for community partnerships, which we believed were important. Community partnerships and arts partnerships were developing in importance in the Queensland context. Amongst others, the work of Judith McLean, a drama lecturer at QUT, who was on the board of Arts Queensland and the Australia Council, had been recently focused on building relationships between artists, companies, schools and communities. The current emphasis on community-arts partnerships contributed significantly to our being permitted to add this section to the syllabus.

1.6. The last heading was “equity in curriculum”. The text here had already been decided and was to remain common across all syllabus documents, though we added a few arts-specific paragraphs at the end, stating, “The arts encourage students to understand and appreciate diverse needs, experiences, and perspectives and to value and respect people, cultures and their environments. Students should critically reflect on the opposing values
of respecting cultures while simultaneously being aware that some customs conflict with human rights” (p. 13).

The syllabus continued.

2. Following the syllabus template brings us to the next section, the outcomes section. In this part of the document the headings were

2.1. *key learning area outcomes*, i.e. statements of what we hoped that all learners would be able to do after participating in a curriculum based on these documents for 10 years of compulsory schooling.

2.2. descriptions of the *strands of the key learning area*. In our case the strands were dance, drama, media, music, and visual arts.

2.3. the *strand organizers*, which as I have explained earlier were *create, present, respond*.

2.4. the *core* (CLO) and *discretionary* (DLO) *learning outcomes* for each strand. The outcomes section of the syllabus contained two final statements, both of which were common across all syllabus documents and had been determined by earlier.

2.5. *the relationship of the outcomes levels to year levels*, and

2.6. *indicative time allocations*.

3. The final and briefest section of the syllabus was the section on *assessment*. This was necessarily brief as the QSCC had been blocked by Education Queensland on the provision of any advice on assessment and reporting, since Education Queensland insisted that was the provision of the systemic authorities. Ironically, nonsensically perhaps, this project was commissioned to write a syllabus document to be implemented in all schools, but not permitted to give teachers advice on assessment. This is illogical in terms of curriculum theory and was an unprecedented stance as the senior syllabus documents prepared by the BSSSS provided detailed and specific assessment requirements. The issue of assessment was a source of ongoing tension, especially during the trial and pilot phases. I will deal with this in more detail in the Chapter 9.
Chapter 8.

Collecting shells 2: influences and constraints in the syllabus development phase

The struggles for me:

Constantly I found myself asking myself, “Is this right? How will I know that we have got it right?” A real concern was that in sourcing for ideas to underpin the syllabus, the outcomes and the development in levels, we used existing curriculum documents and existing practice. Of course, the syllabus had to be implemented within the current contexts, but I kept looking for a theory, or some theoretical study that would help me to be sure that we were navigating in the right direction. Few texts that I referred to at this time were concerned with aspects of progression in drama learning. Instead the majority of published drama texts focused on content for understanding dramatic form, or what the teacher did, and the orientation of this curriculum focused on the progression of the student. I went to Richard Courtney’s (1980) *The Dramatic Curriculum* and this was a useful reference; Bolton (1979, p. 136) proffered a list of observable behaviours that would be seen over time as a result of learning in drama; and Neelands’ chart of progression from KS3 to KS4 (1997, pp. 20-21) was enormously helpful in my conceptualising of what might be expected of students. However I was conscious that two of these texts were twenty years old and would have felt comforted by being able to draw on some contemporary evidence-based research that looked at how and what and when and under what conditions students progressed in learning of drama. Most texts focusing on student progression were based on existing curricula, thereby both supporting and constraining progression within the frame of the curriculum.

The wisdom of quality current practice was embedded in the outcomes from the comprehensive and consultative process that QADIE went through in designing the first set of outcomes and it was beneficial to have such a solid foundation upon which to build. Throughout the project the Drama strand was often singled out for approbation. My challenges were really faced within the refinements: to modify the
outcomes so that they were clearly “nested” in each of the organising strands; to be sure that the sense of “levelness” across the outcomes was accurate; and to ensure the “step up” between levels was appropriate and that teachers would be able to see clearly the difference between a student demonstrating an outcome and another student, in the same class, demonstrating the related outcome at the level above or below. This was vital to allow teachers to accurately assess student progress.

The published syllabus states

*Since the learning outcomes are interrelated, units of work may be planned to include all core learning outcomes at a level in a strand concurrently* (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002b, p. 4).

In earlier drafts “may” was written as “should” but this did not suit all of the modified outcomes from the other arts strands so the emphasis on working within the three processes was diminished in the final draft. However the drama outcomes were designed to be interrelated and complementary, arising from concerns that the Senior document artificially separated the three processes of forming, presenting and responding. It was not uncommon to hear teachers of Senior Drama say, “We are doing a forming unit now,” which meant that all learning experiences and assessment were focused on the “forming” dimension of the syllabus. This had always seemed an unnecessary and artificial division, forced on teachers and students by the particular criterion and standards-based assessment model followed in BSSSS syllabuses, which demanded the identification of discrete criteria for any assessment item. In the Years 1 to 10 curriculum we wanted to integrate the three processes into a holistic way of drama learning. I was particularly committed to this and was constantly mindful of the need to be able to connect all the outcomes at one level.

When I was required to make changes to the outcomes as a result of directives or consultation or editing I agonised about retaining the complexity and integrity of the original materials. This was especially difficult between April and July, 1999, when we were directed to make changes without external consultation, instead relying on the personal expertise of the team members. Although my friends and colleagues in the drama community understood my predicament, they were angry enough to take the official action described earlier and this caused me a good deal of personal strain. This period of being deeply embedded in revisions and being personally responsible for the changes, however, allowed me to gain a greater degree of understanding of the outcomes themselves and what the community was hoping to produce as a framework for drama learning. When consultation resumed in July, 1999, I did not feel so in need of reassurance from QADIE and professional
colleagues as I had gained in confidence about my own knowledge base and the intent and direction of the curriculum.

Another challenge was that of writing the documents, including the outcomes, in language that would be accessible for parents as well as teachers. The audience for the documents was very broadly conceived. Of course, the chief audience was intended to be teachers and school administrators, but the document was meant to be understandable, accessible, and decipherable for parents, politicians, community members, and hopefully students as well. This was part of the charter for the QSCC (1997d) and this led to a great deal of rewriting and refinement. I set myself the task of writing the outcomes so that they could be understandable by the students:

_We are constantly talking about reworking the outcomes so that non-specialists and parents understand them. But what about the kids? They should understand the outcomes too. They should be let into the secret of what it is they are supposed to be learning so that they can identify and talk about their own progress. If we don’t give the kids the language to talk about what they do in arts learning then we are letting them down badly_ (Journal, 16 November, 1999).

I don’t know if any of the other team members felt about this in the same way but I know it was a significant motivation for me. In the team I had raised concerns about the lack of consultation with students, the biggest set of stakeholders in this whole project. How can we empower students to become arts literate and artists if they are denied access to the language of the curriculum?

**Constraints, influences, and problematising factors**

Time, timelines and meeting deadlines continued to add stress to the job. The syllabus and the outcomes went through many drafts in the 18 months of the trial and pilot. Concurrently with writing and rewriting the team spent a great deal of time in the trial and pilot schools, and speaking about the developing materials at Universities and Head of Department meetings. We often seemed to only come in to the office for our regular team meetings and the SAC meetings, spending the majority of time in the trial and pilot schools. I wonder if much of our work was not reactive instead of thoughtfully proactive as we received the weekly list of responses required and tasks to be completed. There was little time to think, or to spend in detailed discussion either with each other or the teachers in schools.

Changes to personnel also added problematising factors. Linda and I had worked full-time on the project for a year before the additional six members joined us and the interpersonal dynamics took some time to work out. Personnel changes at
more senior levels, too, impacted on the progress of the work. Our Principal Project Officer left the team for four months while acting in a more senior position, leaving us with a new direction in the hands of the replacement PPO. At an even more senior level, changes to the portfolio of Minister for Education and the Director-General of Education (two of these in less than two years) produced shifts in focus, relationships with Education Queensland, the direction of curriculum and the ownership of curriculum. These changes contributed to uncertainty and confusion about the direction of the developing curriculum.

**What was achieved and what compromised**

The first (Consultative) Draft of the syllabus was sent out for broad consultation on 16 November with responses required by 11 December, 1998. Note both the time and the timing of this. The school year for government schools finished on 11 December, with Catholic and Independent Schools ending a week or two earlier, which meant that some teachers would have had only two weeks, at one of the busiest times of the year, to respond to the draft document. As I have mentioned earlier the timing of the responses to draft documents had been the subject of criticism, which may have contributed to the diminishing number of responses to documents during the project (see table 6.3). Once we were in the trial phase (dealt with in detail in the following chapter) regular feedback was provided by the teachers in the trial and pilot schools. However the most powerful feedback during this time came from the external evaluator, Ed Data, a company commissioned to provide “impartial” responses to the document. Ed Data was charged with the task of providing feedback to the documents by employing staff and processes that were “outside” the project. I will talk about this in the next chapter also.

**Table 8.1** Responses to Draft syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April/May 1999</th>
<th>July/August 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>AISQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional associations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(QADIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The closing down of consultation for the few months between March and July, 1999, was compounded by internal changes of staff and this impacted on the interpersonal dynamics of both the team itself and individuals’ relationships with their peers.

25 Few of the responses provided advice on the outcomes except to say they were improving in accessibility and clarity.
personal, professional network. Despite this, responses both to the document and the process were positive and this remained a great comfort:

*The process is rewarding and stimulating and well worth while*
(Drama trial/pilot teacher, fax response, 30 April, 1999).

*Happy with process so far – its (sic) hard to get to a good working document that suits primary + secondary but its getting there. The general flavour of “arts” experiences for students P-10 is exciting!!* (Secondary dance/drama teacher, fax response, 5 May, 1999).

The outcomes and the rationale went through many drafts in response to internal office decisions about layout (core content must fit on one page), the conceptual framework of the syllabus (engagement and reflection becoming overarching principles rather than organisers of the outcomes), and responses from teachers and systemic authorities (seeking a reduction in numbers and complexity of outcomes).

I sought to retain the intent of the original set of outcomes submitted by QADIE and moved specific sections of text that had to be removed from the outcomes to the level statements and the core content wherever possible.

The most profound influence on decisions about the outcomes was the nature of the outcomes themselves i.e. that the statements were not merely desirable but had to be possible to be demonstrated by all students if they were given sufficient time (20 hours per year in primary school and 180 hours for the three secondary school years). In addition they had to be written in simple language so as to be understood by non-specialist teachers and parents. Thus, this was only ever to be a skeletal document, a framework for planning that delineated the minimum requirements of learning in drama. Of course teachers could, and I hoped would, go beyond the content of the syllabus and offer learning that was not described therein, but this was a matter for the implemented and lived curriculum of the classroom.

Pressures of time remained a constant strain. Perhaps the most notable achievement was that we met the deadlines for the curriculum project, completed most of the materials within the timeframe, and were endorsed by Council at our first submission at each stage.

The work of curriculum developers is a complex undertaking. The task is to develop curriculum materials that *are able to be implemented within current conditions of schooling*. Ironically, and in opposition to this, any new curriculum should look forward, towards the future, rather than being interminably fixed in some sort of invariable present, and when the developer is charged with (and committed to)
broad consultation, advice received is often contradictory and concerned with remaining in the comfort zone of what teachers’ knowledge and familiarity. For example discussion at the Executive Committee meeting reported that “the Queensland Teacher’s Union representative stated that the syllabus document must help teachers change their practice” (Team meeting minutes, 18 June, 1999, my emphasis). This statement contrasted with every formal submission from the QTU (12 June, 1998; 3 August, 1998; and 23 December, 1998) which expressed concerns about changes in assessment practices and workload (in particular for primary teachers). Admittedly they were trying to protect the members from additional work and to avoid assessment overload but, on the other hand they wanted us to include a more “socially critical” (12 June, 1998) approach which was difficult to reconcile with reducing teacher workload. On the other hand AISQ asked us to steer clear of the “socially critical” as some of their school members would not endorse such an approach.

**Political changes**

A new minister for education (Dean Wells) was appointed (29 June, 1998), shortly followed by the appointment of a new director-general of education (Terry Moran) in August who held the position for less than two years, when he was replaced by Jim Varghese in June, 2000. Very soon after Terry Moran’s appointment we were given an indication of the distancing of Education Queensland from the work of the authority. The Council Meeting minutes record that the new Director-General planned not to attend Council meetings but would send ADG Robin Sullivan in his stead.

Some members of Council wished to see the Director-General directly involved (Council meeting minutes, 18 November, 1998).

This decision was not a simple one, and required an amendment to the Act which had placed the Director-General as a pivotal member of the Council in an attempt to ensure the position did not solely focus on government schools but was responsible for all education within the State. The minutes of the Council meeting recorded that the “amendment to Act Section 32 (A) has gone through parliament to allow the DG to send a proxy” (Council meeting minutes, 24 February, 2000). From this time the Director-General did not attend a Council meeting.

In the next chapter I will talk about the changes in direction initiated by Education Queensland, most notably its “2010” document which was an attempt to address the problem (for EQ) of the large numbers of students leaving the government sector and moving to private schools.
Changes to these influential decision-makers added to a large degree to the feelings of uncertainty about the work we were doing. In February, 1999 the Director of the Council reported to the staff of the office that he had met with the Minister who was “considering the introduction of benchmarks”. While this is part of the common discourse about education it is the antithesis to an outcomes approach where learning is a constant but time is a variable (Spady, 1994) and the “benchmarking” of student results at age-related points in time is oppositional to the philosophy. However, more than one government minister has seen this as an accountability measure and a way of controlling the work of teachers and of schools. The mood within the office became one of uncertainty, and cynicism about the amount of support that would be offered by Education Queensland. The Council meeting minutes (7 October, 1999) expressed concern and uncertainty about the direction of the work of the Council because of the “New Basics” curriculum project being promoted by Professor Alan Luke, from the University of Queensland. At this meeting the Queensland Teachers’ Union reiterated its support for the eight Key Learning Areas but the publicity surrounding the New Basics indicated support for a change in direction from EQ.

By 4 November of that same year the Council had decided to make representation to the Minister about the alternative directions set by Education Queensland and a Special Meeting of Council was called where the discussion recorded:

- Adoption over time (by 2004?) of a “new basics” curriculum
- Introduction of a preparatory year of schooling
- School authorities determine pedagogy
- Consideration of moving on Year 10 to BSSS. Concerned with post Year 10 dropout.
- Consideration of combining the two curriculum authorities

And that Education Queensland would like to see closer links between the work of the Board and the Council (Council meeting minutes, 29 November, 1999).

The publicity about New Basics was extensive and the Director of the Council attempted to participate in the development of this work so that links could be made with the work of the Office.

*The Director reported that he is a member of a reference group that is working with Professor Luke and as such has provided comment on the Professor Luke framework. He further reported...*
that the proposal does challenge some of the work that the Council has been committed to over the last few years. (Council meeting minutes, 24 February, 2000)

Despite the Director’s attempts to continue to make positive links, the staff of the Office remained cynical about Education Queensland, believing the work of the office would be undermined. This cynicism was well-founded and, by September 2000, it was clear that the QSCC would soon no longer exist but would be merged with the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies.

Report from meeting with the Minister. A proposal to form one P to 12, intersystemic, statutory authority received a “high” level of support from most participants. It was further suggested that such a body might comprise three sections related to stages of schooling. (Council meeting minutes, 7 September, 2000)

The merging of the two authorities took place at the end of 2002 and very few of the full-time staff of the QSCC were taken on by the new authority, though the full-time staff from the BSSSS and TEPA were offered positions.
Chapter 9.

Phase 3 – The Changing Tide

The trial and pilot phases of the project were concurrent with the revisions to the draft syllabus, outcomes, core content and level statements described in the previous chapter. Each of these phases had different goals and purposes and need a brief explanation. The purpose of the “trial” phase to work collaboratively with a small group of representative schools to revise and refine the outcomes based on teacher feedback in specific school contexts and was intended to last for the first half of 1999. The “pilot” phase brought in a larger number of schools. The intention here was to work with the revised and final outcomes to test their effectiveness in terms of planning and assessment, and to co-develop exemplar support materials. Feedback from the schools was important in the reshaping of the syllabus and support documents as the project progressed. In this chapter I will focus on the trial and the pilot phase and describe the development of the additional support materials that made up the curriculum package.

An overview of the Trial and the Pilot

At the beginning of 1999 the first consultative draft syllabus went into the trial phase. This process was to last for the ensuing eighteen months and involved 36 schools which volunteered to trial the materials and contributed to the process of development. The selected schools self-nominated in response to advertisements placed by each of the systems and were chosen to be representative of the diverse schooling contexts around the state. They came from remote, rural locations as well as urban schools. At the Arts SAC meeting on 5 March, 1999 representatives from each system explained the process of choosing the schools. The selection involved collaboration among the three systems. Education Queensland nominated six of the twelve trial schools and twelve of the 24 pilot schools. There were several target groups and categories that were represented: metropolitan, provincial rural communities, special education and disabilities, diversity of population, large and small schools, distance education and isolated schools. The three systems
collaborated to ensure that the schools came from locations which allowed them to be “clustered” so that they could be visited and supported by the project team. This collaboration was valuable, though unusual, and showed the commitment from the three systemic groups to the project. The collaborative decision-making that lead to the clustering of schools in locations that facilitated team visits helped us greatly as the project team was able to stay in one location for a block of time (usually a week) and consult with teachers in their specific schools. Despite the lack of commitment to the work of the QSCC that was evident at the top levels of EQ, Ann Carroll, who headed the VPA unit, made extra effort to support this project.

Each school which volunteered was required to commit at least three teachers to the trialling of the materials and each Project Officer was allocated a school cluster with which they were expected to liaise and provide ongoing support for the entire eighteen months. This allowed us, individually, to develop an understanding of the specific needs of the schools we were working with, and to build a relationship with the particular teachers on the trial.

The Arts SAC (10 September, 1998) approved the decision to budget for twelve trial schools with three teachers each lasting for twelve months i.e. January – December, 1999, followed by a 6-month pilot (January-June 2000) when the trial schools would be joined by the additional 24 schools. In addition this was offered as an “open trial” i.e. where “anyone may access and use the document and attend the conferences but only the selected schools will be able to access system support” (SAC meeting minutes, 28 October, 1998) The open trial was made possible by placing the developing syllabus and support materials on the QSCC website so that any schools who wished to could access them. This was in contrast to “closed” trialling processes undertaken by the BSSSS and Education Queensland, when only selected schools could access trial materials and was another example of the openness of the QSCC process of consultation. This practice was initiated and supported by the Director of the QSCC, Jim Tunstall, and is another example of his commitment to transparent and consultative curriculum development.

Trialling the materials had two purposes. The first was to provide feedback on the feasibility of the outcomes i.e. to “test” them in diverse schooling contexts, and the second was to continue the consultative and collaborative process, drawing on teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 2004), and offering teachers opportunities to contribute to the developing materials. This allowed us to access the knowledge and expertise of teachers in the co-development of the support materials: elaborations and sourcebook modules. Many curriculum theorists (Boomer, Lester, Onore, & Cook, 1992; Schwab, 1970, 1973; Stenhouse, 1975; Walker & Soltis, 1997)
have emphasised the importance of teachers’ involvement in curriculum development and the processes established within the office of the QSCC attempted to value and support teachers’ contributions. The process recognised that:

If meaningful curriculum change is to occur in schools, it must be controlled by those who constitute the school community, and yet it is these very people who are marginalised by the dominant 

hierarchical forms of curriculum development (Johnson & Reid, 1999, p. xi)

and attempted to move the voices of the teachers in the school community from the margins to a more central position.

Also in line with a commitment to accountable consultation, the practice of the Council was to employ an external evaluator on a consultancy basis to provide an impartial eye in the evaluation of the developing curriculum. Ed Data bid successfully for the evaluation of the curriculum and provided three reports during the twelve months of June, 1999 to June 2000. During the trial and pilot phase, the project team continued to consult with teachers in schools and revise the drafts of the documents.

**Influences on the process of development**

Several factors impacted on the process of development some of which had personal impact and others of which were clearly political and systemic. The earliest of these was our change in location from the Annex to the main office where the team was expanded by six new members. Further personnel changes were forced upon the team by the ill-health of the Director of the QSCC and this influenced the direction of the curriculum materials, as I mentioned briefly in the previous chapter. The feedback from the external evaluators was important in validating the decisions we were making as the project progressed, and at a political and systemic level, Education Queensland began to indicate very strongly that the intention was to offer a completely alternative curriculum framework in government schools.

**Changing location**

At the end of 1998, Linda and I moved from AISQ House to the main office in the MLC building. Space had become available because the Science and HPE projects were completed and the seconded staff from those two projects were returning to school or taking up new positions. The relocation to the main office was beneficial because we had closer access to our PPO and the Director and Assistant-Director. Because we were now within the confines of the office we had much easier access to copying facilities; we could ask the corporate services staff for administrative assistance; and we could quickly and easily check details with Carolyn or one of the
other, more experienced, members of other teams. Prior to this we had to make formal appointments or meeting times to discuss anything, while now we could take advantage of people passing by or take a few minutes to discuss ideas over a coffee if we could see that someone was free. The location within the office allowed us to feel part of the corporate identity rather than outsiders who only semi-belonged to the office.

**Changes to staff**

It had been planned that, when the project was moving into the trial/pilot phase, the team would expand to encompass expertise in all five arts areas. Advertisements describing the positions had been placed in the Courier Mail, a state-wide newspaper, and given to each of the systems, at the end of October, 1998 (SAC meeting minutes, 10 September, 1998). Key selection criteria related to subject specific expertise, experience in curriculum development, writing skills and the ability to work as a collaborative team member. The selection process was confidential and Linda and I were not involved at any stage. All short-listed candidates attended an interview and the interviewing panel had representatives from QSCC, EQ, and QCEC. In mid-January, 1999 six new team members joined us. One represented dance; another was an additional drama person (and a deputy principal of a primary school, thus bringing an administrator’s perspective); one and a half (one of the team members worked a 0.5 load) represented media; another half-time team member represented an early childhood perspective⁴⁶; and the final full-time member represented visual arts.

**The Human Dimension – personal relationships**

The influx of new staff offered some particular challenges in that some very quickly began to try to change the direction of the project:

Linda and I had been sent on a compulsory computer course in January, 1999, and came back in the afternoon of the third day to find the new members of the team reworking the entire syllabus structure. One of the new members rewrote the level one outcomes to be generic for all the arts strands. To say that we were taken aback was to put it mildly. We had no idea that any reconceptualising was taking place, nor did we understand why it should, as the feedback we had received about the draft syllabus had so far been positive. Possibly this was an example of a new group trying to find a place for themselves in the project, and also possibly, Linda and I had become so comfortable in our working relationship that we didn’t anticipate that

---

⁴⁶ This was in response to a special request for early childhood representation from the Queensland Teachers’ Union. (3/8/98)
new people meant new ideas and perhaps changes. However the swiftness of some of the new team members to criticise the work that had been completed meant that we started the new year feeling defensive and distrustful. Some of the new team members were clearly uncomfortable with the situation, though they did not speak up.

**A vignette:**

A few days after this first incident, I was working at my desk on revisions to the rationale section of the syllabus, when one of the new team members requested me to hand over to her the document I was working on so that she could edit it. I told her that I was still working on the section but would pass it to her when I had finished. A few hours later I:

> was called to Carolyn’s office to hear that [ ] had complained about my blocking her access to the rationale. I explained to Carolyn that I was happy to pass it on to [ ] for editing once I had finished working on it but that I was still working through the rationale section and I didn’t want to hand over an incomplete document. I DIDN’T say to her that [ ] had asked me for the material so that she could “clean it up” saying, “I know that you have worked really hard on this but it is an awful mess and I will pull it into shape.” I am so angry I can barely speak! (Journal 25 January, 1999)

When the new members joined the team it was to be expected that there would be some shifts in working patterns and dynamics, but the confrontational way in which this particular member dismissed the work that we had done in the past caused an irremediable rift, evident in the team meeting on 16 February, 1999 which was called especially to focus on internal team communication.

At the same meeting it was noted that “all writing presently underway to be given to Barry Salmon for approval”. The trusting and respectful relationship between the team and the management of QSCC that had been established over time seemed to be fragmenting. It would be true to say that, from this time, the team never worked as one on the project, rather the project was characterised by a group of individuals with discipline-specific concerns, rather than an overarching, shared
vision of what the syllabus could be.

In such periods of instability it is easy to begin to doubt the credibility of one’s own position and decisions. I began to wonder if my colleague with drama experience had been chosen to change the direction of the drama outcomes. As I have said earlier, Ann Carroll was very keen on a traditional “speech and drama” approach and was approving of my appointment in the first place because I had my teaching qualifications in speech and drama and had run my own studio and prepared candidates successfully for examinations. It is worth noting that the second “drama” member of the team was not a member of QADIE and was firmly in the speech and drama camp. This made me doubt that I had the support of Ann Carroll and, more importantly, Carolyn, who may well have chosen ‘Elaine27’ to try to steer the syllabus away from the more processual drama education focus towards a voice production focus. I was determined that would not happen.

Elaine and I developed a positive working relationship and worked well for most of the project, though this was challenged when we began working on modules. Her experience and knowledge of teaching drama was based on the pre-service teacher training that she had experienced in the early 1970s, and which was very similar to mine at that point in time. Her approach was characteristic of drama pedagogy in the 1960s and 1970s and grounded in the work of Peter Slade (1954) and Brian Way (1967). She appeared not cognizant of the major paradigm shift, and the developments in both practice and theory that had occurred since and which had been implemented since the mid-1970s. By the time of this syllabus development project a more “process drama” approach had almost completely superseded the earlier model in both schools and in teacher education. Unless teachers of Elaine’s and my vintage were members of Drama Queensland and had accessed the professional development offered by that organisation, there was little chance that they had opportunities to engage with more contemporary discourse, practice and professional development in the field. When modules that Elaine had planned went out for review, the reports were not favourable, so I was required to modify them before publication. It is enormously difficult to hand over work that you have spend a great

---

27 A pseudonym.
amount of time on and are proud of, to someone else to “fix up”. Clearly these circumstances resonate with the event that caused my second journal entry above. The challenges of managing varying levels of experience with more contemporary drama education practice and differing viewpoints made difficult interpersonal dynamics an unwelcome priority.

A number of attempts were made to create a cohesive unit, including a “Shared Understandings Meeting” attended by the Acting-Director on March 29, where Linda and I were asked to talk through the history of the project and clarify the decisions that had impacted on the current shape of the documents. However this meeting was very tense and following it one of the new members stated that she “felt restricted” by the history of the project (Team meeting minutes, 30 March, 1999). From this time, our inter-team communications became formal and took place at our weekly team meetings, rather than time spent as a whole group discussing, planning and sharing ideas. Much of our time and work in 1999 and 2000 during the trial and pilot was spent out of the office, working in schools with the trial and pilot teachers. This phase was characterised by individuality and responsiveness to school needs rather than a cohesive group vision of the project.

**The Human Dimension – consultation**

While consultation continued to be fundamental to the process, the emphasis shifted strongly in favour of the trial and pilot schools. The on-line consultative network remained active but fewer people responded to the developing draft syllabus. The Arts SAC continued to meet four times per year, but the focus in these meetings was on the developing support materials. Feedback from the trial and pilot schools, who were after all working most closely with the documents, was what had the greatest impact on the changes to the outcomes. When the evaluator spoke to the SAC in August, 1999, she reported the “overall positive feeling that the project team is listening to the teachers and taking on board their concerns” (SAC meeting minutes, 20 August, 1999). The Arts SAC and the active participants in the on-line consultative network offered “bigger picture” advice now: specific wording within the rationale and responses to the Sourcebook Guidelines and Initial In-service Materials. Apart from the responses from teachers in schools, the greatest influences on the documents came from within the Office itself.
Internal office influences

Two “equity” officers had been appointed to the office in September, 1998. One had a special focus on students with intellectual and physical impairment and specific learning difficulties, while the other was charged with consideration of gender, multiculturalism, and socio-economic issues. From the time of their appointments these officers offered another layer of scrutiny and advice for the materials under preparation. Each draft of every document (syllabus, sourcebook guidelines, modules, outcomes and elaborations) went to the Equity Officers for feedback as part of the ongoing process of development. They looked at the documents for inclusive and exclusive language, accessibility for all students (considering gender, disability, cultural background, location and SES status). At the same time they developed guidelines for inclusivity which were to be considered when preparing materials, and to assist teachers in implementation in diverse contexts of schooling. These were later published on the QSCC website as .pdf files. As I have mentioned earlier, the Director and staff of the Office had a strong commitment to issues of equity and access. The SACs for all KLAs included representation from ATSI communities, special schools, and remote and rural locations. This commitment pervaded the process of preparation of all documents and, for the Arts Syllabus, a special equity group was brought together to scrutinise the almost final draft of the syllabus in early May 2000, before it went to Council for final approval.

A second internal office influence was the publishing process and existing protocols related to this. All KLA syllabus and support materials published by the office were to have the same look: font, style, layout on page, amount of text under specific headings etc. The Office procedures required “sign off” under four headings: text approval, editing approval, design approval, and publishing approval; with a total of 30 signatures required on any single document during the publication process (See Appendix 9.1). These signatures were required in the sequence of the publishing approvals form and, as you may imagine, took a great deal of time to collect because, at any stage, the document might have to go back to the author, illustrator, or designer for changes before continuing on the approvals track. Because there were a number of projects running concurrently in the publishing phase (SOSE, Technology, LOTE and The Arts), each with syllabus, sourcebook guidelines,
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28 Nine documents focusing on students with disabilities and learning difficulties were published. Following the amalgamation of the QSCC with the BSSSS and TEPA into the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA) in 2002, these documents are no longer available.

29 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander
modules, and in-service materials, documents began to pile up on desks and there was often a backlog of work waiting for approval.

**EQ2010**

In April 1999, Education Queensland published the “2010” document (Education Queensland, 1999) which proposed new directions for education in State schools in Queensland. Australia-wide, enrolments in government schools had been dropping as parents, especially middle-class ones, had exercised their right to choose, and moved their students to catholic or independent schools. The new Director-General identified this as a significant problem for Queensland state schools:

*The drift in enrolments erodes the funding base, undermines staff morale, and leads eventually to the situation in which the student population is severely skewed to the most disadvantaged social groups* (Moran, 1999, p. 4).

Catholic and independent schools employed more and more “sophisticated marketing strategies to gain a greater share of student enrolments” (Moran, 1999, p. 4) as their education funding increased in response to Commonwealth Government priorities. The “2010” document recognised the enrolment drift as a major problem for government schools.

*When linked to a dogmatic view that government is “only a purchaser of services” in open markets, the traditional value of public education is undermined and state schools are disadvantaged* (Education Queensland, 1999, p. 7).

The shift in enrolments was a result of a larger and more affluent middle class choosing not to send their children to state schools because they believed that independent and catholic schools would provide their children with more opportunities for social networking and better educational standards.

In addition a recent OECD report had been unfavourable to Queensland, pointing out the relatively low percentage of students who completed high school:

*Queensland lags far behind the leading OECD countries and the gap is widening. In 1998, 68 per cent of the age cohort completed Year 12. The leading quartile of OECD countries all achieved 85 per cent or better, and all have positive educational, social and economic policies in place to improve that figure* (Education Queensland, 1999, p. 7).

The “2010” vision for education aimed to entice students back into government schools and keep them there until they graduated. Of course this was
not entirely altruistic. The numbers of students in schools directly impacted on the calculation of funding for education from the Commonwealth government.

The product of Education Queensland’s future vision was the “2010” document and the proposal to develop a curriculum framework based on the New Basics (Education Queensland, 1999, p. 15) coordinating curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. It is paradoxical that Education Queensland had continually insisted that QSCC syllabuses be pedagogy free and would not address assessment, when their incoming Assistant Director-General, Professor Allan Luke posted the following statement on the Education Queensland website:

> If we want to change student outcomes, it’s a key axiom in curriculum theory that … the three message systems – curriculum, pedagogy, assessment – need to be brought into proper alignment for us to get desired education results and outcomes (Luke, 1999, p. 3).

He signalled dissatisfaction with outcomes-based syllabuses which had large numbers of outcomes:

> Most other Australian systems are struggling with issues of overcrowding, of overspecification of outcomes (100s of outcomes per KLA), and of reliance on large-scale testing (Luke, 1999, p. 4).

The publicity surrounding the introduction of the trial of the New Basics curriculum project in Queensland schools gained substantial publicity (and substantial funding) with rumours of around $40 to $50 million being allocated for the New Basics trial in 38 trial schools.

Luke went on to publicly state:

> I’m not attacking or defending any particular syllabus here, some of the individual curriculum documents are superb documents (especially two that I’ve had advanced preview on: the Studies of Society and Environment and the LOTE syllabi are outstanding pieces of curriculum planning) (Luke, 1999, pp. 5-6).

But the message was that the KLA syllabuses were to be superseded and it was apparent that Education Queensland intended to place its curriculum priorities elsewhere.

**Conflicting conceptions of Curriculum – the New Basics**

Messages from Education Queensland were confusing and contradictory. The Committee meeting (24 June, 1999) was informed that Professor Allan Luke, then at the University of Queensland, was commissioned by Education Queensland to “sow
the seeds of a new direction for EQ; he is not developing a curriculum framework.”
Obviously he was developing a curriculum framework, and one which would connect curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. In fact the information on the New Basics website states: *The New Basics are futures-oriented categories for organising curriculum* (Education Queensland, 2004). The four categories are described as “clusters of essential practices” and designated: Life pathways and social futures; Multiliteracies and communications media; Active citizenship; and Environments and technologies. The “triad” upon which the New Basics is founded was described as: New Basics – what is taught; Productive Pedagogies 30 [“borrowed from the American Authentic Pedagogies” (Harris & Marsh, 2005, p. 15)] – how it is taught; and Rich Tasks – how kids show it (assessment) (Education Queensland, 2004).

The publicity surrounding the New Basics and the new direction for State schools was substantial and ongoing. At the Curriculum Committee meeting in April discussion centred upon this topic. Representatives from Education Queensland made it apparent that the major aim of the 2010 strategy was for Education Queensland to become more competitive with other education authorities and to increase market share in the state sector. Therefore the Department had independently developed a new model of curriculum organisation which was in conflict with the model “agreed upon by all curriculum stakeholders in Queensland” (Curriculum Committee meeting minutes, 13 April, 2000). The New Basics project had begun with the notion of developing a framework for assessment and reporting. Thirty-eight schools began trialling the New Basics framework in January 2000.

In response to the confusion generated by this sudden change in direction Education Queensland made an attempt to reconcile the new curriculum trial with the work of the QSCC by saying that schools could draw on the KLA syllabuses to develop curriculum materials:

*Within the New Basics Framework (as employed by trial schools), there should be a definite contribution from KLA syllabus materials.*

*For “mainstream” schools using KLAs as their curriculum organisers (according to mandate), there are aspects of the New Basics Framework that could be usefully imported (e.g. alignment of pedagogy and assessment)* (Education Queensland, 2000, p. 10).
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30 There are 20 Productive Pedagogies including: higher-order thinking, deep knowledge, connectedness to the world, problem-based curriculum, academic engagement, explicit quality performance criteria, inclusivity, narrative, and group identity.
Specific “Rich Tasks” which drew on the four New Basics of learning were developed for students in Years 3, 6 and 9. In trial schools between 40% and 60% of school time was allocated to preparation for these tasks. Students were expected to successfully complete these tasks at the indicated stages of schooling (Education Queensland, 1999). I have selected from the seven provided tasks at Year 3 level those which had some aspect of arts learning but, clearly, that is limited. I have highlighted the “arts” aspects of the tasks. This was the curriculum model that was to replace the KLAs.

**Table 9.1 Sample Rich Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Rich Tasks (Year 3, November 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICH TASK – No. 1 Multimedia profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will show that they are able to create a multimedia presentation profiling a member of the school community. They identify people in the various communities associated with the school, collect information about them, check the accuracy of their ideas and involve the persons as members of the audience for their presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RICH TASK – No. 2 Web page |
| Students will show that they are able to create an interactive web page in order to communicate with students from other schools about themselves, their school and their community. They gather and organise information, present it in imaginative formats and respond in appropriate ways to questions and requests from other students. |

| RICH TASK – No. 7 Read and talk about stories |
| Students will show that they are able to read and view fiction stories, talk about characters and settings and compare representations in different stories and in different media with their own experiences of people and places. They present their ideas in words and through performance involving visual images, music, drama or dance. |

The first two tasks contain aspects of media and the final one asks the students to present information through performance, involving one or more of the arts. This use of the arts as an assessment practice is cause for concern. Teachers often ask students to “design” a poster or brochure but have not taught any elements of design such as foreground and background colours, font, and layout. Or they ask students to create a short dramatic scene without giving them the opportunities to learn about working in role, or structuring dramatic work. Students need opportunities to learn mastery of the form of assessment as well as the content that is being assessed.

It was distracting and disturbing to have Education Queensland making such a major shift in direction. But in some ways it was a relief to know that our suspicions of the decision-makers, and their intention not to support the work of the QSCC, were substantiated. We knew that the materials that we were developing would not be
given sufficient implementation support and this knowledge made us more determined to create materials that were engaging and enticing so that teachers would use them despite the lack of commitment by Education Queensland.

Over coffee break we started talking about New Basics … AGAIN!!!
I wouldn’t be surprised if our syllabus gets no implementation support at all. They are spending so much money on the New Basics schools. But this is curriculum by assessment. Anyway we decided that we will just have to create such interesting materials that teachers will want to pick up our stuff and use it. So the modules have to be fantastic! (Journal, 6 December, 1999).

Of course we had always wanted the materials to be “fantastic” but the situation made us more determined. It was at this time that Carolyn made the decision to include all print material on the CD-Rom and produce sufficient quantities for each teacher in the State to get an individual copy. Our motivation was to get as much of our material into teachers’ hands as possible. In hindsight, this was a very important decision. By the time our materials were ready for full implementation EQ agreed to appoint an implementation officer for each of the strands and to budget a total of $200, 000 for two years for the implementation. In contrast and at around the same time, the New Zealand Ministry of Education budgeted $5 million for drama alone and supported implementation for five years. After the first year of implementation in Queensland further budget cuts meant that the five arts implementation officers were reduced to two.

A small proviso here: the lack of commitment to the QSCC documents was exhibited mainly at the very highest levels of Education Queensland, i.e. Assistant Directors-General and above. Our colleagues from the Visual and Performing Arts Unit continued to work closely and supportively with us, perhaps because they, too, could not find a place for arts learning in the New Basics and Rich Tasks.

By this stage, the Arts project had attained its own momentum. We knew of the changes and ongoing discussions at senior levels of EQ, but they had little impact on our day to day work. The QSCC remained committed to completing the trial of the syllabus and the ongoing development of the accompanying curriculum materials and, with the commencement of the trial/pilot phase, we were simply too busy to worry about what might happen to the materials in the future. We continued the process of consultation, trial and development throughout 2000 and 2001.
The Trial

The trial began with a conference, *Engaging the Imagination*, held specifically for the trial schools but open to interested parties, on 11/12 February, 1999. Table 7.2 shows the number of schools and the first three clusters. The schools marked with an asterisk were P-12 schools and had a primary and secondary school on the same campus, so there were twelve schools in all involved in the trial. The conference focused on communicating expectations of the trial process, familiarising participating teachers with the draft syllabus, and beginning planning with the outcomes.

Table 9.2 Trial Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
<td>HS* – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
<td>PS* - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
<td>HS* – 1</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS* – 1</td>
<td>PS - 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
<td>HS* – 1</td>
<td>HS* – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS* – 1</td>
<td>PS* – 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total /High Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HS = High School; PS = Primary School; *P-12 school

I was attached to the Mackay cluster and visited the area twice each semester for three days each time. I spent most of those days in the schools meeting with the teachers, helping them plan and, occasionally, watching them teach. One of the days in the first visit was spent on a whole-day meeting with all the teachers in the trial schools with the purpose of clarifying expectations, planning, and raising issues of concern as we collectively researched the viability of the outcomes for planning. “Trial” is not an accurate term to describe the process undertaken, implying the testing of materials in school contexts. The orientation of this trial phase was towards consultation and collaboration in continuing to develop the curriculum, by drawing on the input and ideas of teachers who were attempting to plan with the emerging materials. The practice of engaging teachers in a collaborative curriculum development project such as this aligns with Stenhouse’s (1975, p. 133) approach for involving teachers in research for curriculum development:

1. Research should be located in the reality of the particular school and the particular classroom.

2. The research roles of the teacher and of the project team member should complement each other.
3. The development and maintenance of a common language is a prerequisite.
4. The role of the teacher as a researcher must relate closely to the role of the teacher as teacher.

Our intention was that the teachers and the Project Officers (POs) were collaborators in the process with roles that were complementary. The PO brought a deep knowledge of the document and the underlying principles of OBE, and the teachers added the contextual knowledge of the particular school. The materials were all trialled in the realities of particular schools and classrooms, with the teacher concentrating on their role as a teacher as they helped to co-develop and refine the materials. The conferences, the three shared cluster meetings per year, and the individual meetings with the PO were offered in an attempt to develop and maintain a “common language”.

Each team member understood the importance of developing a positive working relationship with the teachers that were part of “their” cluster. Sometimes this offered particular challenges.

**A vignette**

It is late in the morning of the second day of the trial conference. We are all tired and on edge, but happy because things seem to be going so well. I have been working with the Mackay group for two hours now and while most seem happy enough I see, in my peripheral vision, Alison’s face becoming stormier and stormier. I try to concentrate on what I am saying. I have to be clear and concise, but I am distracted by her unease. At last she can stand it no longer and bursts out, “What a load of rubbish I’ve been teaching for thirty years and this is rubbish. I tell you what I am going to do… I will plan exactly as you are telling us to, and I will prove that this whole process is a waste of time!” I, rather lamely, responded, “Thanks, Alison. That would be really helpful. We need teachers with your expertise to tell us what works and what doesn’t, so please do give it a shot and we will value your feedback” and went on with the rest of the planning workshop.

Alison was one of the most experienced and highly respected teachers we had on the trial. She is a music teacher and, at the time of the project, was renowned throughout the State for the quality of her work. The Principal of her school had nominated the school to be part of the trial and, it was clear, Alison was not convinced that it would be worth her effort.

I became really nervous of her, because of her authority and her vehemence. Before I went to Mackay for the first trial visit (22-24 March) I rang all the teachers to chat about how they were going. Alison was the very last person I rang.

“This is great! I can’t tell you how much it has changed my teaching practice. I did exactly what you said. I planned as you told us to and my classes have been transformed. The students know exactly what is expected of them. They just come into class now and get started. I used to
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31 Condensed and written from a number of journal entries between February 12 and March 28, 1999.
32 A pseudonym.
have to play some game or do something enticing to get them motivated but I don’t have to waste time with those activities any more. We all just get on with learning music.”

I couldn’t believe my ears, but when I went to Alison’s school and sat in on her class it was great. The students were focused and she was “exhilarated” by the way that using the outcomes had changed her classes.

It is ironic that the teacher who worked the hardest at planning in order to “prove us wrong” became our greatest advocate.

The conference had been opened up to interested parties and, at the following Arts SAC meeting, one member (a Principal of a State primary school) reported that he went back to his school and told the staff that, “it would work and it would not be difficult, but it would take time and effort. He described it as a “liberating” syllabus, providing a chance to explore new areas” (SAC meeting minutes, 5 March, 1999)

However, once again the process of consultation brought contradictory information to the surface. Some participants in the trial were positive about the consultation process while others felt it was “flawed”.

- I feel this process of developing a syllabus is essentially flawed. It is ultimately a path to mediocrity, getting everyone’s opinion. It should be developed by experts who then wear the flak. However, the document is one everyone can live with.
- There is good representation of relevant stakeholders in the development and exposure to the syllabus.
- I am pleased to be involved in this important project knowing that an isolated place [like mine] can influence the development of the syllabus so that it suits all Queensland schools (Second evaluator’s report January 2000 p. 3-4).

Meetings with schools

The months between the February conference and the preparation of the pilot draft to be sent for editing in August were very busy. We reworked the outcomes, core content, and level statements. We began the creation of the glossary and refined the elaborations of the outcomes for the sourcebook guidelines. And we visited the trial schools at least three times to provide support with planning and implementation.

Though we were responsible for specific clusters it was expected that, when we were in the office, we would be available to attend meetings in the nearby schools. In addition if specific subject area expertise was requested at one of the more distant school clusters, additional POs would travel to provide the required support. For example, the visual art PO and the music PO travelled to Mackay with me on my
second visit in response to requests from teachers there. For most of the weeks during this period we were out of the office and in schools for two to three days per week.

**The pilot**

The pilot phase followed directly after the trial. During the trial a large number of changes had been made to the outcomes and it was hoped that the latest set of outcomes would remain fixed throughout the pilot, to allow the Project Officers and the teachers in schools to test the outcomes in a broader range of school contexts and co-develop work exemplars that would become part of the curriculum package. The focus in this phase was on the development of support materials, especially modules.

**The pilot conference**

A further 72 teachers in 24 schools joined the development process at the “Creating Connections” Conference 11-12 October, 1999 to pilot the redrafted syllabus. The 108 primary and secondary teachers in the pilot process were grouped in clusters in Mt Isa, Cairns, Mackay, Sunshine Coast, Caboolture, Toowoomba, Logan and Brisbane.

The pilot teachers used the syllabus and support materials for planning and assessment and provided feedback informally to the project team and formally to the external evaluators. Since the first two evaluation reports focused on the draft syllabus, their findings strongly influenced the redevelopment of the draft syllabus into the current draft provided to the curriculum committee.

**Table 9.3 Numbers and locations of Pilot Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Location</th>
<th>State High Schools</th>
<th>Independent High Schools</th>
<th>Catholic High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane/ Caboolture</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 3</td>
<td>PS – 2</td>
<td>PS – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 2</td>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 2</td>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS – 1</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toowoomba</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
<td>HS – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 2</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
<td>PS – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Isa</td>
<td>HS – 2</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
<td>HS – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS – 2</td>
<td>PS – 0</td>
<td>PS – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total / High Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Evaluation Process

The QSCC was committed to an external evaluation of all curriculum materials as a way of ensuring public accountability. Consequently an advertisement for expressions of interest in the external evaluation of The Arts Curriculum was placed in the Courier Mail on 23 February, 1999 with a closing date for applications of 18 March, 1999. The intention was to employ a group or consortium with the capacity to evaluate curriculum materials across all the arts. The specifications included that the evaluators were to provide advice on the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of The Arts materials in meeting the needs of schools. The evaluators were required to provide three reports, which were given to the Arts team and also tabled at the Curriculum Committee and Council meetings. This allowed for impartial and external advice to be shared with the team and with the Council. The three reports were published early in July 1999 in time for the incoming pilot schools; in mid-January 2000; and in June 2000 in time for revisions to be made to all the documents before seeking final endorsement by Council.

The evaluators, Ed Data, were introduced at the Arts SAC meeting June 4, 1999. At this meeting they explained that they would focus on teachers’ responses to the materials with an emphasis on translation of the documents into practice, the “operational” (Eisner, 1994, p. 33) curriculum of the classroom.

Report 1

Ed Data provided the first report in July, 1999 in time for feedback to be acted upon before the conference for Pilot Schools, which had originally been planned for August but was postponed till October because the original dates clashed with state-wide tests in primary schools. This report focused on the responses of the trial teachers to the draft syllabus and its workability. Teachers were asked to rate the syllabus overall, the rationale, the level statements, the core learning outcomes and the advice given in the assessment section. Overall, responses were positive:

*In the interviews, the trial teacher gave moderate to high ratings of the syllabus and its components as practical documents for teachers. Only the Assessment section drew mostly low ratings because of a perceived lack of specific direction* (EdData, 1999, p. 14).

Suggestions for improvement included the simplification of the core learning outcomes, consistency of definition and use of terms across the five art forms, and
clear practical guidance in the assessment section. The Executive Summary concluded:

The trial version of the syllabus has been judged quite favourably. As expected there are many ways in which improvements can be made, but the syllabus is soundly based on a thorough project design brief and it promises to develop into the foundation for valuable learning experiences for students in the compulsory years of schooling.

The impact of the syllabus can be expected to accumulate over a period of several years as teachers become increasingly expert in its implementation and students build upon their learning as they progress through the levels.

The curriculum defined by the syllabus has the potential to establish an identity and status for The Arts as a key learning area within the Queensland curriculum for schools (EdData, 1999, p. v).

Report 2

The second report (January, 2000) focused on trial and pilot teachers’ responses to the pilot phase of the project, the draft syllabus, the draft elaborations and the sample modules. Data was collected via an external review of the materials by selected expert consultants in each art form; interviews with a sample of 30 of the teachers in the pilot schools; and a survey of all teachers in the pilot schools.

The report’s most pleasing findings were:

- the positive results of the external review of the sample modules
- the high level of support for the draft syllabus in the pilot schools
- the success of the draft elaborations
- the expectation among most of the pilot teachers that the new curriculum will improve student learning in the arts
- the levels of optimism and motivation about the second term of the pilot that were encountered in many of the interviews (EdData, 2000a, p. vi).

However this report identified some problems. The teachers asked again for further simplification of the outcomes, increased specification in content and levels, and for consideration to be given to amalgamating or omitting strands in primary schools. The last comment was a response to the interviews which indicated that many primary teachers lacked confidence in their own expertise in all strands, but especially Media, Dance and Drama. (EdData, 2000a, p. 28). However it was contradicted by the survey data reported earlier in the document:
Among the primary teachers, around two-thirds supported the general direction taken by the draft syllabus, with Drama drawing the highest level of approval, Media and Music the lowest (p. 8).

The evaluator’s report was considered at the Arts SAC meeting on 15 March and the possibility of cutting back on areas in the primary school was discussed for some time. The committee felt it was unfair to recommend the removal of some areas in primary school due to the contradictions within the report itself (e.g. that 62% of primary teachers felt comfortable with the drama strand, the second highest rating of the art forms33, while drama was recommended as one of the areas to cut from the primary curriculum). Other reasons for retaining the existing syllabus structure were that it was unfair to draw conclusions at this stage since the pilot teachers had only been introduced to the documents in mid-October 1999 and the school year finished for Independent and Catholic schools at the end of November. With end-of-year assessment and reporting, it was unlikely that many teachers had really had a chance to plan or implement their planning. Consequently the Arts SAC overrode the recommendation that the number of arts areas to be offered in primary schools should be reduced, and the project continued on track.

Feedback accepted from this report included continuing to simplify language and terminology. The sample modules provided at the conference were well received by teachers.

I feel that this module not only fulfils the requirements of the syllabus, but also represents sound educational practice. Considered as a whole, this module is a very successful and impressive piece of work (EdData, 2000a, p. 30).

Responses to the draft elaborations were also positive:

I go straight to the elaborations for clarification. I work with the elaborations all the time. Our understanding of the outcomes will be strong as a result of working with the elaborations. These allow us to fully document what we want the kids to achieve. Without them we could easily misinterpret [the outcomes] (EdData, 2000a, p. 12).

Report 3

The final report was presented in June, 2000 and accompanied the final draft syllabus to the Curriculum Committee and the Council meetings. This report was very

---

33 Primary teachers who felt comfortable with their preparation to teach the arts strands: Dance 38%; Drama 62%; Media 32%; Music 50%; and Visual Art 68%. (EdData, 2000a, p. 26)
positive in all aspects stating, “The progress of the pilot in its second term was much improved over the first term,” (EdData, 2000b, p. v).

I will quote extensively from the Executive Summary:

A recurring theme in this and the previous evaluation reports has been the expression of concerns that primary teachers will be intimidated by the curriculum documents in terms of their volume and the organisation around five art forms that many will not feel qualified to teach. Apparently, the high levels of direct support provided by the project team were instrumental in making the draft documents effective for the teachers, helping them to overcome any initial apprehension about the documents and showing them in small groups and individually what the documents mean and how to implement the draft curriculum in the classroom.

We conclude that the draft curriculum, as defined by the draft syllabus, sample modules and draft sourcebook guidelines, is highly appropriate for a core curriculum in Years 1 to 10\(^{34}\). It has the potential to raise the profile of the arts considerably in schools and to broaden the ambit of the arts within the curriculum, especially in the primary years. It has the potential to improve outcomes in the arts for many students. The materials are effective in defining the curriculum in terms of outcomes. The sample modules are effective in giving teachers practical ideas on how to implement the syllabus. The elaborations and typical demonstrations are highly effective in explaining the key learning area to teachers in practical terms. The curriculum is realistic in terms of resource demands and the indicative time allocation for The Arts.

A real risk exists however that the draft curriculum will fail at implementation without strong advocacy and teacher support from schooling authorities (EdData, 2000b, p. vi).

We had long been aware of this last point but implementation was outside the province of the Council.

\(^{34}\) My emphasis.
Teacher support or teacher proof materials

Giroux and McLaren (1989) warn that the deskilling of teachers goes hand in hand with what they term “management-type pedagogies” evident in pre-packaged “teacher-proof” curriculum materials. These one-size-fits-all materials, so often seen nowadays, “do not require the use of the teacher’s judgement, … demean teachers and … expect them to function as automatons rather than professionals” (Eisner, 2002, p. 41). As I have tried to indicate throughout this document, the curriculum materials that were developed for the QSCC Arts project were developed with sensitivity to the diversity of schooling contexts throughout the State. However we were constantly requested by teachers, schools and systemic authorities to provide detailed and specific materials for teachers to use as the basis of their planning. In the Chapter 7 I illustrated the changes to the outcomes, core content and level statements that were a result of both consultation and Office decisions. The specificity that teachers were requesting would be found in the arts area-specific “elaborations” and the modules that were prepared in conjunction with the trial and pilot processes.

Sourcebook Guidelines

The Sourcebook Guidelines was made up of a single book, which gave detailed advice on planning and some more advice on assessment, the “elaborations” for each core learning outcome, and a set of “modules” which were exemplars of planning. Teachers in the trial and pilot schools responded positively to the elaborations in particular, and many of them would plan and assess from the “elaborations” without going to the syllabus because all of the information they required for planning was provided in the elaborations. We attempted a range of page layouts for the elaborations (see Appendix 9.2 for extracts from draft elaborations) and reworked them with advice from teachers to make them as user-friendly as possible. The first set of drama elaborations were tabled at the Arts SAC meeting on March 5, 1999. These matched with the first set of outcomes and were substantially drawn from the original QADIE submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborations - February 1999 draft: reworked from QADIE submission.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain a range of roles and relationships drawn from school/community issues, historical and fictional contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Students manage focus, time, space, language, movement, and use mood and symbol in contributing to the creation and shaping of dramatic situations, roles and narratives using dramatic conventions and where appropriate incorporating basic scriptwriting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negotiating, creating and sustaining role: building aspects of the role (e.g. language, status, body language, attitudes, motivations), maintaining the role during the drama, remaining focused and committed to the task.*
Dramatic forming techniques and strategies: using conventions such as hot seat interviews, stream of consciousness (during the dramatic action the participant gives a running commentary which makes explicit the thoughts and feelings of the character), frozen effigies, mantle of the expert. (Content and/or context may be drawn from other KLAs),

Basic scriptwriting exploring ways to frame the action (inside the event – participants are characters directly involved in the action; on the edge – the characters are directly associated with the action but removed through differences in time or place; outside – these characters are removed completely from the direct action, e.g. argument between father and daughter, on the edge of the action are other family members, outside the action is the girlfriend who hears about it later), structure drama using basic narrative structure (introduction, exposition, climax and resolution), manipulating time (continuous and episodic action), dialogue, language, roles and relationships. Use script layout and format.

The elaborations above attempted to “unpack” the language of the outcomes so that teachers could see the relevant content and processes at each level and apply these in their planning for the specific school context. Even at this early stage the Arts elaborations were far more substantial than the published elaborations in other areas. For example the table below shows an elaboration from the published Science Sourcebook Guidelines at Level 4 (QSCC, 1999, p. 20). As you can see the information provided to assist teachers in planning for this “Earth and Beyond” core learning outcome is minimal and content-based.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earth and Beyond 4.1 Students recognise and analyse some interactions (including the weather) between systems of Earth and beyond.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some interaction between systems of the Earth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• between atmosphere, water and land – weather, water cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• between land and water – weathering, erosion, mountain building, changing course of rivers, formation of rocks (sedimentary, metamorphic, igneous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some interactions between systems beyond Earth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• between Earth, moon and sun – moon phases, tides, eclipses, day, night, seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• interactions in the solar system – orbit, rotations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• asteroids, meteors, comets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• space exploration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have indicated earlier that assessment was an issue that was of great concern to teachers on our project. This was also the case for the other Key Learning Areas and, in March 1999, the Director set up a working party made up of a colleague from the HPE team, the Science team and myself, to begin developing a set of guidelines for assessment and reporting which he intended to publish (QSCC, 2002). His decision to provide advice on assessment and reporting was contrary to the directives that had come from Education Queensland. However teachers and schools in the trialling of each of the KLAs continued to request support in this area.
and it was becoming untenable for the staff of the Office to refuse to offer advice on assessment and reporting. The “Position Paper and Guidelines” mapped out the principles and processes that should be followed when planning and assessing with outcomes. The Director was aware that this would produce friction between the QSCC and Education Queensland but, at this stage, there were strong indications that Education Queensland was intending to take a different path (New Basics) and Jim felt it was important to respond to the requests from schools and the other systemic organisations for advice on assessment.

My involvement on the assessment project gave me yet another job to do, but was invaluable in developing my understanding of outcomes and how to work with them in planning and assessment. One of the tasks we set ourselves on the assessment project was to identify the “know and do” inherent in all of the outcomes and track the development and complexity of these upwards throughout the levels e.g.

| DR3.2 Students rehearse and present dramatic action for a specific purpose.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students know</th>
<th>What students can do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rehearsal procedures</td>
<td>refine work in rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of performance</td>
<td>apply performance skills from core content Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| DR4.2 Students present devised and scripted drama using performance skills appropriate for a variety of purposes and audiences. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students know</th>
<th>What students can do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purpose of performance</td>
<td>refine work in rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience profile</td>
<td>apply performance skills from core content Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| DR5.2 Students present selected roles using performance skills appropriate to the selected dramatic form, style and purpose |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students know</th>
<th>What students can do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conventions of selected form or style</td>
<td>analyse the script to determine motivation, context, sub-text, style and given circumstances of the character they are playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conventions of selected role/s</td>
<td>apply performance skills from core content Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This became a major focus of my work for the next eighteen months, and was highly influential in the reshaping of the elaborations for the Arts project team. The Assessment team began to use the term “Typical Demonstrations” to describe what teachers might look for when students were being assessed. So, “typical demonstrations” became part of the elaborations for the first time in the draft presented at the Pilot conference (11/12 October, 1999) e.g.

35 Purposes in Level 3 Core Content are celebration and expression.
36 Purposes in Level 4 Core Content are entertainment and information.
37 Purposes in Level 5 Core Content are education and promotion. Forms and styles are clowning and physical comedy, collage drama, process drama, realism.
DR4.1 Learners, individually and in groups, apply dramatic elements to build, shape and manage dramatic action drawn from school and community issues, and historical or fictional settings. They present devised and scripted drama for presentation to a specific audience. They begin to use script-writing techniques. Learners use drama terminology when making critical judgments about drama experiences.

Typical demonstrations – the learner may:
- respond appropriately to others in role
- accept changes of role within the drama
- contribute to the drama when in role
- apply a range of language registers to differing roles
- suggest possible directions and future scenarios for the drama
- use a range of movement styles
- manage changes in time and space
- convey location through language, movement or simple set
- show relationships through the use of space and levels
- respond to changes of mood
- select specific objects, props or costumes to focus the action or enhance the mood

The more detailed elaborations found favour within the trial and pilot schools and in the on-line consultative network.

*The elaborations were great. The levels took a little bit of grasping last year but now we understand them. It is like putting on a different pair of glasses* (EdData, 2000b, p. 7).

*Elaborations: here you find the “guts” of the document. I went here all the time to get the detail for planning or knowing what was meant/needed for a particular CLO* (Secondary dance/drama teacher, fax response, 7 May, 1999).

*Elaborations: this stuff is vitally important to teachers who have (in the primary school) not been required to access arts praxis/learning previously. What a wonderful range of strategies* (QADIE representative, fax response, 2 February, 2000).

We removed the term “typical demonstrations” because some of the pilot teachers had been converting the dot points into a checklist of competencies where they felt that they must have ticked off all the dot points before they could say a student had demonstrated the outcome. The intention was that teachers should look at the outcomes and the students’ work more holistically and in particular assessment contexts rather than reducing an outcome to a list of competencies that were context-free. In the syllabus we had emphasised the interrelationship of the three outcomes in each arts area at any level.
| Core content | 
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Elements** | **Conventions** | **Forms and styles** | **Performance skills** |
| focus | role-reversal | improvisation | characterization: maintain appropriate role |
| mood | develop action from given circumstances | published scripts | experimentation with different performance spaces |
| symbol | speak thoughts aloud (in role) | student-devised scenarios | movement: vary for character and stage space |
| | role-reversal | written: character profile, plot outline | voice: audibility, pitch and clarity, adapting projection for different spaces. |

| Audience | Purpose | 
|---|---|---|
| formal and informal: other year levels, family and friends. | entertainment | information. |

**DR4.1 Students select dramatic elements and conventions to collaboratively shape improvisations and roleplays.**

**Select dramatic elements and conventions:**
- consider roles that are directly involved in a situation or narrative (athletes involved in a controversy while preparing for the Olympics) and how their perspective may differ from roles outside or on the edge of the narrative, such as the sponsors of the event
- employ role-reversal to play roles from opposing perspectives
- explore the use of objects, props, costuming and colours to enhance the dramatic meaning
- explore ways of changing the mood by using language, movement, space and time and how this affects the dramatic meaning
- select elements from the core content at this level and from previous levels and manage these in the shaping of improvisations and roleplays
- speak thoughts aloud, tapping into individuals’ thoughts at key moments
- write character profiles and plot outlines, including elements, to assist in improvisations and roleplays.

**Collaboratively shape improvisations and roleplays:**
- apply elements and conventions from this and previous levels to improvisations and roleplays
- participate in games and workshops to develop spontaneity and the skills of improvisation
- participate in small group and whole class roleplays
- work in groups to improvise short scenes based on some given information, such as characters, circumstance and time
- work in groups when contributing to the direction of improvisations and roleplays.

**Students may:**
- accept changes of role when necessary within a drama
- change the mood of an improvisation or roleplay by introducing new information e.g. tired and depressed shipwrecked sailors when land is unexpectedly sighted
- enhance the mood by applying language and/or symbol e.g. individuals clutching and caressing an object of personal significance and then placing it in a box as a list of emigrants/refugees is read aloud signifying their departure for a new life in Australia
- play a range of roles which present differing perspectives on the issue or narrative e.g. an environmental issue where voices heard may be from land-owners, traditional owners, environmentalists, developers, government representatives
- select and use specific objects, props or costumes to focus the action or enhance the mood
- use an object in a repeated way so that it comes to have its own meaning e.g. a rocking chair represents generations past and present; a sun can represent a new beginning; a photograph can represent a memory
- contribute to improvisations when in role
- respond appropriately to others when in role
- select and sequence moments of drama and drama narratives with the conscious purpose of informing an audience about an idea, issue or event.
In all strands, the learning outcomes are interrelated, complementary and interactive. The order is not hierarchical, and they should be considered together when planning for learning and assessment (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002b, p. 14).

Because of the decision to level core content (described in Chapter 7), we decided to present the elaborations for each level of each strand on a single A3 page (across two A4 pages for publication). This page contained all the syllabus information that a teacher needed for planning at that level on one page: the level statement, core content, core learning outcomes, the outcomes “unpacked”, and information about what teachers may look for that indicated the students were demonstrating the core learning outcome at that level.

The extract from the Sourcebook Guidelines at Level 4 (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002a, p. 44), Table 9.4, shows the core content, core learning outcome 4.1 unpacked and suggestions of what students might do when they are demonstrating their learning in relation to this core learning outcome. This was the final, published layout of the elaborations in the Sourcebook Guidelines. The detail was another attempt to make the materials enticing and easy to use for teachers. All information required for planning for learning and assessment with the outcomes at each level was presented on one page: the core content and the outcomes as well as the “unpacking” of those outcomes. “Unpacking” meant two things. The first part of the table under the outcome statement aimed to assist the teacher in understanding the language of the outcomes. For example, under “select dramatic elements and conventions” I tried to use language and examples to suggest what that might mean. A particular challenge was to connect the examples with the specified core content at this level and I tried to make sure that all the core content was included in the hope that a teacher who was using this material for planning was able to scan the page and see the links made explicit between the language of the outcome and what that might mean in relation to the core content at each particular level.

It seems to me that this is an important aspect for helping teachers to plan for themselves and not just implement pre-planned drama work that they find from other sources, including the modules that we provided. Teachers need to be able to understand the outcomes and plan with them for their own context.

Under “Students may” I tried to provide specific examples of the types of things that teacher might observe students doing as they demonstrated the outcomes. This was not intended to be used as a “checklist” of behaviours and so I tried to provide examples that could be drawn from a diverse range of dramas and dramatic contexts. And, again, I tried to weave the core content into the language of
the examples of possible demonstrations. You will notice that instead of using the term “typical demonstration” the heading is deliberately non-specific, “students may”, and this was another attempt to avoid this information being used as a list of competencies that could be “ticked off” by the teacher as they noted a student “doing it”.

We were writing this material with the belief that implementation support for the syllabus would be minimal and with the aim of providing as much detail in as simplified a form as possible. We aimed to provide a set of documents which extended “an invitation to teacher and students to enter into it” (Aoki, 2005c, p. 362). By doing this we hoped that teachers would be able to find their own entry points to the documents and, even with little or no professional development, be comfortable with attempting to plan with cognisance of diversity and the lived curriculum of their classrooms. We sought to avoid “a curriculum imperialism that calls for a sameness” (Aoki, 2005c, p. 362). There were days when it all seemed pointless. We knew very well that teachers are so busy with their day-to-day work that they rarely have the time, or the inclination, to grapple with new ideas or material on their own. Feedback from the trial and pilot teachers reinforced this. They told us and the external evaluators how invaluable the support of the project team was in helping them come to understand the outcomes and how to plan and assess with them. However the signals from EQ did not encourage us to believe that there would be much implementation support. So the language that we used in the elaborations was the language that we used to explain to teachers in schools and, while we knew that printed materials are no substitute for professional interactions, they offered the best medium available to us. In retrospect this was another wise decision. As I have mentioned before the implementation support provided by EQ was minimal and then cut back following budget cuts. However the drama implementation officer, who was employed for a time, has since told me that, “The teachers love the elaborations. That is where they go to plan. They ignore the syllabus because it is too wordy, and just use the elaborations” (J. Dunn, personal communication, 7 June, 2005). It seems that providing all of the information that we did, on just one page for ease of access, was a worthwhile activity.

**Modules**

As I discussed in the previous chapter we wrote “exemplar” modules of work that used the outcomes as the basis for planning. Sixty modules (see Appendix 9.3) accompanied the Sourcebook Guidelines. The structure of the modules followed the office template. Modules were not intended to be units of work or series of lessons.
Instead a module “demonstrates one way of planning and assessing learning outcomes in a given context. Teachers are encouraged to modify modules to meet the specific needs and interests of particular groups of students” (Queensland Studies Authority, 2002a, p. 2).

It was difficult to write the modules until the pilot was well underway. The outcomes were in a continual process of change until June 2000 so, though the intention was to have the modules produced as part of the trial/pilot, the changes in outcomes made this impossible.

We had prepared primary and secondary modules as exemplars for the Pilot Conference (e.g. *A Novel Idea* and *Pigs Can Fly*) and these were reworked and refined as the outcomes were further developed.

Primary teachers’ responses to *Pigs Can Fly* were enthusiastic:

> the module provides documentation to in-service teachers working in unfamiliar strands. This cross-arts module is fun and exciting and ideas are presented broadly to facilitate diversity. The context of learning through orientating, enhancing and synthesising are strongly presented throughout the concepts of the module (EdData, 2000a, p. 31).

However, secondary teachers from the trial and pilot schools did not use the sample module as they had pre-planned existing units of work in their school programs. Because the pilot conference had been scheduled so late in the year, the new teachers who had joined for the pilot phase did not have sufficient time to come to understand the changes in planning, pedagogy and assessment required if they were to implement an outcomes approach and felt that they could use existing materials with an overlay of the outcomes. This was problematic and we had to spend a good deal of time re-planning when it became apparent that trying to squeeze existing units into the new “outcomes” framework made for an uncomfortable fit.

There were two reasons for this. The first was that most junior secondary units that were in existence at the beginning of the pilot had been written with the Senior Drama syllabus as the underpinning framework. The Senior Drama syllabus was unequivocal that there should be no “double-dipping” i.e. that assessment could not use work developed in the “forming” dimension for “presenting” assessment and “presenting” could not be used for “responding assessment. This produced, in the Senior Secondary school programs, units of work that focused solely on “forming” or “presenting” or “responding” and this practice was continued because teachers who were teaching senior drama classes also taught the junior classes. In contrast, this
Syllabus was recommending that the three dimensions be “interrelated, complementary and interactive” so the separation that was required in planning senior units was undesirable. The second reason goes hand-in-hand with the first. Previously planned units had assessment tasks at the end of the unit and these focused on only one or two of the dimensions: forming, presenting and responding. The assessment practices we were recommending were that evidence of students’ demonstrations of outcomes be made over time and in more than one context, so the common practice of one single assessment item at the end of a unit did not suit the new curriculum.

Most of the drama modules38 (see Appendix 9.4) were written after the completion of the pilot phase of the project, once the outcomes were finalised. It had been intended that the modules would arise from the work of the teachers in the pilot phase of the project but few did. Only two of the teachers involved in the trial and pilot were experienced drama teachers. One of these was forced to withdraw from the pilot phase because her school opted to become one of the New Basics trial schools and the other was too busy with administration duties within her school to contribute a module. The pilot phase was too short (only one semester of teaching) to allow materials to be developed and refined. I had written two modules for the pilot conference. Pigs Can Fly was co-written with my visual arts colleague from within the office, and I had written A Novel Idea on my own. Race around the Block was written by one of the pilot teachers and trialled at her school. It was given to me in draft form and I reworked it to strengthen the links to the final set of outcomes, adding additional activities and assessment. My colleague Elaine had written the first drafts of A Home for Teeny-Tiny, and The Disappearing Sands, and I revised these using the final set of outcomes at the end of 2000 and throughout 2001.39 Once the pilot phase had finished in June, 2000, our work between July and December focused on editing the syllabus and sourcebook guidelines, and designing the structure of the CD-Rom with Reel Image, the production company who had successfully bid for that contract. So most of the modules were written during 2001.

At the beginning of 2001, I had completed two modules that were in the final stage of editing and approvals and two more that were under revision. I was required to write eight more before I finished my secondment at the end of the year. Module writing was only a part of my job at this stage. At the same time I was co-writing the
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39 Elaine left the project at the end of 2000 to return to her position as Deputy Principal of a local Primary school.
Initial In-Service materials with Carolyn, visiting schools to collect video footage with the film crew from Reel Image and then selecting the short sequences that we could use on the CD-Rom, finalising the Policy and Guidelines on Assessment and Reporting with my two colleagues from Science and HPE who were still seconded to the QSCC, etc.

**Initial in-service materials**

The final book accompanying the syllabus, sourcebook guidelines and modules was the *Initial In-service Materials* (IIM). This document was a package of seven modules to be used for the in-servicing of teachers by the school administration, or that teachers themselves could use as a self-paced package. The IIM book contained information about the curriculum materials, an outcomes approach, learning in the arts, planning and assessment, and curriculum evaluation. Most of the text in this document was generic text, common to all the IIMs that had been produced by the already completed KLA projects, with some “tweaking” for The Arts. The components had been finalised by the Science and HPE teams, which were the first projects to finish and we were bound by the internal office policies to adhere to the content, language and structure that had been used by those two teams. This was the document that was least modified for publication by our project.

However, another innovation made by the Arts project was the preparation of a CD-Rom which contained all of the print documents as both “Word” and .pdf files to allow teachers to cut and paste text into their own planning. As I have mentioned earlier this was an attempt to put the materials into the hands of every teacher in the State because the budget allowed us to produce one CD-Rom per teacher while the print materials had limited release. The CD-Rom also contained a glossary of terms and a help file to assist those teachers who needed aid in understanding terminology and application of strategies. In an attempt to help, once again, with assessment each outcome is illustrated by a short video clip of students in classrooms in our trial and pilot schools participating in activities that could be sample demonstrations of the outcomes. The use of video clips that showed “real kids and real teachers working in real classrooms" was the most innovative aspect of the CD-Rom. We deliberately chose not to use “best practice” exemplars as we thought this would be daunting for teachers who had neither the expertise, experience or resources that are evident in “best practice” materials. By using the work of our trial teachers in schools we were hoping to show that the materials were feasible in the diversity of school contexts in the State.
Chapter 10.

Collecting shells 3: influences and constraints in the trial/pilot phase

Implementation

During 1999 and 2000 it became more and more apparent that Education Queensland was not prepared to commit to the documents being developed by the QSCC, nor would Education Queensland commit to supporting implementation and mandation of the syllabus for all students. When the LOTE curriculum materials went to Council for approval in April, 1999, an Education Queensland representative requested the removal of the sentence:

“All students must be provided with opportunities to demonstrate relevant core learning outcomes during the compulsory years of schooling;”

because it signalled a requirement for Education Queensland in terms of implementation. When it was pointed out that similar sentences were approved in the previously published syllabuses of Science and HPE, he replied, “Education Queensland does not have the resources to implement LOTE for all students in Years 4 – 10.”

The Arts team’s response was to provide as much detail in the documents as possible and to develop the CD-Rom so that teachers were not reliant on system-provided professional development to help them plan and implement the materials.

The implementation plan supported by EQ was the distribution of all documents to schools (this was funded and provided by the QSCC) and the employment of an implementation team of five seconded teachers, located in the EQ headquarters, for a period of two years. QCEC and AISQ did not develop an implementation plan for their respective systems, relying instead on workshops provided by the professional associations and their freedom to access the implementation workshops offered by EQ. From 2001 to 2004 $1 687 650
(approximately half of which was wages) was allocated to support Arts syllabus implementation (M, Kenny, personal communication, September 21, 2007). EQ’s implementation process involved the implementation officers travelling, in pairs, to each of the 36 school districts and facilitating a 2-day workshop for representative teachers from schools within the district. The face-to-face workshops aimed to familiarise teachers with the syllabus on the first day and, on the second day, work towards establishing professional learning communities to support arts implementation – Arts Consultative Groups. The teachers who attended the workshops became the key contacts for the Arts Consultative Group within their respective districts. In addition the EQ Arts Implementation Team established an Arts website on EQ’s Learning Place (www.learningplace.com.au/ea/arts) for on-line discussion, and the sharing and dissemination of resources. The discussion in password-protected and only open to teachers employed in government schools but the resources are freely available. In September, 2007 the resources page contained:

- two units planned to integrate all five arts strands
- one dance unit
- one drama unit
- three visual arts units
- one document entitled “Literacy and the Arts”.

The latest upload was in 2005.

“The success or failure of an innovation is explained in terms of influences whose characteristics have been judged retrospectively “(Harris & Marsh, 2005, p. 30). To date there has been no State-wide systematic evaluation of the arts implementation by EQ (M. Kenny, personal communication, September 21, 2007) and therefore it is not possible to judge the “success or failure” of this curriculum.

However EQ implementation officers report that teachers responded positively to the syllabus and resources although “often they had not seen the materials until we showed them at the workshops, which was very frustrating given the fact that each school had them well prior to the sessions” (J. Dunn, personal communication, September 21, 2007). Teachers’ lack of time, unwillingness or inability to access the supplied curriculum materials was borne out by the only implementation report available (Years 1-10 Arts Syllabus Implementation Group, 2004) which also noted that teachers did not access syllabus documents prior to the
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40 By comparison, the Ministry of Education in New Zealand allocated $5,000,000 to drama alone and for a similar timeframe.
workshops (p. 3). However teachers responded encouragingly to the documents and “found the elaborations useful” (M. Kenny, personal communication, September 21, 2007). In general the elaborations were “very well received and the secondary folk thought they would be very useful” (J. Dunn, personal communication, September 21, 2007). Teachers were enthusiastic about CD-Rom but wanted more videos, especially of specific conventions being demonstrated in classrooms. They also “loved” the modules though primary teachers “couldn’t see themselves doing such a detailed unit in the arts!!!!!!” (J. Dunn, personal communication, September 21, 2007). As I suggested earlier assessment provided a particular challenge for teachers. Julie Dunn reported that “the secondary folk … were SOOOO confused and fixated by the assessment of outcomes and evidence gathering versus the single assignment … and reporting to levels. … I have to say the whole outcomes approach probably died because no-one sorted out the reporting structures first” (J. Dunn, personal communication, September 21, 2007).

EQ’s insistence to disallow any connection between the curriculum and assessment significantly weakened the work of the project teams in schools, and of the documents themselves. Teachers complained that there was insufficient assessment advice provided in the syllabuses and we were directed not to provide assessment advice to the trial schools, thus weakening our positions as authoritative voices in connection with the curriculum documents, and diminishing the effectiveness of the documents because teachers sought within them information that was not provided.

**Timelines**

Working on the Arts project was not all we were asked to do. The QSCC was a young organisation, having commenced work in 1996. Consequently some of the work of the Office personnel was to contribute to materials that were being developed within the office. For example, in addition to our arts-based workload in the three months between February and May we were required to provide written team responses to the:

- work education report
- values report
- literacy and numeracy report
- curriculum framework
- code of conduct – guidelines for ethical behaviour
- assessment discussion paper.
Such a heavy workload meant that, during this phase, we had little time for considered responses to feedback and our efforts concentrated on getting the job done rather than having opportunities to continue to consult and consider the implications of the decisions that we made, or were being made around us.

**Assessment and reporting**

The QSCC Director’s response to the growing concerns about assessment and reporting was to develop an Office position paper which aimed to provide detailed advice to teachers. This too, was undertaken with a consultative approach (though much more limited in scope than our curriculum consultation) and, once my colleagues and I had come up with a draft, an intersystemic committee was set up to provide advice and feedback on this document before it was approved for publication. The consultation on this document was limited to the members of the committee, which had a total of eight nominees from EQ, AISQ, QCEC and the Council itself, and colleagues from within the office. Professor Graham Maxwell, from the University of Queensland and an expert in assessment and reporting, was employed as a consultant to contribute to this document. The “Policy and Guidelines on Assessment and Reporting” was written between March 1999 and December 2000 when the penultimate draft was presented to Council. It was finally approved for publication at the Council meeting on 19 July, 2001.

This document had direct and significant impact on the Arts curriculum materials, especially the elaborations in the Sourcebook Guidelines. Instead of simply providing a list of content that could be covered in learning experiences planned from the outcomes, The Arts elaborations gave examples of evidence to look for when noting students’ demonstrations of the outcomes in a range of contexts.

Because The Arts had never been assessed in primary schools this information was invaluable for primary teachers.

**Integration**

We tried to offer examples of integration within the modules. Here was a place where it was possible to indicate potential links between one strand and others of The Arts KLA. They also allowed links to be made to outcomes and strands of other KLAs. A significant challenge was the “in-process” status of Technology, English and Mathematics, as not one of these KLAs had finalised outcomes. It was easier to link with Science and HPE, which were already published, and SOSE which was approved for publication during the pilot phase of The Arts project. A full set of approved outcomes from all KLAs would have made this task much easier.
Final approval of syllabus

The penultimate draft of the Syllabus was submitted to the Curriculum Committee for the 8 June, 2000 meeting. The Committee was asked to provide advice to the project team on the readiness of the Years 1 to 10 the Arts Syllabus for submission to the Council for approval.

The Curriculum Committee approved the document (Decision Number CC000608) and the draft syllabus was discussed at the Council meeting on 20 July, 2000. At this meeting the Council (Decision number C000713) approved the syllabus for publication, subject to editorial changes during the publishing process, but decided to hold the release of the syllabus until all of the accompanying documents were ready. This meant that teachers would have the complete set of documents to assist them to understand and plan with the materials, rather than providing the syllabus by the end of 2000, with the support materials to follow as they were published.

Questions about Consultation

Since the foundation of this project was based on broad and compulsory consultation it is worth considering some questions and issues that surround both the consultation process and the representative nature of the committee. First I will consider the nature of representation. The SAC was established to be a representative group so that the membership was drawn from people who were “known” within their own particular community to be able to contribute to discussion at a high level and (mostly) who had an understanding of and commitment to arts education. There were a few exceptions: the literacy representative from EQ had no experience of arts education and wanted us to adopt a language learning “concept based” structure rather than use the processes of art making as our conceptual organisers; the parent representative (who was sent by the Parents and Citizens Association) came to one meeting only and was never replaced.

In the case of this curriculum development process the union representatives were active contributors to the documents throughout the process and certainly made apparent their concerns about equity of student access and assessment. However, once the syllabus for publication and the Science and HPE Syllabuses and curriculum support materials were ready for distribution, the QTU changed its stance and complained that teachers would not be able to teach with these documents, threatening a ban on implementation. At the Council meeting (8/11/2001) the union president was asked to explain the Union’s position. She made it clear that the ban was not a reflection of the quality of the curriculum materials but rather, “prompted by
concern about ongoing professional development to support syllabus implementation”. The QSCC briefly became a “whipping post” for the lack of an implementation plan that included substantial support for teacher in-service and which was the responsibilities of the systemic education authorities, not the Council. At no point during the three years of the curriculum development process for any of the Key Learning Areas did the Unions lobby for improved teacher training, either pre-service or in-service.

At the first meeting of the SAC the “parent and community” organisation representative appeared uncomfortable and out of her depth. She was not someone who had an arts or arts education background and did not feel she could contribute to the project. From this time, she sent apologies for the meetings and did not attend another for the entire three years. On several occasions Carolyn, as PPO, wrote to ask if the association would like to nominate someone else, who might be more able to attend meetings, but that representative was not forthcoming. We were grateful that we could still meet the legislative requirements because several of the committee members had children of school age. There must be better and more effective ways of involving parents and parent groups in curriculum development. On the other hand the parent representative on the Council itself was one of our greatest advocates. Purely by serendipity she was a professional visual artist and was a passionate supporter of arts education. Once we moved up to the 27th floor of the main office where the Council meetings were held she introduced herself to us and then often dropped in to say hello and how important she felt our work was. This was very affirming at the time but just a lucky chance that she was such a positive voice for the arts. How can arts educators work in an informing as well as a listening way so that the community feels able and purposeful in their contributions, without giving rise to the “stealth” campaigns that Michael Apple (2004) identifies are waged by fundamentalist Christian groups and other pressure groups in US schools?

A crucial absence in the consultative process was the voice of students. Garth Boomer (1992) had been a strong advocate for student negotiation within the curriculum. As Jon Cook points out:

*Children also are people, and a capable of being successful negotiators. Like adults, children have needs, wants and points of view; they will work hard to get what they want; and they can understand the trade-off, involving the recognition of the inevitable constraints and the impossible. More than most adults, children are willing to strive to please, often for little better reason than it is expected of them. This willingness to*
please others and to accept the inevitable has, I believe, been unwittingly played upon by educators, who often seem too prepared to interpret that willingness as the lack of decision-making ability and less of individual intention. I would argue the contrary to be the truth: that when the opportunity to exhibit abilities is unavailable, those abilities will remain hidden and under-developed (Cook, 1992, p. 15).

Curriculum developers, whether at a school level or a systemic level, need to hear the voices of the children who are the greatest stakeholders in the curriculum. There are “systemic” models where student negotiation is central such as the Reggio Emilia approach (Abbott & Nutbrown, 2001; Katz & Chard, 2006) and the Waldorf schools (Bamford & Utne, 2006) but these models have not been incorporated into larger systemic organisations. We must find ways of bringing students’ “hidden and under-developed” abilities to the surface, incorporating the considerations of the “needs, wants, and points of view” that they are entitled to share. While I brought this up on a few occasions it was dismissed as unnecessary – “we can hear what the students think through the teachers” – by other team members.

It is highly problematic that there was nothing put in place to hear the voice of the students. I wonder whether if, and when, students are given real choice about the content and direction of their education we would find ourselves bound by existing timetables and discipline boundaries. In the six years between 1993 when schools began to offer Senior Drama as a subject and 1998 when we started this curriculum development project, enrolment in drama grew from 5090 to 6128, an increase of more than 20% (even though the total number of students changed little) and 1/5 of the entire cohort of Year 12 students. A number of factors may have influenced these figures (e.g. school resources and attention to the arts, the acceptance of Drama results for entrance to university on equal footing with all other subjects, word-of-mouth reports from students) but it is certainly possible that these figures rose in response to the desires of the student community (and their parents). What would this, or any other curriculum material look like if there was serious consideration paid to student voice in its development? We will never know, in terms of this project at least, because they were never directly asked. How could we have heard from them? During the trial and pilot phases, in particular, we missed opportunities to survey or
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41 Prior to 1993 students could study Speech and Drama or Theatre. In 1992, 2126 students studied Speech and Drama, and 2864 studied Senior Theatre. Source: qsa.qld.edu.au/yrs11-12/statistics (retrieved 25 April, 2007).
interview students. In terms of Boomer’s ideal of a negotiated curriculum, at least at a systemic level, we have a long way to go.

**Some reflections**

This part of the project was characterised by change and upheaval. As we continued to grapple with the heavy workload and short timelines, we were also confronted by changes of personnel, location and politically motivated changes at a systemic level from EQ.

The interpersonal dynamics of the team, coupled with the large amount of time we spent out of the office working with the trial and pilot schools, caused significant changes to the working processes that we had established in the first phase of the project. Team meetings became times to report what we had been doing and plan for future meetings and tasks rather than discuss ideas and issues. There was little opportunity to establish a shared commitment to and understanding of the curriculum materials. This may have been due to the confronting interactions that occurred when the additional team members joined the project at the beginning of 1999. Unfortunately the distrust resulting from the professional challenges that characterised those early interactions was never overcome and pervaded the team interactions for the remainder of the project.

The process of working closely with the trial schools contributed significantly to the reworking and refinement of the outcomes but the delay in the start of the pilot meant that there was insufficient time to truly put them to the test in the trial and pilot schools. Nor was there sufficient time to develop modules of work that were grounded in school practice. At the end of the pilot phase there was a good deal of work to be generated.

The external eye provided by EdData, the external evaluator, was invaluable in both substantiating the quality of the work that had been done, and influencing modifications that made the documents more teacher-friendly.

The changes at a systemic level (of Ministers and Directors-General of Education) introduced a large number of politically motivated changes and signalled significant changes in curriculum directions. There is no wonder that teachers are reported as suffering from “innovation fatigue” (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1993, p. 134). The shift in curriculum orientation toward the New Basics and the employment of Professor Alan Luke as an Assistant Director-General gave credence to our cynicism that EQ was not prepared to endorse the work of the Council in the public arena. For us this produced feelings of helplessness and futility as we came to believe that our work would have little impact in schools due to lack of support at a
systemic level. Contrarily we endeavoured to produce materials that would be provided to each teacher in the State and hoped that teachers would find them useful and accessible regardless of the lack of professional support.

Once again the Arts project met with unprecedented support when the final draft of the syllabus was presented to Council on July 20, 2000 and unanimously endorsed for publication. It was the first time a syllabus document had gained this level of support on first submission. Recognising the need for the full suite of documents to accompany the syllabus, the Council decreed that the distribution of the syllabus would be delayed until all supporting materials could be released contemporaneously as part of the package.

Five members of the Arts team, one for each strand of the syllabus, continued to work throughout 2001, revising and editing existing materials, writing new modules and developing the CD-Rom.

The full suite of documents was launched in June, 2002 at the Queensland Art Gallery, only months before the QSCC was amalgamated with the BSSSS and TEPA to become the Queensland Studies Authority, now the curriculum development and assessment authority for all Queensland Schools.

In Chapter 4, I provided information about the context of schooling and curriculum development in Queensland. Chapters 5 to 10 focused on particular aspects of this case and I endeavoured to highlight influences and constraints that arose during three phases of this particular curriculum development project. In the next chapter I will offer insights which may be useful considerations for future curriculum development initiatives.
In Chapters 6, 8 and 10, I have discussed the particular influences and constraints that were predominant during each of the phases (design brief; outcomes development; and trial/pilot) in answer to the main research question of this study: *What were the influences and constraints on the development of the Years 1 to 10 Arts Curriculum, as exemplified by the Years 1 to 10 arts curriculum documents, prepared by the office of the QSCC between 1998 and 2001?*

In this final chapter I will consider my original research question and the second question that emerged during the research in light of what the data has shown in the previous analysis chapters.

*How do we understand the role of a curriculum planner of centralised curriculum?*

In this final chapter I offer “shells” that have been thrown up by the changing tides during this project and ask that you hold them up to your ear and listen for the “lingering notes” (Pinar & Irwin, 2005) of insights that emerged in this particular curricular seascape. The shells are: 1) a proposal that we “curate” curriculum; 2) a framework for conversation about curriculum development; and 3) desirable qualities of a collaborative curriculum writer.

**Curating curriculum**

I propose that this is an example of curriculum curation rather than curriculum creation. Curator comes from the Latin *curare*: to care for and the job of a curator is to select, organise and look after the items in a collection or exhibition. Curatorship involves similar processes of selection and organisation as were evident in this curriculum development project. The role implies cognisance of existing practices and materials. For curriculum development the selection of content, concepts, and processes is made based on the work of previous curriculum developers, the theory of the field and the practices of teachers in schools. Just as the curator of an exhibition is constrained by the space and light available, so are curriculum...
developers constrained by the space within the existing curriculum and preconceptions grounded in time and location. Just as the curator of an exhibition organises and displays works, with care and intent for the perceiver to make meaning, so the developer endeavours to construct curriculum documents that allow for diversity of interpretation, encouraging educators and students to see familiar concepts and materials with new eyes. A walk through a gallery or exhibition allows for progression at one’s own pace; revisiting, and lingering when the work is enticing or puzzling, offering moments of quiet contemplation or questioning and discussion. Similar engagement with curriculum is desirable.

This curriculum is the result of such a process. Significant constraints on the curriculum development process were the “model of the state”, time allocations for the arts, the lack of pre-service and in-service teacher preparation for arts teaching, the power disjunctions between the systemic stakeholders, and the barriers to the curriculum that are inherent when the process is unable to address issues of implementation and assessment. While constrained by the framework of an outcomes approach which derived from modernist notions of curriculum design, the mandated consultation process afforded acknowledgement of the diversity of existing practices and implementation contexts. Writers of the documents took account of the ongoing and broad consultation, and were informed by the practice of teachers in schools, professional associations and theorists in the field. The work of the developers resisted a “prescriptive” approach and attempted to provide a framework for a curriculum which allowed for adaptation, interpretation and translation into a curriculum-as-lived experience for teachers and students in varied schooling situations.

A framework for conversation about curriculum development

Rather than a model for curriculum development that is fixed and linear I offer a “framework for conversation” about curriculum development. Curriculum has been characterised as a “complicated conversation” (Pinar, 2004b; Pinar et al., 2002).

As we participate, live, and dwell in such a conversation, our task is not only to speak well but also to listen well. We need to hear back, recursively, both our own words and those of others (Doll, 2002, p. 49).

This framework attempts to incorporate a reconceptualist approach and acknowledges the influence of Pinar’s currere (Pinar, 2004b, 1998; Pinar & Grumet, 1976; Pinar et al., 2002). The phases are recursive and dialectical, each informing the other, overlapping and diverging. The framework addresses Doll’s (Doll, 1993b)
“4 Rs” of richness, recursion, relations and rigor and is derived from the processes and principles that underpinned the project with notable consideration of the consultative process. Reconceptualists argue that neither is there a single model of curriculum development nor a single curriculum theory that encompasses and is suitable for all situations and contexts. Rather than being a model for curriculum development, the framework offers suggestions for principles and practices that allow for diversity and inclusion of stakeholders concerns. The boundaries between the phases are permeable and the phases themselves iterative and recursive, encouraging a “looping back of thoughts on thoughts” (Doll, 1993b, p. 255).

**Fig. 5.1 A framework for conversation about curriculum development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum development phase</th>
<th>Characterised by</th>
<th>Underpinning principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>a focus on “wants” (what do we want the curriculum to be), consultation, listening, discussion, debate, sharing, communication, reflection, contemplation, weighing up; both forward and backward looking.</td>
<td>ethical and open consultation; valuing diversity; considers but is unconstrained by history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>conceptual framework, design; selection and exclusion; linking, connecting, unifying; concentration/consolidation; collectivisation, working towards shared goals; accommodation of existing constraints</td>
<td>pragmatism, agreement, experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>dissemination; diffusion; distribution; multiple possibilities and interpretations; translation; transformation; consideration of context/local constraints</td>
<td>focus on learners and learning in specific contexts; valuing diversity; teachers as curriculum designers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The emergent phase**

This phase focuses on “wants” i.e. what do we want the curriculum to be. It considers the possible curricula of the future and the curricula of the past. The phase involves consultation which values diversity of context and supports input from the widest range of stakeholders, including students. Consultation procedures take account of the locations of power and control, and influences of these on representation and decision-making. Consultation is accountable and transparent in terms of
representation and opens avenues that can continue to support and value the input of all participants throughout the span of the project.

**Challenges in the emergent phase**

A difficulty for the curriculum developer is to listen to many responses and to balance competing and conflicting advice. Most of the respondents to the documents produced on this project valued the work that had gone into them and, because they could see their ideas and responses reflected in the documents, felt that attention was being paid to their considerations and concerns. Of concern in such processes is the tendency for those who agree with the direction of the curriculum to withdraw from giving input, and for the majority of responses to come from those who want changes made. These individuals may not be representative of a majority view and the curriculum developer finds it necessary to weigh up the input from all stakeholders.

In curriculum development at a systemic level the most powerful voices come from the systemic authorities themselves. To some degree this can be counter-balanced by the inclusion of authoritative voices within the consultative network, including parents, professional associations, academics, researchers, and students.

It is challenging for individuals and groups involved in curriculum development to move beyond reproducing the status quo. Embeddedness in existing practices and conceptions of curriculum readily produces more of the same. A positive is the grounding in current practice allowing for a high degree of teacher comfort with the materials and potentially an easy implementation process. On the other hand, the curriculum is constrained by familiarity: the need to provide materials and ideas that are not too new. Looking outwards to discover alternative approaches, and inwards to discover personal connections and hopes assists in producing a forward-looking, futures-oriented curriculum.

**The convergent phase**

*In conversation lie our hopes for both convergence and transformation: We become transformed as our differing views converge on that which is presently beyond us, and the situation itself changes or becomes transformed as we go through the convergence process* (Doll, 2002, p. 49).

This phase concentrates on establishing the conceptual framework of the curriculum. Decisions about selection, inclusion and exclusion – (the “null” curriculum, Eisner, 1979) – are made. During this phase the constraints inherent in existing practices and pre-conceptions are considered and accommodated, modified, or challenged.
The consultation process involves developing shared understandings and working towards shared goals. Compromise is necessary as the curriculum begins to consolidate, concentrating key concepts, content and processes. Materials under development are the product of collective experience and shared understanding. The materials conform to a design which may emerge from consultation or which is established by existing authorities. Stakeholders participating in consultation during this phase become more engaged in the process when they are able to see that their input is influencing the direction of the materials under development. Co-development with teachers in schools is essential and it is beneficial if sufficient time is allowed for teachers to plan and assess with the developing materials and provide advice that contributes to revision and re-planning.

**Challenges in the convergent phase**
Here it should be acknowledged that decisions remain provisional and may undergo further changes following ongoing consultation. Privileging powerful systemic concerns for pragmatic or economic reasons can lead to disenfranchisement or dissatisfaction felt by those who consider their concerns have not been taken into account. The challenges of managing timing of innovations and consultation are assisted if consultation occurs during periods when curriculum planners and implementers in schools have sufficient opportunity to engage thoughtfully and reflectively with materials for consultation and development. Useful ways of addressing these challenges are to allow time for dialogue, reflection and recursion, and the generation of new ideas and approaches, revisiting the possibilities which arose in the emergent phase. This will assist developers to avoid the tendency to focus on “ends” and attempt to arrive at them as quickly as possible.

**The divergent phase**
This phase concentrates on the dissemination; diffusion; and distribution of the curriculum materials. It acknowledges multiple possibilities and interpretations and encourages translation and transformation of materials with consideration of local constraints and contexts. As Eisner (2002, p. 42) points out, “the improvement of educational practice is a process that is adaptive in character”. Adaptation, modification and adjustment of materials characterise the phase with teachers’ input being paramount. During this phase sufficient time is allowed for teachers to contribute to the planning and evaluation of exemplar materials. Teachers are supported by professional development opportunities which assist them in interpreting and adapting the developed materials for particular teaching/learning
contexts. The phase acknowledges complexity and rejects fixed notions of reality, knowledge or method.

**Challenges in the divergent phase**

When change is supported at a systemic level teachers are provided with both the time and professional support needed to accommodate necessary changes to practice. Acknowledgement and assessment of the diversity of student needs and schooling contexts informs ongoing development. “Difference” of learners and learning contexts are seen as both strengths and challenges to meaningful curriculum development rather than attributes needing to be modified to come closer to common expectations for all students. Meaningful consultation needs to continue, whereby participants can see the evidence of their input, so that opportunities for contributions are not relinquished to others who are seen to be more powerful or informed. Cultivating mechanisms of support such as the establishment of collaborative networks and platforms for the discussion, critique and sharing of materials are positive ways of nurturing ongoing professional development. Networking groups and "lead" teachers can play a pivotal role.

**Influences on the curriculum developer**

This curriculum development project was bounded by personal and collective preconceptions, the constraints of the organisation and the contexts in which it would be implemented, and the time and social and political influences under which it was to proceed.

The location of our first office at a distance from the central office of the Council highlighted the influence of location and remoteness on the potential for emotional dislocation from the decision-making process. This is of particular importance in a community that is physically distanced from the locus of power, such as the educational community outside the south-east corner of Queensland and highlighted the need for ongoing personal and face-to-face interactions. Once the curriculum development team moved to the central office the capacity for spontaneous interactions with our colleagues gave a much stronger sense of identity within the office and assisted in making our interactions more confident and with less differentiation of status. Collaborative curriculum development demands that physical distance is compensated by opening channels of communication that can compensate for remoteness. Recent internet innovations (such as SKYPE) which allow for on-line face-to-face discussion and sharing can assist in compensating for dislocations produced by lack of proximity to decision-makers. However it is the nature of the discussions that is paramount. The process must be one of dialogue.
and sharing, leading to awareness of the broadest range of concerns, and with the contributors understanding that their ideas are valued and taken into account.

**Desirable qualities of the collaborative curriculum developer**

During the project itself, but especially during the analysis phase of this research I came to realise that I had underestimated the power of the individual curriculum writer. Over time, curriculum writers become immersed in a deep understanding of the developing curriculum, and the interests and competing/conflicting demands of stakeholders. Continual engagement with consultation, policy documents, negotiations with schools, reading of theoretical texts, and discussion with professional colleagues provides the writer with the most comprehensive understanding of the particular curriculum development context and enables them to make decisions which balance diverse perspectives. The curriculum developer is the filter for input from many sources and thus has the broadest and deepest understanding of the context upon which curriculum decisions can be made. In this project, as time went on, less feedback was provided by the more informal consultative networks, though formal contact with the Syllabus Advisory Committee was sustained. The reduction in feedback responses was a product of the broad-ranging consultation process, whereby individuals and community groups gained confidence in the process of consultation and could see desired changes and directions evident within the documents. Strong consultative connections with stakeholders in the community, multiple opportunities for dialogue and discussion, and the feedback thus provided contributed to the development of self-confidence within the curriculum writer. The writer was able to internalise the issues and concerns of the community, displacing personal orientations when necessary, to make decisions with awareness of the full range of stakeholder desires of how they wished the curriculum to be framed. Such confidence was the result of long and deep absorption in both the development process itself, and the consultation which contributed to it.

To the desirable qualities of a curriculum development team proposed by Marsh and Willis, discussed in Chapter 3, I would add the following desired qualities of the collaborative curriculum developer: resilience; the capacity for attentive listening; the capacity for strategic thinking; the capacity to work independently; school experience in a variety of contexts; and the capacity for critical self-reflection.

*The more mature and understanding, and the less personally threatened and ego-involved individuals are, the more capable they*
are of re-examining or modifying their philosophy, or at least of being willing to appreciate other points of view. (Ornstein et al., 2003, p. 5)

Resilience involves the capacity to persist in the face of confrontation, change and diversity of viewpoints. Inherent in the involvement of large numbers of individuals and groups in a curriculum development project is the diversity of views and experience they represent. Contributors tend to be passionate about their points of view and are not always willing to accommodate the perspectives and concerns of others. The developer is accountable for the materials that are being produced and may often bear the brunt of disagreements or displeasure. In such situations the curriculum developer needs to develop qualities of resilience, which allow them to persist through challenging periods or circumstances.

This is of special concern when changes to personnel are made at any level. Change was a notable characteristic of this project but the changes of personnel at every level (Minister of Education, Director-General of Education, teachers in trial and pilot schools, and members of the development team itself) highlighted the importance of establishing and maintaining personal relationships. It is difficult not to be defensive when sharing ideas; or to distrust or dismiss the ideas of others when personal relationships are fractured.

For the capacity of attentive listening I draw on Noddings (Noddings, 2002) idea of “receptive attention” where the listener is characterised by careful attention to what is being said (and not said), and “motivational displacement” so that their issues and concerns are deflected within the listening encounter. The attentive listener pays heed to the needs and concerns of the speaker, values the contribution, and seeks to accommodate those needs and concerns even if their own differ. By paying heed and “transposing oneself into the other” it is possible to come to a shared understanding and is “essential to a true conversation” (Doll, 2002, p. 49).

This curriculum conversation was built on a legislated base of “mandatory consultation”. However consultation involves more than just sending out information and taking heed of the responses that come back. Without “attentive listening” the responses of contributors can easily be dismissed as being purely of personal or local concern, and irrelevant or unable to be accommodated in line with systemic priorities. An attentive listener is able to seek ways of connecting personal concerns with systemic priorities and move them from the margins into a more centralised and powerful position.

Undoubtedly there will be circumstances when a decision important to the project is blocked or hindered by others. Individuals with skills in strategic thinking...
can find ways round the block by identifying powerful decision makers and travel alternative routes to achieve the goal.

The benefits of strategic thinking, particularly in relation to consultation, were most important. Cultivating positive relationships with colleagues in more powerful positions and organisations was essential to the success of this project and the process of targeting key people in order to gain their endorsement was evident throughout. Strong and supportive strategic bases, including links with professional communities and especially those of professional associations are essential for strategic interactions.

Ironically in a collaborative process, the capacity to work independently is important. Collaborative consultation can lead to a reliance on the group to make decisions. In a sense a collaborative curriculum developer is like Agar’s ethnographic “halfie” (Agar, 1996), being both a member of the group and outside it. The capacity to work independently and make decisions, on behalf of the group and with understanding of their issues and concerns, is pivotal.

Credibility with teachers, and the broader educational community, is an important aspect of collaboration. When working with teachers in diverse schooling contexts the likelihood of effective collaboration is enhanced when participants believe the developer has deep understanding of their particular issues. Teachers value the experience of other teachers, especially if that experience is recent, and in similar contexts to their own. Substantial school experience in a variety of contexts contributes to these layers of credibility. The developer with deep and varied experience is able to understand the complexities of pedagogy, curriculum and assessment. They can “read” the situation backwards and forwards, and understand how changes are likely to affect teachers and students in classrooms. They know that circumstances can be different and imagine and strategise for how they can be changed. In my own circumstances, my extensive experience as a teacher, and particularly as a Head of Department, gave me invaluable skills in “reading the situation” and allowed me to predict what was likely to happen within the project. My credibility with teachers, professional associations, administrators, and senior systemic personnel on this curriculum development project was grounded in my acknowledged experience and expertise in a variety of educational roles.

It is only in retrospect that I have come to realise how much my role as a researcher of the project, in particular the keeping of a critically self-reflective journal, contributed to the project itself. The study made me particularly conscious of keeping meticulous records and noting the changes to the documents, and my journaling brought personal responses and challenges to the fore. Thorough documentation
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and analysis of materials, allowed me to identify sources of actions and decisions, what had influenced them, and who motivated the change. The reading of theoretical texts about drama and arts education informed the decisions which impacted on the curriculum design to be theoretically grounded in my own reading, as well as drawing on the wisdom of situated practice of the teachers in schools via the trial/pilot and the SAC. This allowed me both a micro and macro view of the project itself and assisted in the sifting of inputs.

**Summing up and insights**

By drawing on contemporary practice, whether exemplary or not, we were working within the comfort zone of teachers. The quality of the materials was enhanced by the collaborative process in that, in Queensland, we were able to draw on the lived experience and pedagogical heritage of a large number of practised and theoretically sound arts educators. The quality of pre-service teacher education and the professional support available, in particular from professional associations, offered a rich base of knowledge of the field. In the current teacher-education context in Australia with time dedicated to arts education being eroded in almost every university this has clear implications for curriculum development in the future. Without the substantial theoretical grounding that underpinned the practice of contributors to this curriculum, it is likely that the gap between theory and practice will broaden, and the quality of future curriculum will diminish.

The long process of consultation contributed to the sharing of understandings and practices and this curriculum is a point-in-time document. It drew on the past and current experiences and knowledge of a large number of people, most of whom were working in schools, and some in quite challenging circumstances. This syllabus document and the support materials are not scholarly works, although of course they are meant to be based on both good scholarship and good practice and offer “a welcoming hand” (Aoki, 2005c, p. 362) to teachers and students. I would claim that this collaboratively developed syllabus is a peer-reviewed document, with an “editorial board” that probably approached a thousand. In the development phase of the curriculum documents, the peer-review process was the mandated consultation with teachers, administrators and professional associations, and the aim was for clarity and accessibility “so that [the documents] can be understood by people who are neither subject specialists nor familiar with the specialised language of educators” (Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1997b, p. 1).

Positive and supportive personal and professional relationships were of vital importance in the collaboration and development process. When the relationship was
strong and based on trust and mutual understanding the project could proceed to a
degree of consensus, even with dissenting and alternative viewpoints. The success
of the collaboration lay in the belief that all voices were being listened to and valued,
even if they could not be accommodated and agreed with completely. Contributors to
each phase of the project valued seeing their amendments and ideas represented in
the documents. The informal meetings and opportunities to interact on many levels,
socially as well as professionally contributed to this sense of a shared community
with shared goals.

The lack of student voice and contributions is notable in the consultative
process. It is impossible to know what alternative directions would have been
suggested and possible if we had found ways of hearing the ideas and contributions
that young people could have made given the opportunity. A particular challenge is to
take account of the perspectives of even very young people. This was not considered
important or valuable in this particular project. Curriculum development authorities
would benefit from looking at the work of organisations such as the Reggio Emilia
and Waldorf schools for models of practice that give voice to students.

This project took place during a period of great change and uncertainty in
education in Queensland. The changes at powerful political levels contributed to
pressure and the tension of uncertainty as to what other changes would take place.
The QSCC was emblematic of that change. It was an organisation established to try
and ease the control that EQ had held over curriculum development. However with
changes of government and politically powerful individuals seeking to retain the
centralised curriculum approach, the alternative orientation to curriculum
development was blocked by the Department of Education, the most authoritative
member. Since the end of 2002, the Minister for Education has changed again, and
so has the Director-General of Education (twice). The QSCC was amalgamated with
the BSSSS and the Tertiary Entrance Procedures Authority to become the QSA. The
New Basics is no longer proffered as the “curriculum of the future”; teachers in
Queensland have had to cope with two recent curriculum innovations: QCAR – the
Queensland Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Framework initiated by the
Queensland government, the Essential Learnings framework initiated by the Federal
government, and rumour has it that there is another curriculum innovation in
preparation at the QSA. Even more ironically, in light of the challenges discussed
throughout this thesis, the Queensland Department of Education has been renamed
the Department of Education and The Arts.

There is a need for further evidence-based research into the learning of
drama as it is influenced by the range of models of drama curriculum currently in
existence. Progression is described differently according to the varying conceptual frameworks of existing drama curricula. It is clear that student progression is both produced and constrained by the curriculum frame within which students and teachers are working. The reliance on progression as described in existing curriculum documents (or texts that derived from them) without knowing the basis for development, trialling and evaluation is cause for concern. There appears to be little research-based evidence that addresses this issue. This is a significant gap in the field.

Additional research is required to support, challenge or modify the frameworks I propose above. Further research into collaborative curriculum development at a systemic level would offer valuable insight into the field and assist curriculum developers to manage the conflicting, contested and contradictory positions and positioning of practitioners at a school-based level and those in powerful authoritative positions within systemic organisations. Such research is imperative in the current climate of increasing politicisation of decisions relating to education, schooling, curriculum, assessment and reporting.

I said in my journal at an early stage, “We won’t be able to write the perfect arts syllabus” and of course that is true because there is no such thing. When I applied for the position as an Arts Project Officer in 1987, I was interested in developing a curriculum for the arts, but I really had no idea of the complexity of the world I was entering. My experience as a teacher had been rich and diverse and I anticipated the job ahead to be interesting, but somewhat mundane and certainly “slow and steady”. It was more challenging than I anticipated. The job was busier, messier, more conflicted and contradictory than I could have known in advance. And there was never the “down time” that I was used to in school vacations. My role required me to develop personally and professionally, and I found it far more exciting than I had thought possible. I still look back on this time with gratitude, pride and a sense of accomplishment. Gratitude, because I learnt so much during my years at the QSCC, and the dynamics of the office showed me that it is possible to operate with professionalism, caring and respect, in a corporate office. Pride, because I believe in the quality of the work that was produced, and because it was achieved with meticulous care and consultation.
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The Shifting Sands of Curriculum Development
Appendices
Appendix 2.1 Sample of Team minutes
Please note I have removed the attendance list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.       | MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – Business arising:  
Debbie saw re mailout for the conference: Syllabus etc. 1 month before to go to the schools. Recommended that we only send it if it relates to some pre-conference task. A conference letter needs to go to trial and pilot schools to officially notify of the dates etc. Start considering title and speakers. See item 6  
Team lunch: 12:30 Lennons Hotel 13/4  
Letters have gone to Sunshine Cluster and Villanova and St Peter’s re the next cluster meeting. Tracey has her lot under control. Dates will be decided after faxback responses are received. | to write letter to go to schools early next term.  
 to organise details. |
| 2.       | DEBRIEF OF ‘shared understandings meeting’:  
Many unresolved issues.  
Core content could be resolved. | to advise on core content guidelines from the Council.  
 to set up a proforma for the team glossary on Q-drive so each member can add to it as required.  
This will include KLA terminology as well as arts specific terminology.  
Keep thinking about possible planning |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the meeting was valuable and that it raised important issues and built shared understanding within the team.</td>
<td>frameworks etc. and bring any ideas to the next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has lost track of what is happening in all of the arts areas. Perhaps because of her part time position. also mentioned the difficulty of keeping track. suggested we set up computer files to operate as working copies.</td>
<td>to come up with a proposal for file paths for working copies of outcomes and core content tables. All changes to be dated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports from team members:

**Drama** - : Madonna and are working on the outcomes to ensure the pattern is developmental and clear between levels. They are crosschecking with Core Content.

**Dance** - : has done the same to the dance outcomes. She has expanded the ‘movement components’ for non-specialist teachers.

**Visual Art** - : is linking outcomes to the elaborations and strengthening the links. First redraft was with and members of the SAC and has finetuned the outcomes to make the stems more clear and developmental. is running a workshop at the QATA conference to feed back to the Office.

**Media** - and have reworked the media outcomes and are hoping to get feedback from the media schools. believes the media outcomes are now sequential and generic enough to signal that you don’t need a camera to achieve them. April or April are possible Media focus groups meeting dates. Floor 26 MLC.

**Music** – : Slightly changed core content and the numbering of outcomes. She has been applying planning and outcomes in the classroom setting and has been weekly teaching a Year 8 class and testing the outcomes with this class. Working on recording of tracking individual students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>DEBRIEF OF Mackay Cluster Meeting: Madonna spent three days in Mackay. Monday was spent at [REDACTED] talking and planning with teachers and administrators. [REDACTED] is supportive of the trial and brought in a contract teacher for the day to release the teachers for feedback and planning sessions. Tuesday a.m. was spent at [REDACTED] with all three trial teachers and initial meetings with the Headteacher and the Head of the Junior School. Tuesday p.m. with the three trial teachers at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is the drama teacher at this school who is actually teaching with the syllabus. He feels disadvantaged because he was unable to attend the Trial Conference, has had little support to come to terms with the document, is a first year teacher and was not trained in drama education. [REDACTED] was able to attend the Cluster meeting. On Wednesday the first Mackay Cluster meeting was held at [REDACTED]. Joy Rogers, Principal of [REDACTED] SS, was present as an observer and representative of the Small Schools Principals' Association. The response to the outcomes was generally positive. [REDACTED] was particularly enthusiastic about the change in her classroom practice which has resulted from trialing the outcomes. There was general agreement that the outcomes were helpful, gave a focus for teaching and were generally clear. Some concern about how to include, and track all the outcomes at any particular level. Discussion focussed on the need for changes in planning structures to cater for outcomes. Implementation issues were a concern for some teachers particularly in relation to a new vertical timetable structure beginning at [REDACTED]. The Mackay teachers mentioned they feel isolated from the other trial schools and would value more opportunities to network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madonna writing a more detailed report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.   | PLANNING FOR NEXT CLUSTER MEETINGS Debbie pointed out that issues raised at the last cluster meeting need to be addressed.  
- Agenda items  
Report on issues from previous cluster meeting addressed by the team, sharing session, planning time, module writing, and Evaluators session. Prior to the module writing we need to develop a team position. [REDACTED] identified the problem with the modules she has seen been focused just on one level. The team position is to try and write modules that operate across levels.  
- Roles and responsibilities of team members | Agenda to include these five components. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Issues from clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>List of possible jobs to be drawn up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Also list of jobs for the day-to-day running of the team to be drawn up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **MODULE WRITING**  
Possible modules:
- Transition from pre-school to Year 1  
- Level 1-2 module with a theme. Perhaps link to literacy and the Year 2 Net.
- “Special Days” module/ Community connections
- link with modules from other KLA’s eg. SOSE to build on what has already been written.
- A BIG DAY OUT module tying in with out of school events such as gallery visits.
- Music for the non-specialist teacher
- Teacher as artist/Artists in residence/Specialists
- Generic media unit crossing all levels – maybe representations – maybe indigenous representations in the community
- Popular culture – levels 4 – 6 (Could include media and dance)
- Web design – visual arts and media
- Technologies
- Ways to a career in the arts
- Strand specific modules
- Cross strand modules
- Cross KLA modules
- Small schools package
- Target groups
- Film music
- Arts showcase – concert, musical, performing arts night

Debbie, Julie, Madonna and Judy to look at issues from the clusters at the meeting next Tuesday. Also list of team jobs.

These will be prioritised later.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CONFERENCE PLANNING</td>
<td>Tasks to be listed for meeting next Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Target groups – middle school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible keynotes: Cate Fowler – QAC, Louise Dunoon – Global Arts Link, Kristen Bell – QUT, Dance, Dr Robyn Stewart – USQ, Jan Power – Community, Powerhouse project. Possible openers: David Hinchliffe, Jim Soorley -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Items for pre-conference mailout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Redrafted syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget considerations for stationery etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting closed at 12:00 PM

**PLEASE NOTE:** Next meeting: Tuesday April 6, 9:30 a.m., Conference Room. This is the only Tuesday in April on which the Conference Room is available. Other meeting venues to be advised.
Appendix 2.2 Diagram of changes to documents
### Record of changes to outcomes, core content and level statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Core content</th>
<th>Level statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1998</td>
<td>26/10 Submitted</td>
<td>26/10 Submitted</td>
<td>Major changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1998</td>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>25/1 Generic only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1998</td>
<td>Minor and editorial changes only</td>
<td>Trial begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1999</td>
<td>Pilot begins</td>
<td>Pilot begins</td>
<td>Pilot begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1999</td>
<td>Pilot begins</td>
<td>Pilot begins</td>
<td>Pilot begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1999</td>
<td>Minor and editorial changes only</td>
<td>20 July Council approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1999</td>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>20 July Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1999</td>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>20 July Council approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1999</td>
<td>20 July Council approval</td>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>20 July Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2000</td>
<td>Editorial changes</td>
<td>Editorial changes</td>
<td>Editorial changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2000</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2000</td>
<td>Continue development of sourcebook modules, In-service Materials and CD-Rom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.1 Queensland Syllabus documents current in 1998
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand/Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Dance</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Speech and Drama</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>BSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus (but no longer compulsory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Makes Meaning</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Curriculum Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Drama</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB history of this – senior theatre and Senior Speech and Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing Realities</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Curriculum Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Syllabus in Film and Television</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Syllabus in Music</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Music Syllabus</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Music Extension Syllabus</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Syllabus and Guidelines</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Art Syllabus</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Scope and Sequence Chart for Art Education</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Art Syllabus</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Art</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>BSSSS</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living By Design</td>
<td>1990 - 1996</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Set of Teacher Sourcebooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-10 Arts Education Framework</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Dept. Education</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.2 Foundation QSCC members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nominated by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Peter Burroughs</td>
<td>Minister for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director-General of Education</td>
<td>Frank Peach</td>
<td>Official Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Education Services</td>
<td>Brian Rout</td>
<td>Director-General of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director, QCEC</td>
<td>Garry Everett</td>
<td>Queensland Catholic Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal, urban Primary &amp; Secondary School</td>
<td>Murray Evans</td>
<td>Association of Independent Schools of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (rural Primary school)</td>
<td>Maree Roberts</td>
<td>Director-General of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Richard Smith</td>
<td>Higher Education Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Patricia Reust</td>
<td>Federation of Parents &amp; Friends Associations, Qld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Patricia Waldby</td>
<td>Independent Parents &amp; Friends Council, Qld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Representative</td>
<td>Bill Siganto</td>
<td>Minister for Training and Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Julian Toussaint</td>
<td>Qld. Teachers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Trudy Dunne</td>
<td>Qld Assoc. of Teachers in Independent Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Senior Secondary School Studies</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Education</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4.3 Curriculum Committee Members
### Membership of the Curriculum Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janine Cooke</td>
<td>Deputy Principal, Heatley State High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Dudley</td>
<td>Deputy Director (Moderation and Curriculum), Board of Senior Secondary School Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Edmondson</td>
<td>Curriculum Co-ordinator Junior School, St Ursula’s College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Gardiner</td>
<td>Curriculum Officer, Queensland Catholic Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Howden</td>
<td>Headmaster, The Toowoomba Preparatory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Kretschman</td>
<td>Principal, Whites Hill State School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Ludwig</td>
<td>National Project Officer, Education Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Salmon</td>
<td>Assistant Director (Curriculum Development), Office of the Queensland School Curriculum Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Richard Smith (Chair)</td>
<td>School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University (Gold Coast campus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4.4 Published time allocations for KLAs.
### Indicative time allocations for the Core of Each Key Learning Area for Use by Syllabus Developers

*(Times shown in hours)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key learning areas</th>
<th>Years 1-3 (hours across three years)</th>
<th>Years 4-7 (hours across four years)</th>
<th>Years 8-10 (hours across three years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies of Society and the Environment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages Other Than English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems/School Designated Time</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2580*</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In Years 1-3 there is an extra 180 hours available as students in these years are not involved in sport and recreational studies as are students in Years 4-10.

Appendix 4.5 Membership of The Arts Syllabus Advisory Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nominated by</th>
<th>Representing: (background)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sybil Bell</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
<td>Literacy and numeracy representative (Sec. English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Carroll</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
<td>Education Queensland (Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Chenery</td>
<td>Professional Association Australian Dance Council</td>
<td>AUSDANCE (Sec. Dance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Dance Council - AUSdance (Qld Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Churchward</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
<td>Primary Principals (Media)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Conn</td>
<td>Education Queensland - Special Education</td>
<td>Special Education Teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira Cordiner</td>
<td>Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies</td>
<td>Senior Schooling (Sec. Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cox</td>
<td>Queensland Catholic Education Commission</td>
<td>Primary teachers – remote. (Pri. Visual Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Davis</td>
<td>Professional Association QADIE</td>
<td>Queensland Association for Drama in Education (Sec. Drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanne Enoch-Barlow</td>
<td>Equity Representative – Education Queensland</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education (Sec. English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Farwell</td>
<td>Professional Association ATOM</td>
<td>Australian Teachers of Media (Sec. Media)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fitz-Walter</td>
<td>Queensland Catholic Education Commission</td>
<td>Primary Teachers (Pri. Visual Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gattenhof</td>
<td>Queensland Arts Council</td>
<td>Primary Teachers (Drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie O’Shea</td>
<td>Professional Association KMEIA</td>
<td>Kodály Music Education Institute of Australia (Pri. Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Harrod (Chair)</td>
<td>Queensland School Curriculum Council</td>
<td>QSCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hayward</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
<td>Secondary Teachers (Sec. Media)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Hennig</td>
<td>The Association of Independent Schools of</td>
<td>Secondary Teachers (Sec. Vis Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hynes</td>
<td>Professional Association AIAE</td>
<td>Australian Institute of Arts Education (Sec. Visual Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Kelly</td>
<td>Equity Representative</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Macdonald-Raymond</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
<td>Primary Teachers (Pri. Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Martoo</td>
<td>Professional Association QATA</td>
<td>Queensland Art Teachers’ Association (Sec. Visual Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate O’Neill</td>
<td>Queensland Catholic Education Commission Equity</td>
<td>(Sec. English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Ostling</td>
<td>Tertiary – Griffith University</td>
<td>College of Art Griffith University (Visual Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Piscitelli</td>
<td>Tertiary - QUT</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology (Early Childhood Visual Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenene Rosser</td>
<td>The Association of Independent Schools of</td>
<td>Independent Schools (Sec. Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Russell</td>
<td>Professional Association ASME</td>
<td>Australian Society for Music Education (Pri. Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Turnbull</td>
<td>Queensland Council of</td>
<td>The Federation of Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Nominated by</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents and Citizens' Associations Inc.</td>
<td>and Friends Associations of Catholic Schools in Queensland and The Independent Parents and Friends Council of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Wandell</td>
<td>Unions</td>
<td>Queensland Teachers' Union and Queensland Independent Education Union (Sec. English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5.1 Project timeline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appoint Project Officers</td>
<td>January 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental scan begun by Project Officers</td>
<td>February 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct focus groups with tertiary experts, primary school educators, secondary school educators, system staff, subject associations</td>
<td>February 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish consultative network and invite responses to focus questions</td>
<td>February 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission papers</td>
<td>February 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Advisory Committee for the Years 1–10 The Arts Curriculum Development Project, with membership as endorsed by QSCC.</td>
<td>March 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence writing of Design Brief</td>
<td>March 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>7 April 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue development of Design Brief</td>
<td>April 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of draft Design Brief for Consultation</td>
<td>April - May 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of The Arts Advisory Committee - Feedback on draft</td>
<td>29 April 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide report and draft Design Brief to QSCC</td>
<td>May 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further consultation on draft</td>
<td>May - June 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise for syllabus writers</td>
<td>May 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise draft of Design Brief</td>
<td>June 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft available to QSCC for endorsement</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of syllabus writing team/s</td>
<td>July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of draft syllabus</td>
<td>Aug. - Nov. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of The Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>August 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and feedback on draft syllabus</td>
<td>Sept. - Oct 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of The Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Oct 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise for sourcebook writers &amp; select</td>
<td>Oct. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of interest called for trial schools &amp; pilot schools</td>
<td>Oct. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of interest advertised for external evaluator &amp; evaluator selected</td>
<td>Dec - Jan 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of draft syllabus for presentation to QSCC</td>
<td>18 Nov. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of approximately 10 trial schools (2 in each Arts area) and 40 additional pilot schools</td>
<td>Dec. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice of trial school personnel</td>
<td>February 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial syllabus and draft modules with trial schools - support from project team</td>
<td>March - Nov 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Sourcebooks</td>
<td>January - December 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Progress report on evaluation, trial schools &amp; sourcebook development</td>
<td>March 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot conducted with approximately 50 schools</td>
<td>Feb - June 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across all Arts area Evaluation of Trial/Pilot Schools - Report 1</td>
<td>March - May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Progress report on Sourcebooks, pilot and evaluation</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School visits by project team to support teachers participating in the trial</td>
<td>May - November 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Progress report on Sourcebooks, trial</td>
<td>August 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of initial inservice materials</td>
<td>October 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of trial - Report 2</td>
<td>November 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Presentation of second interim evaluation report</td>
<td>November 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar for pilot schools</td>
<td>February 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Final evaluation Report</td>
<td>April 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of syllabus, sourcebooks and initial inservice package</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of trial/ pilot evaluation - Final Report</td>
<td>June 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Final drafts of syllabus, sourcebooks and implementation package</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on final draft of all materials by Advisory committee and consultative committee</td>
<td>June 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Arts Advisory Committee - Approval of final drafts after consultation</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final materials presented to QSCC for endorsement</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit, layout, and publish materials</td>
<td>July - November 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete set of syllabus materials available for implementation in state and non-state schools</td>
<td>December 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.2 Schools in Queensland (by authority), 2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government (State) Schools</th>
<th>1289</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool, primary and secondary</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of distance education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool, primary and secondary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool and primary</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool, primary and secondary</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool and primary</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 54.7% of State schools are designated as ‘rural’.

Source: email correspondence, Education Queensland, 7/11/05
Appendix 5.3 Extract from sample transcript of focus group discussion.
TAPE OF ARTS MEETING 1: 19/2/98

It's a loaded question because you can't ask people in the present curriculum a question like that because they say "What do you want to know for?" Of course everyone is thinking Arts Education and if you go outside the arts you've got the home ec, the literary, the history, the geography people ... everyone is worried about the integrity of their own discipline all of which are disappearing in their own structures into their individual areas. Some of those people are further down the track than the arts and you realise that the strands emerge and a lot of the strands will in fact enfranchise people again but will disenfranchise or threaten by eg Home economics threaten to disappear down the plughole and all of a sudden when they come into a KLA there are things in there that they can offer this whole new area and so they feel comforted by the whole process. The other thing that comes up when looking from Yr 1 to Yr 10 is that the first seven grades, you can turn around here and stand on your head as far as art is concerned and write the greatest documents and the primary teachers will keep on doing what they've always done and do things the way they were taught no matter what documents say. It's hard enough to get them to do things properly the way they were supposed to do for the last hundred years let alone do new things. I'm not saying they are incompetent. They are generalist teachers and are being asked to do so many things over so many discipline areas and they just criticise ? ? ? ? ? ? Parents, schools and employment authorities aren't demanding about and the arts is one of them and so 99% of most primary teachers I've ever met have never read any arts document in a syllabus or anywhere unless it's their particular interest. So here we've got the political side in terms of what's happening in Arts Education as opposed to art education and then you've got the inertia of what happens in primary schools. The specialist instrumental teachers in primary school will be affected by any documents that come out. You've got both ends of the spectrum hanging there together and then the other thing is the concept of Arts Education – the mid point between a 'post office' and social studies that doesn't really do anything properly. I could work with the people I work with at QUT we'd have a great Arts program but when you start to shape it down to smaller things which one of us is going to teach the Arts program with only two of us on the staff. Am I going to teach the drama and dance or music and art. What's the shape of a new Arts program? Are people going to pick up a new body of knowledge or are people looking at how their existing discrete art forms fit together in a meaningful way and watch these change shapes. That's where most people's fears come from because we're handing over to People who are going to decide for us in many ways of how they fit together. We look at the future and we see special things about visual arts, as we move very much into a new visual, technical world of television, computers and this huge importance of visual literacy and visual meaning and visual everything else. Now an example, I saw a course description go through one of the new graduate
programs and the Arts KLA with one third of one subject in a two year course which means if you divided it up visual arts would be a total of 1 and ¾ hours out of the two year course for non specialist people going into the primary school.

That goes back to the point that until training in institutions like ours changes and is more effective these sorts of documents won’t make things change.

The biggest criticism of any of these documents is that the employing authorities won’t spend money on implementing them so you can produce all the documents you like but if don’t spend the next 3 – 5 years inserviceing teachers to make it happen it won’t happen.

Trial pilot of dance syllabus was a very good model, of course not everyone had access to it but there was enough out there. Yes it was good for the primary non specialists. Inservice important. The syllabus will be so how do we get an outcomes based assessment model that is meaningful, relevant, accessible that teachers will do. Because I’ve been a primary teacher and I know that unless you have to do it and unless it’s important …….. You have to prioritise!

The pressure to compete with core outcomes it’s going to be an obligation. The core we must do is more important than outcomes. Worried about setting goal posts so low that people can do it but what good does it become, it’s not true education.

In the light of all those going fears and whatever and existing situations that occur what people are asked what’s good about it they answer in light of those. Accepted and enjoyed by those who could do them and those who got to take them.

Eternal optimist – having a good document is worth doing regardless of all those problems, although you should take those problems into account when you measure what is a good document so if their good generalist teachers and if they’re not getting a lot of training in the arts then I do think we’ll just have to cater for that. We not going to get specialists, ever.

Several answers – the bottom line was you must give them inservice when you bring the documents out, get the money for help, then get people to go and help them translate the documents into classroom practice.

Re the other syllabus documents coming to the end of their 12 month period being trialled in pilots that there is lots of inservice happening, there’s lots of conferences happening, the advisory services going out all over the state working with teachers and administrators - that has to be part of the process. That’s part of the brief of the Council to try and not just come up with the document and the CD Rom in the post. I don’t think that’s what’s going to happen. The task of inservice
in a state the size of Queensland with schools spread so far is therefore a huge and expensive problem. Time is a pressure for teachers when given say six syllabus documents to implement. Concerned that this exercise doesn’t start from scratch because we were sitting around tables 5 or 6 years ago and we were asked the same sort of rationale and questions and I would answer almost exactly the same. What was good about dance ed. then and why kids should dance is still the same so a lot of the old stuff can be used again.

What is it at the moment that we should try to retain and protect and what could be better? This business of the KLA is a really strong voice coming to me of keeping the strands separate into each of the art forms. To what extent we going to be able to do that I don’t know. There is a lot of pressure coming from above and it’s – this lump of clay – what do we do with it given the confines of what we have to do will be mandated to us. You have to first of all see the realities of schools because a document’s not going to change the school or the staff so I think any document has to be achievable. Make it so things can be taken on by the staff and used and implemented and then say “Now how will I do that better?” or “I’ll go and do a course on ………”

Notion of generic v. discrete – it may well be that in Yrs 1 to 2 to 3 to 4 could be to have a more integrated approach than say would be applicable for Yrs 8,9,10. The way to handle that kind of political pressure is to be very clear about where it can be integrated. There has been a certain amount of pressure to do a fully integrated program from primary school. Maybe some of the Arts don’t have to be done from Yr 1 and learning in those Arts doesn’t matter if it doesn’t start until say Yr 9. Some talk about the validity of the separate disciplines. The question is “is the learning developmental and cumulative” “is it developmentally sequential”.

We had this same argument 5 years ago. I’m concerned about that because that’s a completely different twist, I didn’t think there was a question about that. The one that was questioned was media and maybe because of the nature of that subject it should come in at Yr 5 or 6. The question at the moment is whether to not clear at all. More discussion about whether it is cumulative or sequential.

Without changing the physical structure of schools we’ve really got a natural watershed at the end of Yr 7 anyway and up to Yr 7 you’re really looking at non specialist teachers teaching everything and the integration of it is the real strength of primary school where one teacher can carry things off from drama to art to dance to music. Whereas in high school I’d hate to be in charge of a department that had to try to integrate dance with everything.

The other concern that’s come up for us is that a lot of people do things like an integrated arts project for a play or a festival or something like that and therefore
Appendix 5.4 Sample fax survey form.
Focus questions:

What would you consider to be a meaningful arts education for children aged 5 to 15?
How could that be accommodated effectively in the Qld school curriculum?
What is good about current arts education practice in schools? In terms of curriculum offerings and organisation, what could be done better?
Appendix 5.5 Comparison of outcomes organisers
These possible organisers were tabled for discussion and workshop at the first Arts Syllabus Advisory Committee meeting 7/4/98

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>CREATING ARTS</td>
<td>ARTS IN CONTEXT</td>
<td>ARTS AS INQUIRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>USING</td>
<td>EXPRESSING</td>
<td>EVALUATING &amp; APPRECIATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ARTS IDEAS</td>
<td>ARTS SKILLS &amp; PROCESSES</td>
<td>ARTS RESPONSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CREATING, MAKING &amp; PRESENTING</td>
<td>ARTS CRITICISM &amp; AESTHETICS</td>
<td>PAST &amp; PRESENT CONTEXTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>DESIGNING &amp; MAKING</td>
<td>VIEWING &amp; UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>ARTS IN CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DESIGNING &amp; CREATING</td>
<td>VIEWING &amp; UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>PRESENTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>CREATING &amp; EXPRESSING</td>
<td>PRESENTING, VIEWING &amp; UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>ARTS IN CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>EXPLORING, DESIGNING &amp; CREATING</td>
<td>VIEWING, COMMUNICATING &amp; UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>ARTS IN PRACTICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>DESIGNING, CREATING &amp; EXPRESSING</td>
<td>VIEWING, INTERPRETING &amp; UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>ARTS IN CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>DESIGNING, CREATING &amp; EXPRESSING</td>
<td>REFLECTING, INTERPRETING &amp; UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>ARTS IN CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>VISUAL using light, colour &amp; shape</td>
<td>AURAL using sound &amp; rhythm</td>
<td>KINAESTHETIC using bodily movement, time &amp; space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ENGAGING IN</td>
<td>EXPRESSING THROUGH</td>
<td>REFLECTING ON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.6 Possible layout of outcomes April 1998
**LEVEL STATEMENT**

A level statement is included for each developmental level of each strand. This statement summarises the intended learning outcomes for each level and provides the conceptual framework for grouping the core and extension learning outcomes.

**CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Core learning outcomes describe the learnings considered to be essential for all students. The number of core learning outcomes at a level is determined by consideration of notional time available for addressing the core and general consensus as to whether a particular learning outcome is essential for all students.

*Separate outcomes will be identified for each strand, although some outcomes may appear in more than one Arts area to reflect the complementary learning that takes place. The key concepts will be taken into account in the core learning outcomes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DANCE</th>
<th>DRAMA</th>
<th>MEDIA</th>
<th>MUSIC</th>
<th>VISUAL ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**EXTENSION LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Extension learning outcomes describe what students know and can do beyond what is essential at a particular level. They are included to assist teachers in broadening the understandings of some students. It is not expected that these outcomes will be achieved by all students.

*Two different types of outcomes will be written: one showing extension outcomes in each separate Arts area and the other showing outcomes that reflect links within the Arts and to other key learning area outcomes.*
Appendix 5.7 Feedback form for Design Brief
SECOND CONSULTATIVE DRAFT OF THE YEARS 1-10 ARTS DESIGN BRIEF

Please complete RESPONSE SHEET by 3 August 1998

Fax: (07) 3237 1285
Email: carolyn.harrod@qed.qld.gov.au
Post: Qld School Curriculum Council
       “Attention Arts”
       PO Box 317, Brisbane Albert Street, Q 4002
       In Floor 27, MLC Centre,
       person: 239 George Street,
                Brisbane, Q 4000

CONTACT DETAILS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Areas of expertise:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Addres s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding on behalf of:

☐ Self ☐ School
   How many staff does your
   school represent?________

☐ Organisation
   How many people does your
   organisation represent?____

If you represent a school or an organisation, please list the consultation
The purpose of this Design Brief is to provide guidance to the writers developing the Years 1-10 Arts Curriculum Materials.
Proposed structure of the Arts KLA

Please comment on how well the described structure will enable schools to devise effective arts education programs for their local contexts.

Pg 16 - 20 The organising strands for learning outcomes.
Please comment on the appropriateness of the strands for organising learning outcomes in the Arts.
**Pg 16 - 17 Description of each strand**
Please comment on the clarity and appropriateness of the description of each strand. Does the description accommodate each of the five arts areas?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

**Pgs 4 - 10 Description of what the syllabus rationale should contain**
Please comment on the clarity and appropriateness of the description that will inform the syllabus rationale.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

You may wish to make further comments that would enhance the Design Brief as a framework for the development of the syllabus and sourcebooks.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Thank you very much for your time in completing this survey.
Please return it by Monday 3 August 1998
Appendix 5.8 Feedback form for Draft Syllabus
RESPONSE SHEET

The Years 1-10 Arts Trial Syllabus (First Consultation Draft) has been developed by the Office of the Queensland School Curriculum Council within the framework of the Arts Design Brief endorsed by the Queensland School Curriculum Council. The purpose of this First Consultation Draft is to seek advice and comments on aspects of the document prior to its being refined for trial in schools.

This document can be accessed through the QSCC Web site- http://www.uq.net.au/qssc/qssc.html

We would like to thank you for taking the time to complete this response sheet. Please consider all aspects of the document. It is important that the arts project team are aware of what is considered positive, as well as any aspects you feel need further consideration.

If you would prefer you could write directly on the syllabus-in-development and return it with this feedback proforma.

Name of Respondent:_______________________________________________

Group or School Represented:_______________________________________

Please complete by Friday 11 December 1998 and send to:
Ms Carolyn Harrod
Principal Project Officer
Queensland School Curriculum Council Office
PO Box 317
BRISBANE Albert Street Q, 4002

Fax to (07) 3237 1285,
Email: carolyn.harrod@qed.qld.gov.au
In commenting on the Years 1-10 Arts Syllabus-in-development please consider the following information:
It is anticipated that the Syllabus and Sourcebooks will be published in electronic form on CD ROM and the QSCC website and will be seamlessly interfaced. They will also be supported by Initial Inservice Materials. In addition to the CD ROM it is planned that the syllabus and some sourcebook materials will be available in print format.

The Syllabus will be a brief document encompassing a rationale, outcomes and principles and modes of assessment. It will provide a succinct statement of the mandated student outcomes at each level and allow teachers flexibility in deciding how they will help their particular students reach those outcomes.

The Sourcebooks will provide the details of the scope and sequence of the KLA content and have the potential to provide exemplars of effective curriculum organisation, planning and assessment.

For each of the comments that follow, please indicate your response by placing a ☐ in the appropriate box. Mark one box only and write additional comments and suggestions in the space provided. If you have specific aspects that you wish to comment on please write on the syllabus and return it with this Response Form.

1. Rationale

1a. The rationale captures the nature and purpose of the Arts learning area. □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

Comments
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1b. Please comment on the clarity of the rationale. Make comment about how well the rationale ‘frames’ the rest of the syllabus.

Comments
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. The Outcomes

2a. The General Outcomes for the Arts (p.12) describes realistic and worthwhile outcomes after ten years of arts learning.

The Core Learning Outcomes (pp.18-30)

2b. The core learning outcomes describe the critical arts learnings that students must know and do at each level.

2c. The progression of the core learning outcomes through the levels is evident.

Comments
2d. The level statements summarise the intended learning outcomes for each level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

2.e How helpful is it to label the core learning outcomes under the headings of the strand organisers: Engagement and Reflection?

Comments

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

3. **Principles and Modes of Assessment**

3a. The specific assessment strategies are appropriate for the arts areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

3b How well do the strategies enable you to gather information on engagement in arts learning and reflection on arts experiences?

Comments

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
4. General Comments

4a How cohesive is the document in terms of having clear links between the rationale, strand organisers, general learning outcomes and core learning outcomes?

Comments
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4b Other Comments
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO PROVIDE US WITH FEEDBACK.
Appendix 7.1 First and final outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Engagement in (Forming)</th>
<th>Engagement in (Presenting)</th>
<th>Reflection (Responding)</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Students create and accept roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore stories from personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.</td>
<td>1.3 Students share moments of dramatic action with others in informal settings and reciprocate as respectful audience.</td>
<td>1.4 Students transform ideas and feelings, experienced during and after drama, into spoken, written, visual, kinaesthetic, and musical forms.</td>
<td>1.7 Students engage in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Families, Stories, Purposes and Perspectives (SOSE core topics); and genres – story, personal recount, picture, story, personal letter (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Students work individually and with others using appropriate language and interactions, objects and space, to develop role and situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>DR 1.1 Students create and accept roles while participating in dramatic play.</td>
<td>DR 1.2 Students share drama with others by participating, listening and watching.</td>
<td>DR 1.3 Students describe ideas and feelings experienced during the making and shaping of their dramatic play.</td>
<td>DDR 1.4 Students recognise that drama tells stories about people and their worlds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDA, DDR, DME, DMU &amp; DVA 1 Students transform ideas and responses experienced during drama activities into spoken, written, visual, auditory and kinaesthetic forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 2 | 2.1 Students create, accept and develop individual and group roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.  
2.2 Students negotiate with others in and out of role, within a teacher provided framework to build dramatic action by making choices about situation, time, language and movement, objects and space. | 2.3 Students sequence and focus dramatic action in order to share it in informal and formal settings and reciprocate as a respectful audience. | 2.4 Students exchange viewpoints and make links with the views of others during and after drama by selecting a written, visual, kinaesthetic or musical form of communication.  
2.5 Students interpret drama experiences and presentations, expressing opinions using drama vocabulary.  
2.6 Students recognise that there are different types of drama which are used for different purposes in societies. | 2.7 Students engage in drama activities which explore other KLA topics eg. Stories, Purposes and Perspectives; and Asian Cultural Study (SOSE core topics) and genres – fables, traditional stories, fantasy story, interview, note-making, personal letter.  
DDR 2.4 Students recognise that there are different types of drama, which are used for different purposes in societies.  
DDR, ME & VA 2 Students participate in a storydrama and represent it by combining sequenced illustrations, images and text. |
| DR 2.1 Students make choices about and develop roles to build dramatic action. | DR 2.2 Students share moments of dramatic action using voice and movement so that they can be seen, heard and understood. | DR 2.3 Students describe drama experiences and presentations, expressing opinions and exchanging viewpoints with others. | |
| Level 3 | 3.1 Students develop and negotiate in and out of the drama, a range of dramatic roles and relationships from real, life-like and fictional contexts. 3.2 Students shape dramatic situations, roles and narratives both individually and in groups with appropriate use of language and movement, time, space and simple symbols. 3.3 Students participate in rehearsed group presentations of devised drama with an awareness of audience in formal and informal settings. 3.4 Students identify and describe through teacher-guided response, the learning and understanding developed in and through drama experiences. 3.5 Students make informal, but supported critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements and skills using appropriate drama vocabulary. 3.6 Students describe the purposes for which drama exists in communities and cultures. 3.7 Students participate in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and Europeans in Australia; Discovery in Australia; environment; Indigenous and immigrant Australians; traditional stories, journal and learning log entries; short new report, readers' theatre, radio drama (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10). | DR 3.1 Students negotiate, in and out of role, a range of situations and narratives. | 3.4 Students identify and describe through teacher-guided response, the learning and understanding developed in and through drama experiences. 3.5 Students make informal, but supported critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements and skills using appropriate drama vocabulary. 3.6 Students describe the purposes for which drama exists in communities and cultures. | DR 3.2 Students rehearse and present dramatic action for a specific purpose. 3.3 Students participate in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and Europeans in Australia; Discovery in Australia; environment; Indigenous and immigrant Australians; traditional stories, journal and learning log entries; short new report, readers' theatre, radio drama (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10). | DDR 3.4 Students describe the purposes for which drama exists in communities and cultures. 3.5 Students make informal, but supported critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements and skills using appropriate drama vocabulary. 3.6 Students describe the purposes for which drama exists in communities and cultures. | 3.7 Students participate in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and Europeans in Australia; Discovery in Australia; environment; Indigenous and immigrant Australians; traditional stories, journal and learning log entries; short new report, readers' theatre, radio drama (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10). | DA & DDR 3 Students create a dance-drama by transforming freeze frames into movement motifs. |
| Level 4 | 4.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain a range of roles and relationships drawn from school/community issues, historical and fictional contexts. 4.2 Students manage focus, time, space, language, movement, and use mood and symbol in contributing to the creation and shaping of dramatic situations, roles and narratives using dramatic conventions and where appropriate incorporating basic scriptwriting. 4.3 Students present rehearsed, devised and scripted drama using voice, movement and characterisation appropriate for a specific audience and space. 4.4 Students identify and evaluate learning and understanding developed in and through drama. 4.5 Students evaluate the handling of dramatic elements and skills in their own work and that of others through reporting and other genres, making supported critical judgments using appropriate drama terminology. 4.6 Students examine the purposes and types of drama within particular cultural contexts. 4.7 Students use dramatic conventions to explore other KLA topics, eg. Religion and Culture in Asia; Resources, Power and World Exploration; Media Representation; Government and Democracy (SOSE core topics); and genres – stories, parables, investigative report, radio or television news feature, journal entry, persuasive speech, debate (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10). 4.8 Students create and use masks and/or puppets to extend dramatic characterisations and possibilities. 4.9 Students use, with teacher guidance, basic elements of design and stagecraft to complement dramatic action. DR 4.1 Students select dramatic elements and conventions to collaboratively shape improvisations and roleplays. DR 4.2 Students present devised and scripted drama using performance skills appropriate for a variety of purposes and audiences. DR 4.3 Students make supported critical judgments about the application of dramatic elements and conventions in the context of their own work and that of others. DR 4.4 Students analyse and investigate the purposes and types of drama within different cultural contexts. DDR, ME & VA 4 Students collaboratively design and create functional masks in preparation for a multimedia performance. | DR 4.2 Students present devised and scripted drama using performance skills appropriate for a variety of purposes and audiences. | DR 4.3 Students make supported critical judgments about the application of dramatic elements and conventions in the context of their own work and that of others. | 4.7 Students use dramatic conventions to explore other KLA topics, eg. Religion and Culture in Asia; Resources, Power and World Exploration; Media Representation; Government and Democracy (SOSE core topics); and genres – stories, parables, investigative report, radio or television news feature, journal entry, persuasive speech, debate (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10). 4.8 Students create and use masks and/or puppets to extend dramatic characterisations and possibilities. 4.9 Students use, with teacher guidance, basic elements of design and stagecraft to complement dramatic action. DDR 4.4 Students analyse and investigate the purposes and types of drama within different cultural contexts. DDR, ME & VA 4 Students collaboratively design and create functional masks in preparation for a multimedia performance. |
5.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain dramatic roles, relationships and situations to explore through improvisation and roleplay various issues, concepts and stories, contributing individually and cooperatively to problem solving and decision making processes.

5.2 Students manage context, character, language, time, and use tension, mood and symbol to structure or transform texts using conventions appropriate to selected dramatic forms.

5.3 Students present student-devised and scripted drama using characterisation, voice, movement and other dramatic skills appropriate to different styles and forms for a specific audience and space.

5.4 Students select elements of design and stagecraft to create desired effects and environments to enhance dramatic work.

5.5 Students identify and determine meanings created and altered through the manipulations of selected dramatic elements.

5.6 Students assess the forms, styles and processes used in their own drama and that of others applying appropriate drama terminology.

5.7 Students investigate the specific purposes, audience and cultural contexts of dramatic processes and presentations.

5.8 Students identify the personal and career related skills developed through drama experiences.

5.9 Students utilise research and knowledge from other Klaus as starting points for drama, Cultural diversity in Australia, Environments, Civics and Citizenship (SOSE core topics); (relevant HPE Core topics need to be added; and genres – short scripts, stories/tall tales, magazine article, television news feature, public speech (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).
### Level 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1 Students create, sustain and communicate roles with appropriate depth, working individually and cooperatively in improvisations and roleplays based on issues, themes, concepts or texts.</th>
<th>6.3 Students present individually or as part of an ensemble, a rehearsed polished performance within a chosen dramatic form and style demonstrating appropriate characterisation, performance skills and text interpretation to communicate effectively with an audience.</th>
<th>6.5 Students analyse and evaluate how meaning can be created and communicated through management of elements of drama and the use of specific dramatic forms and/or styles.</th>
<th>6.9 Students utilise research and knowledge from other Klaus as starting points in forming and presenting drama, eg. Topics such as Youth cultures, Societies in Change; Work; Australia and International Relations (SOSE core topics); and genres – autobiography, dramatic monologues, short scripts, drama review, interviews (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Students devise and structure dramatic action, scenarios and scripts within selected dramatic conventions, forms and styles to communicate meaning about a selected issue, story or idea.</td>
<td>6.4 Students select and manipulate basic elements of stagecraft and design (space, costume, props, audio-visual, sound and light) to enhance the dramatic context.</td>
<td>6.6 Students interpret, analyse, evaluate and justify their own drama work and that of others using appropriate drama terminology in both short and extended oral and written forms.</td>
<td>6.10 Students combine drama, dance, music, sound and video and other visual material to create a dramatic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 6.1 Students devise and refine scenarios and scripts, both individually and as part of an ensemble, using elements and conventions appropriate to selected forms, styles and purposes.</td>
<td>DR 6.2 Students present a rehearsed, polished performance applying performance skills appropriate to the selected form, style and performance space.</td>
<td>DR 6.3 Students evaluate the forms, styles and processes used in dramatic action and performance, identifying the influence of purpose and context.</td>
<td>6.11 Students create lighting designs and lighting plots for dramatic performances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 6.4 Students discuss, evaluate and interpret different ways drama deals with universal and specific human experiences.</td>
<td>DR 6.5 Students analyse and evaluate how meaning can be created and communicated through management of elements of drama and the use of specific dramatic forms and/or styles.</td>
<td>DR 6.6 Students interpret, analyse, evaluate and justify their own drama work and that of others using appropriate drama terminology in both short and extended oral and written forms.</td>
<td>DR 6.7 Students articulate an understanding of the purposes of drama and the ways drama is made within particular cultural contexts, time and places, and how drama is changed or can be changed to suit a particular context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 6.8 Students investigate and document how drama skills and learning’s contribute to a wide range of study and career paths.</td>
<td>DR 6.9 Students utilise research and knowledge from other Klaus as starting points in forming and presenting drama, eg. Topics such as Youth cultures, Societies in Change; Work; Australia and International Relations (SOSE core topics); and genres – autobiography, dramatic monologues, short scripts, drama review, interviews (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).</td>
<td>DR 6.10 Students combine drama, dance, music, sound and video and other visual material to create a dramatic performance.</td>
<td>DR 6.11 Students create lighting designs and lighting plots for dramatic performances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 6.12 Students use computer animation programs to realise their scriptwriting and direction.</td>
<td>DDR 6.1 Students manipulate dramatic elements, forms, and styles to create scripts, characterisations and contexts.</td>
<td>DDR 6.2 Students direct individuals or small groups to interpret scripted and student-devised drama.</td>
<td>DDR 6.3 Students rehearse and present scripts employing film-acting techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR 6.4 Students discuss, evaluate and interpret different ways drama deals with universal and specific human experiences.</td>
<td>DDR 6.5 Students analyse and evaluate how meaning can be created and communicated through management of elements of drama and the use of specific dramatic forms and/or styles.</td>
<td>DDR 6.6 Students interpret, analyse, evaluate and justify their own drama work and that of others using appropriate drama terminology in both short and extended oral and written forms.</td>
<td>DDR 6.7 Students articulate an understanding of the purposes of drama and the ways drama is made within particular cultural contexts, time and places, and how drama is changed or can be changed to suit a particular context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR 6.5 Students document drama skills and learnings that contribute to a range of work and study options. DDA &amp; DR 6 Students create and perform a dance-drama sequence based on a youth issue or concern to be presented in a non-traditional space. DDR &amp; MU6 Students collaborate to create a performance that combines drama and a range of environmental, vocal and instrumental sounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Beyond Level 6 | **6+.1 Students manipulate dramatic elements, forms, styles to create dramatic scripts, characterisations and contexts.**
| **6+.2 Students direct individuals or small groups to interpret student-devised and scripted text.** | **6+.3 Students display independence, confidence and sensitivity in the selection, rehearsal, interpretation and performance of student-devised and scripted text.**
| **6+.4 Students select and manipulate basic elements of stagecraft and design to support the interpretation of the drama.** | **6+.5 Students compare drama in different times, cultures and societies to generalise about trends and developments.**
| **6+.6 Students discuss, evaluate and interpret different ways drama deals with universal and specific human experiences.** | **6+.7 Students use their experiences of drama to consider personal and vocational choices.** |
Appendix 7.2 Invitation to offer for Outcomes writing.
**QUEENSLAND SCHOOL CURRICULUM COUNCIL**

MLC Building, Floor 27, 239 George Street, Brisbane Qld 4000  
(PO Box 317, Brisbane Albert Street Qld 4002)

**INVITATION TO OFFER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer No:</th>
<th>QSCC-06/98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Issued:</td>
<td>3 AUGUST 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquires To:</td>
<td>CAROLYN HARROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone No:</td>
<td>(07) 3235 4722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile No:</td>
<td>(07) 3237 1285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONDITIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS**

**ARTS SYLLABUS COMMISSION WRITERS**

**CLOSING AT** 5:00 pm, **MONDAY 17 AUGUST 1998**

Offers for the above will not be opened publicly.

Offerers are requested to clearly identify any information which is to be regarded as Commercial in Confidence. The names of offerers and total prices submitted in offers shall not be regarded as Commercial in Confidence by the Queensland School Curriculum Council (QSCC) and will be available for public disclosure.

**Note:** These Conditions of Offer and Specifications should be retained by your Organisation for possible future reference. The Schedules must be received by the Queensland School Curriculum Council, Floor 27, MLC Building, by the closing time and date.
CONDITIONS OF SUPPLY

1. GENERAL - Acceptance of our order is deemed to include acceptance of the following conditions which form the basis of the contract. No other conditions imposed by the supplier either verbally, or as writing prior to or subsequent to the placing of our order will apply unless specifically accepted in writing by an authorised officer of the department.

2. DEFINITIONS - Where used herein, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated: -

"The Agent" - shall mean the organisation, individual or partnership to whom our order is directed.

"The Contractor" - shall mean the Queensland School Curriculum Council and/or its agents.

"The Goods" - shall mean the goods or services which are the subject of our order.

"Orders" - shall also be taken to include a "Letter of Acceptance" where this has been issued by the department in response to an offer.

3. SALES TAX - Sales tax is applicable to the goods which are the subject of an official Queensland School Curriculum Council order unless specified to the contrary on the invoice document and order. Sales tax exemption is claimed under the first schedule of the Sales Tax (Exemptions and Classifications) Act 1992 item number 128.

4. FORMATION OF CONTRACT -

4.1 When our order has been issued in acceptance of an offer to supply, and where such offer has a validity period and has not previously been revoked, provided our order is dated and forwarded to the supplier at the address appearing on the offer within the validity period, a contract will be deemed to have been formed.

4.2 When our order has been issued as a result of a verbal enquiry our order shall be deemed to be an offer to purchase, upon acceptance of which, a contract will have been formed. For the purposes of this clause only, acceptance is deemed to have occurred:

(a) When the supplier allocates goods against our order or takes any action to manufacture or obtain such goods for supply to the department or;

(b) When the supplier communicates either in writing or verbally with the department the content of which confirms or implies acceptance of our order;

(c) When the supplier takes any action to notify the department of the refusal of our offer to purchase the goods.

4.3 The contract will be deemed to have been broken if the supplier fails to comply with any provisions contained in the invitation to offer, which has been agreed upon by both parties through acceptance of the department's order and establishment of the contract. A "Break of Contract" will exist in the department to revoke the order, regardless of whether goods have already been supplied and arranged for delivery of the goods from an alternative source. Product supplied against an order which has been revoked shall be collected by the supplier or returned to the supplier at the supplier's cost and risk, within 30 days of the date the order was revoked. Any loss incurred by the department under this clause shall be debit due payable by the supplier in "Break of Contract".

5. PRICES -

5.1 When our order is issued in acceptance of a written offer to Supply, no price increases other than those expressly allowed for in the offer will be accepted.

5.2 When our order is issued as a result of a verbal enquiry it is understood that any price variations must be confirmed in writing by the Ordering Officer issuing a written authorisation prior to the supply of goods. Failure to render such notice will indemnify the department in respect of any increase in price.

5.3 Except where otherwise stated on our order, prices for the goods will include transport to the department's delivery address.

6. SPECIFICATIONS -

6.1 The goods must be supplied in accordance with the specification, or description on our order, or appended thereto. No alternatives are to be supplied without the prior approval, in writing, of an authorised officer of the department.

6.2 Any performance data, measurements, specifications etc. quoted by the supplier, catalogues, brochures, descriptive literature or offers shall be binding on the supplier within the tolerances specified in such documents.

6.3 All goods supplied must be in accordance with any relevant Australian Standards and federal and state regulations in force at the date of contract.

6.4 Throughout the life of the contract, Quality Assurance requirements must be maintained in accordance with the appropriate standard.

7. PACKING -

7.1 Any packing necessary for the safe transport and storage of the goods is deemed to be included in the quoted price unless specifically excluded in the suppliers offer.

7.2 Suppliers offers, advice notes, and invoice shall show where packing is in returnable and the amount of deposit charges, if any. All returnable packing which is charged on a returnable deposit basis or otherwise shall be clearly marked as such, bear a return address and will be returned freight forward at the Constructors convenience by a transporter selected by the Contractor unless otherwise agreed.

7.3 The supplier shall provide with each consignment sufficient delivery documents to enable the Council to identify the contents of each package and in addition shall endorse all packages, delivery documents and invoices with the Council's purchase order number.

8. INSPECTION AND TESTS - The Council reserves the right to inspect and test as necessary all goods supplied. Wherever possible such inspection and tests will be jointly undertaken and the results thereof. The supplier shall be liable for the replacement, free of charge, of all such rejected goods, with goods of an acceptable standard. Any rejected goods shall within 30 days from notification by letter and subject to any lien thereon which the Council may have, be removed by the supplier at his own expense from the Council's premises. If, on the expiration of 30 days, the rejected goods have not been removed, the Council may return the goods freight forward, and to the supplier's risk, to the supplier. All goods which have been notified to the supplier as rejected, are held by the Council at the supplier's risk.

9. DELIVERY -

9.1 The respective periods stipulated for delivery of the goods shall be deemed to be the essence of the contract, and the failure of the supplier to supply in accordance with this stipulation shall enable the Council to treat such failure as "Break of Contract" if it so elects. Refer clause 4.3.

9.2 No deliveries effective outside the normal working hours of the Council will be accepted unless by prior arrangement with an authorised officer of the department.

10. TERMS OF PAYMENT - Payment will be made after inspection and acceptance of the goods, against a fully detailed invoice quoting the Council's official order number and will normally be effected within 30 days.

11. WARRANTY - Where a defect in the goods supplied under the contract occurs by reason of faulty materials, workmanship or design, conditions of the offer will apply.

12. INDEMNIFICATION - The supplier shall indemnify the Council in respect of all damage or injury due to the negligence of the supplier, its employees, agents or anyone occurring during the performance of a service or during the warranty period for goods or services.

13. IMPORT LICENCES - If it is necessary for the performance of the contract for the Council and/or the supplier to hold or obtain any import licence, consent by law exemption, or authority then either or both parties to appropriate shall be obliged to apply for same. If such licence, consent, by-law exemption, or authority is refused then the contract will be treated as being discharged and remains the supplier nor the Council will be under any liabilities to the other.

14. PATENTS -

14.1 The supplier shall pay all royalty fees and expenses, and be liable for all claims, in respect of the use of patent rights, trademarks or other protected rights or test in connection with any goods supplied under the contract and shall indemnify the Council against all claims arising therefrom.

14.2 The Council will indemnify the supplier against claims arising from infringement of patent rights, trade marks or other protected rights, where such infringement results from compliance, by the supplier, with the Council's instructions in relation to designs prepared by the Council.

15. PROPERTY AND RISK - The property and risk in the goods shall pass to the Council in accordance with Section 25 of the Sale of Goods Act 1896 (Queensland, subject also to the following):

15.1 Goods supplied from within Australia

15.1.1 F.S.C. (Free into Council's Store). Property and risk shall pass to the Council at the point of delivery into the Council's store, immediately prior to off loading.

15.1.2 F.O.T. (Free on Transport)

b) Where the property has been sold by the supplier and delivered to the Council, the property and risk shall pass to the Council immediately after the goods have been loaded into the transporter's vehicle.

15.2 Imperial Goods

15.2.1 Unless specified otherwise, only the following terms and conditions are acceptable for the transfer of Property and Risk to the Council:

a) Delivered into Council's Store - at the point of delivery into the Council's store, immediately prior to off loading.

b) F.O.B. (Free on Board) Port of Discharge - immediately after the goods have been loaded on board ship, aircraft etc. provided the supplier
has given to the Council such notice in writing as may enable the Council to ensure the goods for the whole of the subsequent transit period.

C.I.F. (Carriage, Insurance Freight) Port of Entry—immediately prior to offloading at the port of entry provided that the supplier has given to the Council such notice in writing as may enable the Council to ensure the goods for the whole of the subsequent transit period.

15.3 Rejected Goods

Rejected goods shall be at the suppliers risk as defined in Section 8 - Inspection and Tests.

16. DAMAGE OR LOSS IN TRANSIT - Where goods have either been lost or damaged in transit whilst at the supplier's risk the supplier will with all due diligence take all necessary action either to replace the goods or arrange repairs, whichever is mutually acceptable to both parties. The Council will sign all carriers delivery documentation subject to check and accept responsibility for notification to the supplier within 7 days of receipt in the case of damage, or 14 days from receipt of advice in the case of loss in transit.

17. VARIATION—Any variations required by the Council or the supplier will be mutually agreed prior to the variation taking place, and will be the subject of written authorisation raised by an authorised officer of the Council.

18. FORCE MAJEURE

18.1 The supplier will not be held liable for breach of contract or any losses, damage or injury incurred by the Council wherever performance of the contract is prevented by circumstances including but not limited to the following which are deemed to be outside the suppliers control: perils of the sea, strikes, lock outs, act of God, war or warlike measures whether threatened, declared or anticipated, or the outbreak of hostilities between nations or countries trade restrictions or government directives, explosions, embargos, fire, flood, drought, riot, sabotage or accident.

18.2 Similarly the council will not accept liability for any losses damage or injury incurred by the supplier as a result of the Council’s inability to accept or pay for goods for the same reasons.

18.3 In the event that either party is unable wholly or in part to perform its obligations under the contract as a result of the occurrence of force majeure circumstances, such party shall immediately give notice to the other of the details of such occurrence and there upon both parties shall make arrangements and adjustments to the contract as necessary. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, upon cessation of the event all performance of the contract both parties shall, as far as practicable, continue performance of their respective obligations under the contract.

19. CANCELLATION - Where cancellation of our order is required by the Council this will be notified in writing. Any cancellation charges to be applied by the supplier will be notified by the supplier to the Council in writing at the time of cancellation. No cancellation charges will be accepted by the council other than those which have been advised to the council and which represent a genuine loss incurred by the supplier through the cancellation of our order.

20. ASSIGNMENT - Neither party hereto may assign the whole or any part of the benefits or obligations of this party under this agreement without the consent of the other party, provided, however, that the consent of the other party shall not be unreasonably withheld in the case of a proposed respectable and responsible assignee.

21. ARBITRATION - Any dispute arising from the supply of goods against our order shall be submitted for arbitration by one arbitrator agreed upon by the supplier and the council and both parties agree to abide by the decision of such arbitrator.

22. LEGAL CONSTRUCTION - The contract shall in all respect be construed and operate as an Australian Contract and shall be governed by the laws of the State of Queensland and the Commonwealth of Australia.
CONDITIONS OF OFFER

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

This invitation to offer for the Supply of Goods and/or Services is issued under the terms and conditions of the Queensland Government's State Purchasing Policy, General Conditions of Offering (Part D, Section 2, Appendix 3).

If you lodge any offer that conflict with the Queensland School Curriculum Council conditions, then the Queensland School Curriculum Council conditions shall apply unless you specifically state in the schedule that this is not to be the case.

Offerers shall explain and clarify any terms or conditions they have included in their response.

It shall be the responsibility of offerers to inquire about and clarify any matter in the Invitation to Offer for the Supply of Goods and/or Services that the offerer does not fully understand or which the offerer believes may be subject to more than one interpretation.

Any offer which does not comply with the following conditions and our Conditions of Supply overleaf may be rejected.

2. LODGEMENT OF OFFER

2.1 The offer together with any attachments shall be completed in all respects, sealed and endorsed "Offer Number QSCC 06/98" and returned to the Queensland School Curriculum Council at the address shown on the Invitation to Offer to be received by the specified closing time and date. Failure to submit your offer in this format may result in your offer being rejected.

2.2 If desired or if space is insufficient on the offer form, a covering letter may be submitted with the offer.

2.3 Envelopes must be clearly marked "Confidential - Offer Documents QSCC 06/98 Enclosed".

3. ALTERNATIVE OFFERS

One or more alternative offers may be submitted.

4. PRICES

4.1 All offer prices shall be calculated free of sales tax and shall include any wiping where applicable unless specified to the contrary.

4.2 Prices offered shall be on the basis detailed in the Invitation to Offer. The prices submitted in the offer shall be firm unless specified to the contrary.

4.3 Offerers are asked to indicate any settlement discounts applicable.

4.4 Prices quoted should be on the basis of suitably packed. Full details relating to delivery charges must be provided in the offer.

4.5 The following conditions shall apply where goods offered are yet to be imported, for the purpose of obtaining offers on the same basis and for calculating any variations due to exchange rate fluctuations:

(a) the price offered shall be calculated on the selling exchange rate on the date of issue of this Invitation to Offer.

(b) the price to be invoiced shall be calculated on the selling exchange rate on the date of arrival at discharge port as established by customs entry.

(c) selling exchange rates for the above calculations shall be as quoted by the Commonwealth Banking Corporation.

The successful offerer shall show, when requested, proof of selling exchange rate variations between (a) and (b) in the case where the price invoiced is greater than the price quoted in this offer.

5. ACCEPTANCE OF OFFER

5.1 An offer shall not be deemed to be accepted until an official order, or letter of acceptance, from the Queensland School Curriculum Council is placed on the selected supplier within the validity period at the address appearing on the offer, providing always that the offer has not previously been revoked. The Queensland School Curriculum Council shall not be bound to accept the lowest, or any offer and unless otherwise specified, reserves the right to accept an offer on an item by item basis.

5.2 The Queensland School Curriculum Council reserves the right to enter into post offer negotiations on any matters prior to acceptance of the offer. No goods/services should be supplied prior to acceptance of the offer.

6. VALIDITY

Unless specified to the contrary on the offer form, all offers shall be open for acceptance for a period of at least 60 days after the closing date.

7. SAMPLES

7.1 All samples submitted shall be labelled with the description of the sample, the name of the supplier and the offer number to which the sample refers.

7.2 Samples submitted will be retained by the department and will become the property of the department unless otherwise agreed.

8. PACKING

The price offered is to exclude the cost of suitable packing, and if any sum is refundable on the return of a container. Details of the refund are to be stated as part of the offer.

9. DELIVERY TIME

The supplier's ability to supply goods within the specified time-frame will be an important consideration of acceptance of any offer.

10. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Suppliers to government agencies are required to meet the Quality Assurance requirements specified by the agency. Where a risk assessment has established the need for a quality assurance system, this requirement will be specified in the offer document. Suppliers without quality assurance are not precluded from offering. If no offer meets the level of quality specified, all offers may be evaluated.

11. EVALUATION

Offers will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the offer document.
1. **CONDUCT OF THE INVITATION TO OFFER**

The *Invitation to Offer* is issued under the Queensland School Curriculum Council (QSCC) Conditions of Offer and Conditions of Supply attached.

This Invitation to Offer will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the *Queensland Government’s State Purchasing Policy*.

Your organisation is invited to submit a best and final offer at this time.

2. **FORMAT OF OFFERS**

The attached *Schedule of Particulars* must be completed and returned with your Offer. Failure to do so may result in your Offer being considered to be “non-conforming”.

Note - “See Attached” is not an acceptable response unless there is insufficient space provided, in which case give brief details on an attachment/s.

Any supporting documentation in the Offer shall be referred to in the *Schedule of Particulars* and cross referenced. Any amendment to the agreement shall require the written approval of the QSCC.

*Your Offer and any illustrated descriptive literature must be submitted in duplicate.*

Please assist by returning only relevant pages.

3. **LODGEMENT OF OFFERS**

To be considered, this Offer is to be received in hard copy by the closing time and date and either;

- lodged at reception, situated at the Queensland School Curriculum Council office, located at floor 27, MLC Building, 239 George Street, Brisbane Q 4000; or,
- received by the QSCC via post or courier.

The QSCC may not accept an Offer delivered after the advertised closing time, no matter what the reason for the late delivery.

An Offer received by facsimile will NOT be considered.

An Offer in any way incomplete may be rejected at the discretion of the QSCC.

**NB: Offers sent via post/courier must be clearly marked:**
 "Confidential - Offer No. QSCC-05/98 enclosed, closing 5.00pm, Monday 17 August 1998 ".

Copies of these conditions and the specification should be retained by your organisation for future reference.

4. **ACCEPTANCE OF OFFER**

The QSCC is not bound to accept any Offer. The QSCC reserves the right to enter into post offer negotiations prior to finalising the contract if deemed necessary.

Any Offer submitted which does not comply with the conditions of this *Invitation to Offer*, nor include all information requested, may not be considered.
Within the Strategy Plan the Consultant has recommended a number of proprietary products. Offerers will not be restricted to offering these proprietary products if it can be demonstrated that alternative products offer equivalent functionality and capability.

Offers may be submitted and accepted for:

- all goods/services which conform with the specifications;
- all goods and/or alternatives, including conventional and innovative options, which have similar characteristics and which provide performance and quality at least equal to those specified.

The QSCC reserves the right to accept whole or part of any offer. The QSCC may elect not to accept any offer.

5. **PRICE**

Prices are to be in Australian dollars. Offerers should be aware that the final contract will be issued on a fixed price basis. Costs and terms for delivery are to be calculated S.D.I.C.S. (supply, deliver, install and commission, support) to QSCC offices at MLC Centre and AISQ House.

Price increases, as a result of enterprise bargaining agreements, will not be accepted during the currency of the contract.

Prices and rebates offered must be firm for a minimum period of 30 days from the date of close of offer. No variations will be accepted by the QSCC.

6. **PAYMENT**

In order to receive payment for any services performed, the contractor is required to supply the Queensland School Curriculum Council with an invoice outlining the services provided and the invoice amount.

All offerers need to be aware that any payments to a contractor who performs a service under this contract and is not a registered business, will have tax deducted from any such payments.

Prior to this payment, the contractor will be required to supply the Queensland School Curriculum Council with a fully completed Tax Declaration form, declaring the Tax File Number.

7. **OFFER ERRORS/DISCREPANCIES**

Should any errors or discrepancies be found in the Offer after closing, then the QSCC may:

- reject the Offer; or
- direct the offerer to either confirm the offered details or withdraw its Offer immediately.

8. **DISCLAIMER**

The QSCC will not be held liable for any claim on the grounds of erroneous or insufficient information. If an organisation has any doubts as to the meaning or intention of any part of this Invitation to Offer, or if further information is required to ensure a clear and correct understanding of the nature and extent of the goods and services required by the QSCC, application should be made to the QSCC. If, as a result of such discussions, an amendment to the specifications is made, all prospective offerers will be notified.
If there is still some doubt as to the meaning of any part of the Invitation to Offer, the offerer shall include a statement of the interpretation upon which the Offer has been based, and the QSCC will take this statement into account when evaluating the Offer.

9. **WITHDRAWAL OF OFFERS**

Offers may be withdrawn at any time prior to the closing by notice in writing to the QSCC. Such Offers will be set aside for collection by the offerer after the official opening. The official notice should be directed to the Director, Queensland School Curriculum Council, PO Box 317, Brisbane Albert Street, Q 4002.

10. **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

The QSCC will regard all information submitted by offerers, except that which will be made available to all organisations following the opening of the Offers, as confidential and will take all reasonable steps to safeguard the confidentiality of that information.

QSCC staff will enter into any non-disclosure agreements necessary to protect the confidentiality of an organisation’s future plans. However, in view of the Freedom of Information Act 1992, the QSCC cannot guarantee the confidentiality of all information in respondent’s submissions.

Organisations are advised to highlight any information of a confidential nature by labelling all such information “Commercial in Confidence”.

Organisations wishing to obtain information under the Freedom of Information Act should contact the Principal Policy Officer, Freedom of Information and Judicial Review Unit, Department of Education, phone (07) 3237 0758.

11. **GIFTS OR GRATUITIES**

Offerers shall not offer gifts or favours of any kind to public sector officers as inducement to accept an offer or place an order. Such behaviour contravenes the provisions of the Public Sector Ethics Act 1994 as well as the Queensland Government’s State Purchasing Policy Code of Practice on Ethical Behaviour and Fair Dealing and may result in the offer being rejected.

12. **ADVERTISING**

It is a condition of any contract awarded as a result of this Invitation to Offer that no advertising relating to the awarding of any contract shall be published in any advertising medium without the prior written approval of the Director, Queensland School Curriculum Council.

13. **SUBCONTRACTORS**

The successful offerer shall **not**, without the prior written consent of the QSCC, assign or sub-let any part of its obligations under this arrangement. Any permission to assign services to be performed or goods to be supplied by a sub-contractor under the agreement shall **not** discharge the successful offerer from any liability in respect of the agreement.

14. **INDEMNITY**

The contractor shall indemnify and at all times keep the QSCC indemnified against any action, claim or demand, costs or expenses arising from or incurred by reason of any infringement or alleged infringement of any letters patent, design, trademark or name, copyright or other protected right in respect of any stores, goods, articles, services, equipment, machinery, plant, computer software, system or method of performing, using, fixing, working or arrangement used or fixed or supplied by the contractor.
In the event of any claim being made or brought against the QSCC in respect of any of the aforesaid matters, the contractor shall be immediately notified thereof, and shall, with the assistance of the QSCC, but at the sole expense of the contractor, conduct all negotiations for the settlement of the same or any litigation that arise there from and in the event of failure to do so the QSCC shall have power to suspend payment of any money due to the contractor in respect of the contract until such claim has been satisfied or withdrawn. Should the money due, or which thereafter may become due, to the contractor, or that may have been deposited as security in respect of the contract, be not sufficient for the purpose of settling any such claim in respect of the contract, and such claim has been satisfied or withdrawn at the date when the contract would otherwise have been completed, the balance outstanding in respect of the claim shall be a debt due by the contractor to the QSCC and may be recovered from the contractor in any court of jurisdiction.

15. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

The contractor shall take all steps necessary to ensure that information held regarding services provided under the contract is confidential and held in a secure fashion.

16. **OWNERSHIP OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CONTRACT MATERIAL**

Title to and intellectual property rights in all new contract material, including each and every stage of design and production of it, will upon its creation vest in the QSCC without the need for further assurance.

17. **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

All offers will be evaluated on the following criteria:

- compliance with terms, conditions, and specification;
- prices offered;
- methodology for control of the project, including meeting timeframes;
- skills of the contractors staff;
- experience in similar projects; and
- referee reports.

18. **FEEDBACK**

Both successful and unsuccessful offerers will be advised in writing of the completion of the *Invitation to Offer* process. Unsuccessful offerers may seek feedback from the chair of the evaluation panel.
SPECIFICATIONS

The Office of the Queensland School Curriculum Council is currently developing a Years 1-10 Arts Syllabus, Sourcebook and Initial Inservice Materials. A Design Brief has been developed to provide a framework for the development of the syllabus and associated materials.

The Arts syllabus will describe the learning outcomes in each of the five arts areas: dance, drama, media, music and visual art together with the scope of learning in each arts area.

Expressions of interest are being sought from individuals, groups, organisations or consortia to develop sections of the syllabus and associated materials in either dance, drama, media, music or visual arts. Applicants will need to indicate the arts area for which they are expressing an interest in developing sections of the syllabus.

The sections to be developed in each of the arts areas are:
- the scope of the content of learning in the specific arts area, described in levels;
- the core scope of the specific arts area (what is essential to be achieved by Year 10);
- core learning outcomes in each of two strands in the specific arts area, described in six levels (Level 1 to Level 6);
- discretionary learning outcomes in each of two strands in the specific arts area, described in seven levels (Level 1 to post Level 6)

A copy of the consultative draft of the Design Brief together with examples from another Key Learning Area Syllabus are contained in the application package to provide an indication of the expected product.

Writers of these sections will be expected to work closely with the Project Officers, Arts located within the Office of the Queensland School Curriculum Council. They will also be expected to participate in four full day workshops of writers during the course of the project, meeting participation costs from within their contracted budget. Teams can have up to two members participate in these workshops.

$5 000 will be granted to successful applicants on the production of the designated materials in a form suitable for inclusion in the trial version of the Years 1-10 Arts Syllabus. The deadline for receipt of this material is Monday 26 October 1998.

A further $3 000 will be granted on the refinement of the designated materials to accommodate feedback from the trial and pilot processes. The deadline for receipt of the final material is Monday 8 May 2000.
Appendix 7.3 The QADIE outcomes
writing proposal
Queensland Government

QUEENSLAND SCHOOL CURRICULUM COUNCIL

MLC Building, 239 George Street, Brisbane Qld 4000
(PO Box 117, Brisbane, Albert Street Qld 4002)

INVITATION TO OFFER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer No:</th>
<th>QSCC-0698</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Issued:</td>
<td>3 AUGUST 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Date Closing:</td>
<td>5.00PM, 17 AUGUST 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquires To:</td>
<td>CAROLYN HARROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone No:</td>
<td>(07) 3235 4722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each and every respect in which my offer does not comply with the conditions or the specification is detailed herein.
If my offer is accepted in whole or part, I otherwise agree to supply entirely in accordance with all the conditions, requirements and specifications detailed in this document.

INVITATION to Offer QSCC-0698 (Standard Terms and Conditions and Specifications and Schedules of Particulars, which I have read and with which I am fully conversant.

SCHEDULES OF PARTICULARS

Name and address of COMPANY/INDIVIDUAL offering:
Queensland Association for Drama in Education (QADIE) Inc.

State of Aust. where company is registered:
Queensland

Name of Holding Company or Corporate Group:

Where is order to be directed:
The Administrator C/- 9 Bellata Street The Gap Qld 4061

Is a "Free Call" Facility Available? No Number: 0417 748 002

Where is acceptance to be directed?:
As above

Postal Address: As above

Who will invoice: QADIE Inc.

Enquires to: Name Debbie Wall Telephone No. 07 3846 7477
Sue Davis 07 3378 6333 (ext 244)

Authorised Signature: Sandra Booth Date: 17/08/1998

Note: The schedules must be received by the Queensland School Curriculum Council, floor 27, MLC Building by 5.00pm on 17 August 1998. The Conditions of Offer and Specifications should be retained by your company for possible future reference.
**SCHEDULE OF PARTICULARS**

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your offer fully comply with the specifications detailed herein?</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If no, please detail areas of non-compliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your company agree to the QSCC Terms and Conditions as referred to within this document?</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If no, please detail areas of non-compliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB: Failure to accept these Terms and Conditions may result in the QSCC accepting an alternative offer where the QSCC Terms and Conditions have been agreed to without amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10 - Payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need money upfront to pay for TRS for members of the Teacher Reference Group (TRG). Request payment of $2500.00 at the beginning of the project and the remainder of $2500.00 on completion of the project 26 October 1998.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate which area(s) of the Arts you are expressing an interest in.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please circle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have your offer, all brochures and other documentation been submitted in duplicate?</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please state the expiry date of your offer. Please also refer to Section 5, Additional Conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFERER'S NAME: Queensland Association for Drama in Education (QADIE) Inc.
To: Queensland School Curriculum Council

Expression of Interest

to develop syllabus materials for DRAMA

From: Queensland Association for Drama In Education (QADIE)
METHODOLOGY - PROJECT MANAGEMENT

QADIE proposes a coordinated four-level model for developing the drama scope/sequence and outcomes, working collaboratively with QSCC, practising teachers and academics to develop materials which are appropriate, theoretically sound and relate to current & future practice. This model comprises:

- a small writing group (WG) of experienced curriculum writers, 1 primary & 1 secondary to develop respective components and attend QSCC workshops, with a coordinator (WGC) to manage QADIE’s communications, organise developmental workshops and ensure that QSCC timelines are met.

- an Academic Reference Group (ARG) of internationally-recognized tertiary educators providing research material, writing input & responding to drafts to ensure that the views of drama & drama education represented are theoretically-sound & indicative of national and international best practice.

- a Teacher Reference Group (TRG) of 8-10 teachers currently working in State & non-State schools to ensure that recommended approaches to drama education are representative of both current and emergent classroom practice. The QADIE Management committee would also be utilised.

- a Corresponding Reference Group (CRG) representing QADIE members across the state and also utilising QADIE’s www List Serve e mail facility of interested & self-nominated drama professionals working in the field at state, national & international levels.

The following specific development processes for the Syllabus sections are envisaged:

- **Briefing** - of WG by QSCC Project Officers on parameters, expectations & timelines

- **Initial Consultation** - WGC meets and communicates with all reference groups outlining the project parameters & timelines, request for specific materials to support the work of the WG and expectations for involvement in the developmental process of particular Syllabus components

- **Content scope & sequence by levels** - WG work with QSCC project officers utilising the results of www search, environmental scan & literature review, TRG & CRG provide input based on school programs and current practice, ARG provide input, reference & research materials. WG draft overall scope & sequence for the designated strands by bands of schooling. Scope & sequence draft sent to ARG, TRG & CRG groups (and posted on website), seeking feedback on text and nomination of core scope components considered essential for student engagement by the end of each level of schooling. WGC submits text to QSCC officers.

- **Core learning outcomes by strands & levels** - WGC organises school holiday workshop for QADIE members selected from ARG, TRG & CRG groups to develop core outcomes. When a draft is completed these are posted on the QADIE website for more extensive consultation.

- **Discretionary learning outcomes by strands & levels** - discretionary learning outcomes added. Outcomes refined (with assistance from reference groups), WGC submits text of core & discretionary learning outcomes to QSCC.

- **Consultation and submission of scope and sequence and learning outcomes.**

N.B. QSCC officers will be informed of all meeting dates and will be welcome to attend and contribute. Similar processes would be used to redraft the materials after trialling, with a particular focus on utilising expertise in areas where weaknesses may have been identified in the trialling phase.

OFFERER'S NAME: QLD ASSOCIATION FOR DRAMA IN EDUCATION (QADIE)
QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

MEMBERS OF THE WRITING GROUP

Debbie Wall MFA, BA, Grad Dip Teaching (Secondary)
A specialist teacher of Drama with a strong background in curriculum development. Writer of Drama Makes Meaning: Years 1 to 10 Drama Curriculum Guide and co-writer of the BSSSS Senior Drama Trial/Pilot Syllabus. A member of the BSSSS Drama Syllabus Sub-committee which collectively wrote the Senior Drama Syllabus and is currently writing the External Senior Drama Syllabus. A member of the reference group which developed the P-10 Arts Education Framework. Has worked as a secondary classroom teacher, primary artist-in-residence and regional Drama Consultant working across Years 1-12 in the Sunshine Coast, Logan City, Redlands and Metropolitan Brisbane. Currently an Education Liaison Officer seconded to the Queensland Arts Council. Her masters investigated student achievement in drama.

Sandra Gattenhof BA, Dip T. (Primary) ATCL
A primary classroom teacher with a strong interest in the promotion of drama in the primary curriculum. An inservice leader for the implementation of Drama Makes Meaning: Years 1 - 10 Drama Curriculum Guide and of the English Language Arts Inservice Modules while a Key Teacher at Bray Park State School and through the Catholic Education Office. Has worked as a primary classroom teacher, primary dramatist-in-residence, drama and english inservice leader, lecturer and KLARC (The Arts), Metropolitan West Region. Has worked in classrooms, environmental education centres and theatre companies in areas as diverse as Torres Strait Islands, Wide Bay, Sunshine Coast and Metropolitan Brisbane and in both state and Catholic education sectors. Currently an Education Liaison Officer (Primary) seconded to the Queensland Arts Council and president for QADIE. Presently undertaking research for a Master of Arts (Research) in the field of the provision of performing arts experiences for primary school children.

Sue Davis BA, Grad Dip T (Primary), Grad Dip Arts Admin (Coordinator)
Currently HOD (The Arts) at Kenmore State High School. Involved in drama curriculum development and planning across the arts in secondary schools and has published in & co-ordinated a range of QADIE drama curriculum publications. Has also worked in the equity field as a Senior Policy Officer with Education Queensland and coordinated several projects which used the arts to focus on equity issues (Says Who: Sexual harassment Secondary kit, Enough’s Enough Primary sexual harassment and violence kit, and No Fear Gender and Violence Secondary kit curriculum materials). Coordinated the writing of the National Association for Drama In Education (NADIE) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Gender Equity policies. Currently enrolled in a Master of Arts (Research), investigating implementation issues for the arts in primary schools.

MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC REFERENCE GROUP

- Dr John O'Toole, Associate Professor, Drama Education, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt Campus
- Christine Comans, Academy of the Arts, Qld University of Technology, Kelvin Grove Campus- former NADIE & QADIE President
- Tracey Lee, Lecturer in Drama Education (Primary Education), Australian Catholic University, Macauley Campus

(Other academics may be involved in the reference group if QADIE is the successful tenderer)

MEMBERS OF THE TEACHER REFERENCE GROUP

8-10 teachers currently in State & non-State schools located in SEQ (List to be finalised on contract signing, as commitment for some teaching release is envisaged from schools. Members may include Sue Elmes, Senior Education Officer, Education Queensland; Kerry Williams, Loreto College; Sharon Evers, Corinda SHS; Shay Ryan, Bremer SHS; Suzanne Guliwers, Pullenvale Ed Centre; Claire McSwain, Mooloolooba SS.; Donald Brown, Dakabin SS )

MEMBERS OF THE CORRESPONDING REFERENCE GROUP

Selected members of QADIE from across the state working at diverse sites, including from State & non-State education (This group may include, Joan Cassidy, Yeppoon SS; Pat Donnelly, Fitzgerald SS; Debra Hamlin, Tambo SS, Natalie Taylor, Heatley SHS, Belinda Peet, Trinity Bay SHS)

OFFERER'S NAME: QLD ASSOCIATION FOR DRAMA IN EDUCATION (QADIE)
EXPERIENCE OF ORGANISATION IN SIMILAR TASKS

BACKGROUND - QADIE Inc. has existed as a professional association for 22 years and has been instrumental in the establishment and subsequent development of drama as a curriculum area in Queensland schools. QADIE has developed a strong and often envied reputation amongst professional associations for its ability to network statewide amongst diverse professional practitioners, utilise grassroots support for project work and hence advocate effectively for quality drama education, curriculum & professional development supporting best practice in schools.

SERVICES & ACTIVITIES - QADIE provides a range of services for its members, including a website and list serve e-mail facility, regular newsletters and journals, swapshops & other professional development opportunities, and advocacy through its representation on relevant peak organisations of professional associations, and on various government & statutory bodies. QADIE is also a member of the national drama body NADIE and in turn of the NAAE (National Affiliation of Arts Educators) and internationally of IDEA (International Drama/Theatre and Education Association).

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - Over the past decade, QADIE has been closely involved in several significant curriculum development initiatives. At the national level, QADIE provided detailed consultative responses to the National Statement and Profile for the Arts through both NADIE (with Christine Comans as president of NADIE) and Education Queensland, with the current Vice-President and Writing Group Coordinator (Sue Davis) providing ongoing detailed equity input.

At the state level, QADIE representatives and members of the Writing Group have been actively involved in curriculum development conducted through Education Queensland (P-10 Arts Framework, 1-10 Drama Curriculum Guide: Drama Makes Meaning), the Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (Subject Advisory Committee for the Arts, Drama Syllabus Sub-Committee for the development of the Senior Drama Trial/Pilot Syllabus), and more lately with the QSCC (Syllabus Advisory Committee for the Arts).

In particular, a member of the Writing Group (Debbie Wall) effectively used the extensive QADIE network to develop and trial the 1-10 Drama Curriculum Guide: Drama Makes Meaning, and also worked closely with a member of the Academic Reference Group (John O'Toole) on the drafting of the Senior Drama Trial/Pilot Syllabus. The third member of the Writing Group (Sandra Gattenhof) is currently QADIE president and, along with Sue Davis, a current member of the QSCC SAC.

OTHER - QADIE's organisational abilities and international reputation were recognised and highly acclaimed when QADIE hosted IDEA '95 (the 2nd congress of the International Drama/Theatre and Education Association) which was staged in Brisbane and attracted over 1200 practitioners worldwide. QADIE also organises professional development activities in drama education every year, which are regularly attended by over 200 participants. QADIE is also active in co-ordinating responses and submissions to relevant educational initiatives (e.g. Wiltshire Review, Viviani Tertiary Entrance Review).

OFFERER’S NAME: OLD ASSOCIATION FOR DRAMA IN EDUCATION (QADIE)
### REFEREES

1. **Kerry Fairbairn, Principal Education Officer (Teaching & Learning), Education Queensland, Phone 3237 0071**
   Supervisor of Writing Group member Debbie Wall during the research, writing, school trialling and development for publication of the *1-10 Drama Curriculum Guide: Drama Makes Meaning*, and current manager of two Writing Group members (Sandra Gattenof & Debbie Wall) in their work as Primary & Secondary Liaison Officers at the Queensland Arts Council.

2. **Moira Cordiner, Syllabus Officer, Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, Phone 3864 0299**
   Executive Officer of the Subject Advisory Committee for the Arts & Senior Trial/Pilot Drama Syllabus Sub-Committee to attest to the contributions of Debbie Wall & John O'Toole in the writing and subsequent development of the Syllabus.

3. **Judith McLean, Drama Lecturer, OUT Phone 3864 3213**
   Judith was one of the Congress Directors for IDEA '95 and can attest to QADIE's organisational powers and support. She was (until 1997) the Drama State Panel Chair for the BSSSS and is currently deputy chair of the Theatre Panel for the Australia Council.

### TIMELINE

- **Late August:** Review of literature, environmental scan, www material regarding drama outcomes.
- **8 September:** QSCC writing teams briefing
- **Early September:** Meeting and corresponding with reference groups regarding parameters and timelines
- **September:** Afternoon and evening workshops with reference groups to have input into overall scope and sequence (utilising TRS days for school representatives)
- Writing group develop first draft and sends out for consultation
- **October 2 or 3:** Workshop day (in week 2 of the Sept/Oct vacation): To review feedback and input into the outcomes
- **6 October:** QSCC writing teams meeting
  - Writing group develops full draft of outcomes and sending out for consultation
- **15 October:** QSCC writing teams meeting
- **21 October:** Afternoon and evening workshop with reference groups to refine outcomes (core and discretionary) and respond to overall draft (utilising TRS days for school representatives)
  - Final consultations and fine-tuning
- **26 October:** Submission of documentation to QSCC

**OFFERER’S NAME:** OLD ASSOCIATION FOR DRAMA IN EDUCATION (QADIE)
SCHEDULE OF PARTICULARS

DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND POSSIBLE INFLUENCE

Offerers are to supply details of name, address, relationship to offerer, relationship to the Queensland School Curriculum Council, and any explanatory information for any persons who meet any of the following criteria and can have any direct or indirect benefit from the award of an order to the offerer.

1. Queensland School Curriculum Council current employees or contractors or Consultants.

2. Queensland School Curriculum Council former employees or contractors or Consultants who have worked for the Queensland School Curriculum Council in any way during the One Year Period immediately prior to the Opening Date of this Invitation to Offer.

3. Members of the immediate family meeting the preceding criteria.
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Appendix 7.4 The QADIE submission of outcomes.
DRAMA SYLLABUS MATERIALS  
(Draft only)

- Learning Outcomes (Core & Discretionary)  
- Core Scope  
- Scope & Sequence (by Band)

(Prepared by QADIE for the QSCC draft Arts Syllabus  
Years 1-10)

DRAFT ONLY - NOT FOR CITATION  26.10.98
DRAMA LEARNING OUTCOMES (CORE & DISCRETIONARY)
(Prepared by QADIE for the QSCC draft Arts Syllabus Years 1-10)

Level 1 (years 1-2)

Engagement in:

1.1 Students create and accept roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore stories from personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.

1.2 Students work individually and with others using appropriate language and interactions, objects and space, to develop role and situation.

1.3 Students share moments of dramatic action with others in informal settings and reciprocate as respectful audience.

Reflection:

1.4 Students transform ideas and feelings, experienced during and after drama, into spoken, written, visual, kinaesthetic, and musical forms.

1.5 Students describe the making and shaping of their own drama, identifying the difference between the fictional world of drama and reality, within a guided response.

1.6 Students recognise that drama tells stories about humans and their worlds.

Discretionary:

1.7 Students engage in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Families; Stories, Purposes and Perspectives (SOSE core topics); and genres - story, personal recount, picture story, personal letter (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).

Level 2 (years 2-3)

Engagement in:

2.1 Students create, accept and develop individual and group roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.

2.2 Students negotiate with others in and out of role, within a teacher provided framework to build dramatic action by making choices about situation, time, language and movement, objects and space.

2.3 Students sequence and focus dramatic action in order to share it in informal and formal settings and reciprocate as a respectful audience.

Reflection:
2.4 Students exchange viewpoints and make links with the views of others during and after drama by selecting a written, visual, kinaesthetic or musical form of communication.

2.5 Students interpret drama experiences and presentations, expressing opinions using drama vocabulary.

2.6 Students recognise that there are different types of drama which are used for different purposes in societies.

Discretionary

2.7 Students engage in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Stories, Purposes and Perspectives; and Asian Cultural Study(SOSE core topics); and genres - fables, traditional stories, fantasy story, interview, note-making, personal letter (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).

Level 3 (years 4-5)

Engagement in:

3.1 Students develop and negotiate in and out of the drama, a range of dramatic roles and relationships from real, life-like and fictional contexts.

3.2 Students shape dramatic situations, roles and narratives both individually and in groups with appropriate use of language and movement, time, space and simple symbols.

3.3 Students participate in rehearsed group presentations of devised drama with an awareness of audience in formal and informal settings.

Reflection:

3.4 Students identify and describe through teacher-guided response, the learning and understanding developed in and through drama experiences.

3.5 Students make informal, but supported critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements and skills using appropriate drama vocabulary.

3.6 Students describe the purposes for which drama exists in communities and cultures.

Discretionary:

3.7 Students participate in drama activities which explore other KLA topics, eg Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and Europeans in Australia; Discovery in Australia; Environment; Indigenous and Immigrant Australians (SOSE core topics); and genres - traditional stories, diary, journal & learning log entries, short news report, readers' theatre, radio drama, (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).

Level 4 (years 6-7)

Engagement in:

4.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain a range of roles and relationships drawn from school/community issues, historical and fictional contexts.
4.2 Students manage focus, time, space, language, movement, and use mood and symbol in contributing to the creation and shaping of dramatic situations, roles and narratives using dramatic conventions and where appropriate, incorporating basic scriptwriting.

4.3 Students present rehearsed devised and scripted drama using voice, movement and characterisation appropriate for a specific audience and space.

Reflection:

4.4 Students identify and evaluate learning and understanding developed in and through drama.

4.5 Students evaluate the handling of dramatic elements and skills in their own work and that of others through reporting and other genres, making supported critical judgements using appropriate drama terminology.

4.6 Students examine the purposes and types of drama within particular cultural contexts.

Discretionary

4.7 Students use dramatic conventions to explore other KLA topics, eg Religion and Culture in Asia; Resources, Power and World Exploration; Media Representation; Government and Democracy (SOSE core topics); and genres - stories, parables, investigative report, radio or television news feature, journal entry, persuasive speech, debate (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).

4.8 Students create and use masks and/or puppets to extend dramatic characterisations and possibilities.

4.9 Students use, with teacher guidance, basic elements of design and stagecraft to complement dramatic work.

Level 5 (years 8-9)

Engagement in:

5.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain dramatic roles, relationships and situations to explore through improvisation and roleplay various issues, concepts and stories, contributing individually and cooperatively to problem solving and decision making processes.

5.2 Students manage context, character, language and time and use tension, mood and symbol to structure or transform texts using conventions appropriate to selected dramatic forms.

5.3 Students present student-devised and scripted drama using characterisation, voice, movement and other dramatic skills appropriate to different styles and forms for a specific audience and space.

5.4 Students select elements of design and stagecraft to create desired effects and environments to enhance dramatic work.

Reflection:

5.5 Students identify and determine meanings created and altered through the manipulation of selected dramatic elements.
5.6 Students assess the forms, styles and processes used in their own drama and that of others applying appropriate drama terminology.

5.7 Students investigate the specific purposes, audiences and cultural contexts of drama processes and presentations.

5.8 Students identify the personal and career related skills developed through drama experiences.

Discretionary:

5.9 Students utilise research and knowledge from other KLA’s as starting points for drama, Cultural diversity in Australia, Environments, Civics & Citizenship (SOSE Core Topics) (relevant HPE Core Topics need to be added); and genres - short scripts, stories/ tall tales, magazine article, television news feature, public speech (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).

5.10 Students use percussion, vocals, music, visual and other artistic elements to effectively complement dramatic presentations.

5.11 Students work with computer-based technology to convey a dramatic meaning.

Level 6 (years 9-10)

Engagement in:

6.1 Students create, sustain and communicate roles with appropriate depth, working individually and cooperatively in improvisations and roleplays based on issues, themes, concepts or texts.

6.2 Students devise and structure dramatic action, scenarios and scripts within selected dramatic conventions, forms and styles to communicate meaning about a selected issue, story or idea.

6.3 Students present individually or as part on an ensemble, a rehearsed polished performance within a chosen dramatic form and style demonstrating appropriate characterisation, performance skills and text interpretation to communicate effectively with an audience.

6.4 Students select and manipulate basic elements of stagecraft and design (space, costume, props, audio-visual, sound and light) to enhance the dramatic context.

Reflection:

6.5 Students analyse and evaluate how meaning can be created and communicated through management of elements of drama and the use of specific dramatic forms and/or styles.

6.6 Students interpret, analyse and justify their own drama work and that of others using appropriate drama terminology in both short and extended oral and written forms.

6.7 Students articulate an understanding of the purposes of drama and the ways drama is made within particular cultural contexts, times and places, and how drama is changed or can be changed to suit a particular context.

6.8 Students investigate and document how drama skills and learnings contribute to a wide range of study and career paths.
Discretionary:

6.9 Students utilise research and knowledge from other KLA’s as starting points in forming and presenting drama, eg topics such as Youth cultures, Societies in change; Work; Australia and International Relations (SOSE core units) (relevant HPE core topics need to be added); and genres - autobiography, dramatic monologues, short scripts, drama review, interviews (English Syllabus for Years 1 to 10).

6.10 Students combine drama, dance, music, sound, and video and other visual material to create a dramatic performance.

6.11 Students create lighting designs and lighting plots for dramatic performances.

6.12 Students use computer animation programs to realise their scriptwriting and direction.

BEYOND LEVEL 6

6+.1 Students manipulate dramatic elements, forms, styles to create dramatic scripts, characterisations and contexts.

6+.2 Students direct individuals or small groups to interpret student-devised and scripted text.

6+.3 Students display independence, confidence and sensitivity in the selection, rehearsal, interpretation and performance of student-devised and scripted text.

6+.4 Students select and manipulate basic elements of stagecraft and design to support the interpretation of the drama.

6+.5 Students compare drama in different times, cultures and societies to generalise about trends and developments.

6+.6 Students discuss, evaluate and interpret different ways drama deals with universal and specific human experiences.

6+.7 Students use their experiences of drama to consider personal and vocational choices.

(N.B. SOSE core topics included here are based on the draft SOSE 1-10 syllabus. These will need to be amended with future redrafts of the SOSE syllabus)
DRAMA - CORE SCOPE

The main dimensions of drama in education are Forming, Presenting and Responding. For the purposes of this syllabus, Forming and Presenting are part of Engagement and Responding is what occurs in Reflection.

Forming in drama involves students in dramatic play and playmaking modes. Student engage in accepting roles and dramatic contexts and gradually learn to recognise and then manipulate the elements of drama. Initially supported by teacher provided frameworks, students learn to select, sequence and structure their work to build dramatic action and tell ‘stories’. They develop various forms of teacher structured, student devised and scripted drama and also engage in design and planning activities.

Presenting in drama involves students in interpreting, rehearsing and performing their own drama and existing text for audiences (informal and formal), individually and in groups. Students develop characterisation, script interpretation and acting skills and explore a range of forms and styles of drama. Students also use basic design and stagecraft elements to complement their performances.

Responding in drama involves students in reflecting on their own drama and the drama of other people, times and places. They explore aspects such as the purposes, contexts, elements and impact of dramatic performances. They also reflect on their own learning in, through and about drama.

By the completion of level 6 students will have experienced the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGEMENT Forming</th>
<th>Skills &amp; Knowledge</th>
<th>Forms &amp; Styles/Genres/Types of drama</th>
<th>Audiences</th>
<th>Elements of drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forming Drama Play</td>
<td>Accept the fiction</td>
<td>Dramatic play</td>
<td>(Informal)</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher provided</td>
<td>Build &amp; maintain role</td>
<td>Drama games &amp; exercises</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frameworks and</td>
<td>Improvisation skills</td>
<td>Roleplay</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Situetoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student devised</td>
<td>Group skills</td>
<td>Process drama</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playmaking</td>
<td>Sequence dramatic action</td>
<td>Story drama</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher provided</td>
<td>Develop scenarios</td>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and student devised</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dramatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually &amp; in</td>
<td>Scriptwriting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>Knowledge of different forms/styles</td>
<td>Narrative Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting</td>
<td>Script/text interpretation</td>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Space/Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student devised</td>
<td>Characterisation</td>
<td>Scripts</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drama &amp; Existing</td>
<td>Acting Skills (voice, movement, gesture, use of space)</td>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text including</td>
<td>Audience awareness</td>
<td>Documentary drama</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scripted drama</td>
<td>Group ensemble skills</td>
<td>Collage drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually and in</td>
<td>Basic stagecraft e.g. theatre spaces, design elements and production elements</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>Theatre awareness</td>
<td>Comic style/ tragic styles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group ensemble skills</td>
<td>Performance poetry or readers’ theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFLECTION Responding</td>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Theatre for young people from:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written and oral</td>
<td>Analyse</td>
<td>Student devised drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposes of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesise</td>
<td>Australian drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>World drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. elements of drama and dramatic forming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. purposes of drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educate or Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. drama from different times &amp; places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. work &amp; study options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Character/patient profiles</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>Promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Text analysis</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written and oral</td>
<td>Program notes</td>
<td>Other students</td>
<td>A specific target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
<td>Short answer &amp; extended responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesise</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Writing in role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. elements of drama and dramatic forming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. purposes of drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. drama from different times &amp; places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. work &amp; study options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**SCOPE & SEQUENCE FOR DRAMA - EARLY CHILDHOOD BAND**

**LEVEL 1:** Students at this level are aware of the arts in their everyday lives. Through active engagement in arts activities, including exploration and imaginative play, they begin to use and understand some of the symbol systems, notational systems, forms, processes and languages of the arts that shape their world. Students identify, describe and demonstrate specific skills, processes and understandings of each of the arts areas, and show others what they make do and can perform. Students think about their arts activities can discuss their ideas and feelings. They reflect on, and respond to arts works in ways that involve movements, sounds, images, words and tactile forms.

**LEVEL 2:** Students at this level recognise and identify some of the patterns and structures that are used in the various arts areas, and understand some of the symbol systems they use when they engage in arts activities. They use some specific skills, techniques, processes and notation systems that help them negotiate specific tasks. Students choose particular elements to use in their arts works, and organise them for expressive purposes. Students prepare and present their works for others to appreciate and enjoy. They reflect on their own works and those of others, and discuss personal preferences. They begin to construct meaning and are able to express a reason when making decisions about their art works.

**DRAMA AT THIS BAND:**
In this band of schooling forming is understood to be the exploration of students own life experiences and interactions through structured and unstructured dramatic play. The development of basic drama skills and fundamental elements occurs through participating making, playing, experimenting, creating and responding within a dramatic framework.

In presenting students communicate ideas, feelings, thoughts, stories and images using drama skills and processes shaped by teacher provided framework. Students show work predominantly for their peers and occasionally present rehearsed work to school-based audiences in small contained spaces.

In responding students reflect on their own and others drama through predominantly informal and oral genres as part of the dramatic process. They also respond through other mediums such as drawing & movement. As they progress throughout the band they begin to respond in more formal and written genres, reflecting on and making sense of their experiences in dramatic contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - FORMING</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - PRESENTING</th>
<th>REFLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1 Students create and accept roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore stories from personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 Share moments of dramatic action with others in informal settings and reciprocate as respectful audience.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4 Students transform ideas and feelings, experienced during and after drama into spoken, written, visual, kinaesthetic and musical forms.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Work individually and with others using appropriate language and interactions, objects and space, to develop role and situation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.5 Students describe the making and shaping of their own drama, identifying the difference between the fictional world of drama and reality, within a guided response.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.6 Students recognise that drama tells stories about humans and their worlds.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1 Students create, accept and develop individual and group roles within child-structured and teacher provided dramatic frameworks to adapt and explore personal experience, imagination, fiction and heritage.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3 Students sequence and focus dramatic action in order to share in informal and formal settings and reciprocate as a respectful audience.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4 Students exchange viewpoints and make links with views of others during and after drama by selecting a written, visual, kinaesthetic or musical form of communication.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.2 Students negotiate with others in and out of role, within a teacher provided framework to build dramatic action by making choices about situation, time, language and movement, objects and space.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.5 Students interpret drama experiences and presentations, expressing opinions using drama vocabulary.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.6 Students recognise that there are different types of drama which are used for different purposes in societies.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAMA CONTENT SCOPE - LEVELS 1 AND 2 EARLY CHILDHOOD**

<p>| Skills and Knowledge | Accepting the fiction - agreeing to suspend disbelief, building belief in the fictional context, contracting with the teacher. Building role - conventions of going in &amp; out-of-role, developing the fictional context to assist enrolling, except roles of experts, occupations, family/community. | Developing audience awareness: listening to and watching other's work respectfully, taking turns, display appropriate forms of appreciation, separation of audience space and presenting space, working cooperatively with small and large groups, maintaining concentration within. | Thinking Skills: Identifying, Describing, Interpreting, Transforming. Language Development: students use the language of drama to articulate knowledge, skills and understandings. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms, Genre, Types of Drama</th>
<th>Dramatic play (supervised and unsupervised): dress up box, play in school grounds, play corner in classroom, spontaneous play (student initiated)</th>
<th>Story Drama, Storytelling, Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role play: structured dramatic play, teacher intervention into play, teacher provided frameworks for play</td>
<td>Cross-Arts: Puppetry (finger, glove, sock, paper bag, paper plate, stick, shadow), Character Mask, Object Animation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Story Drama/ Storytelling: simulated by picture books, familiar narratives, traditional stories, mythology, non-fiction, class and student devised</td>
<td>Class &amp; small group discussion, short responses (oral &amp; written), diaries, poems, storywriting, recounts, innovation on text, painting, drawing, dancing/movement, soundscapes, instrumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement: exploration of space (personal, group and social space), beat, rhythm, sound, balance, tempo, levels, character, materials (cloth, rope, scarves)</td>
<td>Drama Games and Exercises: to develop drama skills, voice, movement, concentration, focus, teamwork, cooperation, collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audiences</th>
<th>Informal: Self, Small, Group, Teacher, Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal: Small Group, Class, Another class, Family and Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Elements                    | Of Drama: Role, Relationship, Situation, Narrative | Of Dramatic Farming: Time, Space/Place, Movement, Language |
### SCOPE & SEQUENCE FOR DRAMA - MIDDLE PRIMARY BAND

**LEVEL 3 STATEMENT:** Students at this level apply a range of skills and process, and explore ideas and feelings through working in specific art areas. They plan, practise, develop and present arts works for particular audiences or to serve particular purposes. They work co-operatively towards a shared goal or performance. Students begin to adopt a more reflective mode in their arts experiences. They identify characteristics of some arts works from different contexts or cultures and discuss popular and traditional art forms. They perceive more subtle qualities, variations and details in arts works, and discuss aspects of their responses using appropriate arts vocabulary.

**DRAMA AT THIS BAND**  
In forming students negotiate and develop dramatic action by giving and accepting offers, and using some of the elements of dramatic forming through mainly teacher structured dramatic frameworks. In presenting students work in groups to share drama with a sense of audience, employing appropriate vocal and movement skills. Awareness of rehearsal and understanding developed in and through the drama. They are able to make and justify critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements, skills, conventions and purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - FORMING</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - PRESENTING</th>
<th>REFLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Students develop and negotiate in and out of the drama, a range of dramatic roles and relationships from real, life-like and fictional contexts.</td>
<td>3.3 Students participate in rehearsed group presentations of devised drama with an awareness of audience in formal and informal settings.</td>
<td>3.4 Students identify and describe through teacher-guided response, the learning and understanding developed in and through drama experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Students shape dramatic situations, roles and narratives both individually and in groups with appropriate use of language and movement, time, space and simple symbols.</td>
<td>3.5 Students make informal, but supported critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements and skills using appropriate drama vocabulary.</td>
<td>3.6 Students describe the purposes for which drama exists in communities and cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAMA CONTENT SCOPE - LEVEL 3 MIDDLE PRIMARY**

| Skills and Knowledge | Presenting skills - voice (audibility, clarity), maintaining role, concentration, awareness of space & body language  
Rehearsal: practice, accepting feedback, experimenting, meeting deadlines  
Audience awareness: responsibilities of audience members, making action visible and audible  
Group Skills: cooperation, tolerance, negotiation, problem solving, decision making, arriving at consensus, compromising, planning, seeing task through to completion | Thinking Skills: identifying, describing, interpreting, evaluating, justifying, transforming  
Purpose: educating, celebrating, questioning, entertaining  
Vocab: role, character, in-role, out-of-role, fiction, fictional, rehearse, rehearsal, elements, shaping |

<p>| Forms, Genre, Types of | Dramatic play, Role play, Story Drama, Story Drama, Storytelling, Short Scripted Scene. | Short answer responses, letters, interviews. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Storytelling, Short Scripts, Movement-based drama, Games and Exercises</th>
<th>Movement-based drama</th>
<th>Cross-Arts: Puppetry (shadow), Character Mask, Dance-drama</th>
<th>writing in role/role cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiences</td>
<td>Informal: Self, Small Group, Teacher, Class</td>
<td>Format: Small Group, Class, Another class, Year level, Family and Friends, School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Of Drama: Role, Relationship, Situation, Narrative</td>
<td>Of Dramatic Forming: Time, Space, Movement, Language and Introduce Simple Symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SCOPE & SEQUENCE FOR DRAMA - UPPER PRIMARY**

**LEVEL 4 STATEMENT:** Students at this level have developed more complex skills in each of the arts areas. They apply skills and processes to create art works and use many of the symbols systems, notational systems and forms of each of the arts areas. They recognise and analyse arts elements in their own works and those of others and discuss their basic ideas, economic contexts and look for clues to identify the context or time in which works were made. They make some basic comparisons with art forms in other cultures and show an understanding of the diverse nature of The Arts in Australia and some understanding of their origins.

**DRAMA AT THIS BAND:** In forming students continue to participate in teacher structured and student structured drama and experiment with the elements of drama, increasing their skills in manipulating specific elements of drama. They also engage in shaping their drama becoming increasingly aware of how to structure drama and scripts to convey meaning.

In presenting students develop a greater awareness of presenting skills such as voice and movement and rehearse and refine group devices and short scripted plays for informal and formal audiences.

In responding students reflect their own and others' drama through more extended written and spoken responses with increasing analytical and aesthetic awareness. They reflect also on how their understandings about the world have changed through drama experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 4</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - FORMING</th>
<th>CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - PRESENTING</th>
<th>REFLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain a range of roles and relationships drawn from school/community issues, historical and fictional contexts.</td>
<td>4.3 Students present rehearsed devised and scripted drama using voice, movement and characterisation appropriate for a specific audience and space.</td>
<td>4.4 Students identify and evaluate learning and understanding developed in and through drama.</td>
<td>4.5 Students evaluate the handling of dramatic elements and skills in their own work and that of others through reporting genres, making supported critical judgements using appropriate drama terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Students manage focus, time, space, language, movement, and use mood and symbol in contributing to the creation and shaping of dramatic situations, roles and narratives using dramatic conventions and where appropriate, incorporating basic scriptwriting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Students examine the purposes and types of drama within particular cultural contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAMA CONTENT SCOPE - LEVEL 4 UPPER PRIMARY**

**Skills and Knowledge**

- Accepting the fiction - Shape and reshape teacher directed and group devised improvisations
- Negotiating, creating and sustaining roles - building aspects of the role (e.g. language, status, body language, attitudes, motivations) maintaining the role during the drama, remaining focussed and committed to the task
- Dramatic forming Techniques & Strategies - using conventions such as hot seat interviews, stream of consciousness, frozen effigies, mantle of the expert (using research from other KLA)
- Basic Scriptwriting - Exploring ways to frame the action (inside the event, on the edge, outside). Structure drama using basic narrative structure (introduction, exposition, climax and resolution), manipulating time (continuous and episodic action), dialogue, language, roles and relationships. Use script layout and format.

- Presenting skills - voice (pitch, pace, pause, modulation, articulating, breathing), movement & gesture body shapes, postures, levels, energy, characterisation (building internal and external details, maintaining role and focus throughout, basic script interpretation skills (working out who, what, where, when, why, relationships, character's motivation) memorisation of lines
- Audience awareness - focus and concentration
- Group Skills: cooperation, negotiation, problem solving, decision making

**Thinking Skills:** Reflecting, Researching, Identifying, Describing, Interpreting, Evaluating, Justifying, Transforming

**Drama terminology** - narrative structure, focus, characterisation, motivation, symbol

- Students reflect on what they have learnt about drama, but also what they may have learnt about the world (relate to other KLA) through drama.
| Forms, Genre, Types of Drama | Dramatic play - warm ups, skills building games, exercises to explore themes/stories (e.g. freeze frames to show mood, place, roles and relationships, themes, key dramatic moments, emotions)  
Role play - Teacher structured activities using topics from areas such as SGSE  
Story Drama, Storytelling  
Reading and writing of Narrative forms/Scenarios/Scripts  
Performance Poetry, Reader’s Theatre, Movement-based drama | Story Drama, Storytelling, Short scripts, Poetry, Reader’s Theatre, Movement-based drama  
Cross-Arts: Puppetry (shadow, bunraku, marionette), Character Mask, Dance-drama, Music-Theatre | Character/Pilot Profiles, Reports (relate to English program), Letters, short reviews |
|---|---|---|---|
| Audiences | Informal: Self, Small Group, Teacher, Class  
Formal (Specific audiences drawn from): Small Group, Class, Another class, Year level, Family and Friends, School, Community |  |
| Elements | Of Drama: Role, Relationship, Situation, Narrative  
Of Dramatic Forming: Time, Focus, Space/Place, Mood, Movement, Language, Symbol |  |
SCOPE AND SEQUENCE FOR DRAMA - LOWER SECONDARY BAND

LEVEL 6 STATEMENT
Students at this level apply knowledge, skills and understandings appropriate to at least one arts area to make and present/perform arts works in a range of contexts. They use appropriate symbol systems, notational systems, forms, processes and languages with sufficient confidence to express themselves effectively. When presenting or performing their works, students plan, select and modify the form and content to suit the particular occasion. They are sensitive to aspects such as purpose of the occasion, venue or space, and the effective use of materials, lighting, sets, costume, sound, staging and equipment. They create arts works that are finished products, showing a developing sense of distinctive style. They have some ability to deal with abstract concepts, and reflect on and evaluate their own works and the works of others. They show some understanding of the nature of the arts and their uses in particular societies and in different cultures. They explore the influences of cultural factors on the ways arts works are made and their roles in particular contexts.

LEVEL 5 STATEMENT
Students at this level understand the key symbols, notational systems, forms, processes and languages of at least one arts area. They apply skills and techniques at a more sophisticated level to generate arts works that effectively communicate thoughts, feelings and ideas. They apply knowledge to new and unknown situations by drawing on principles and generalisations taken from known contexts. Students reflect on, and modify practice during the making of arts works. They present them, showing imagination, a knowledge of conventions, and sensitivity to the occasion and purpose of the presentation. Their emerging aesthetic understanding is combined with critical skills to realistically evaluate their abilities and achievements. They analyse and interpret aspects of form, structure, content, style and genre. Students show an understanding of social, historical, cultural and political contexts, and analyse and discuss arts works from these perspectives. They explore aspects of the arts in various societies and develop some understanding of the ways knowledge of the arts of different times and cultures is constructed, recorded and transmitted. They become aware of the range of occupations that are connected with the arts in contemporary Australian society. Students show an awareness of different social, cultural, historical and economic contexts and look for clues to identify the context or time in which works were made. They make some basic comparisons with arts forms in other cultures and show an understanding of the diverse nature of The Arts in Australia and some understanding of their origins.

DRAMA AT THIS BAND
Forming In this band of schooling students develop more specific skills in improvisation and role-play and become more aware of and skilled in manipulating the elements of drama. Students are introduced to specific styles and forms of drama and learn to structure their work to build dramatic action and develop short scripts.

In Presenting students develop higher level interpretation, acting and performance skills and work together in groups to refine, rehearse and present drama (student devised and existing text) for a selected range of audiences. Students build on their knowledge of and also use design and stagecraft elements to complement their performances.

In Responding students will continue to reflect on drama using higher order cognitive skills and progress to produce more analytical pieces of work (written and oral). They will also be exposed to selected examples of drama from different cultures, times and places, (including different kinds of Australian drama). They should become increasingly aware of the skills developed through drama studies and their relevance to future study and career options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - FORMING</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT - PRESENTING</th>
<th>REFLECTION - RESPONDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Students create, negotiate and sustain dramatic roles, relationships and situations to explore through improvisation and roleplay various issues, concepts and stories, contributing individually and cooperatively to problem solving and decision making processes.</td>
<td>5.3 Students present student-devised and scripted drama using characterisation, voice, movement and other dramatic skills appropriate to different styles and forms for a specific audience and space.</td>
<td>5.5 Students identify and determine meanings created and altered through the manipulation of selected dramatic elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Students manage context, character, language, time, and use tension, mood and symbol to structure or transform texts using conventions appropriate to selected dramatic forms.</td>
<td>5.4 Students select elements of design and stagecraft to create desired effects and environments to enhance dramatic work.</td>
<td>5.6 Students assess the forms, styles and processes used in their own drama and that of others applying appropriate drama terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7 Students investigate the specific purposes, audience and cultural contexts of drama processes and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8 Students identify the personal and career related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences</td>
<td>Teacher, Small Groups, Class, Another class or year level, Family &amp; Friends, A specific target audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements - Role, Relationships, Situation, Narrative,
Elements of dramatic forming: Time, Space/Place, Movement, Language, Focus, increasing familiarisation with manipulation of Symbol and Mood and Introducing Contrast and Tension.
Appendix 7.5 SAC Minutes 4 June, 1999
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME &amp; APOLOGIES</td>
<td>Marie Edwards welcomed everyone, particularly Mary Ellemor from Mt Isa who is replacing Kylie Herries while she is on maternity leave. Outlined the plan for the day, which included time for reading, as well as reports and workshop time. Advised that the committee is asked to take the documents away and provide further feedback over the next few weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Hynes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Piscitelli, Kathryn Russell, Gabriel Turnbull.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Marie asked for comments on the minutes. Key learning outcomes have been provided. Footnotes will not be part of the final document. A short glossary will be provided.
Trial is going well. The team have been to at least two meetings. Teachers are finding their way through the trial. Some are feeling challenged by the syllabus, others are excited. Some are challenged by the changes. They are also pleased and appreciative of the in-service provided by the team. A significant challenge is assessment and reporting. Particularly in relation to reporting and trying to find ways of matching the needs of assessment with the systems of reporting within the schools.

**Issues:**
- There is value in meeting across sectors ie. Primary and secondary teachers coming together to discuss issues.
- Assessment and reporting
- Planning from outcomes rather than themes or content
  - Schools and their communities are at different stages but in general the trial is going well

**REPORT ON APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**
Marie introduced Ted Hobbs from Ed Data who has been appointed as external evaluator. Ted introduced Patricia Connell (until recently Manager, Education Services at the Logan-Beaudesert District Office, Education Queensland), also present at the meeting. Other members of the evaluation team are Pamela Croft (a practising Visual Artist), Neil Cranston (Senior Lecturer in School of Cultural and Policy Studies - QUT Kelvin Grove – quality assurance), Annette Cooper (Primary drama teacher at St Hilda’s, Southport), Sharon Porter (Performing Arts coordinator and Senior Dance teacher at Mt St Michaels –background in Dance, Music, Drama), Lynne Hais (formerly a principal in Ed QLD), Dr Dugald Williamson (Senior Lecturer in the School of Film, Media and Cultural Studies at Griffith University).

The evaluation team has begun work and attended some cluster meetings. The team has commenced reviewing the draft syllabus from their particular area of expertise. This broad range of interests and experience will be applied to the evaluation report. They are setting up a range of interviews for next week and the week after with trial schools.

Ted has been asked to focus on the teacher for information. The team will spend a lot of time with the teachers. They have undertaken to visit all the schools at least once and will also conduct phone interviews. They will focus on a few schools for case studies and will also talk to the project team. Information will be collected from administrators and students. The focus is the
translation of the curriculum into practice so there will be a real emphasis on what happens within the classroom.

Ted pointed out that the evaluators have experience in the process of the council as they evaluated the Science syllabus in the last two years.

- **REPORT ON THE MEDIA SCHOOLS**
  (see attached report)

  The schools reported a deal of comfort with the outcomes and will provide a good deal of advice for the development of modules.

- **REPORT ON PRE-PLANNING FOR THE TRIAL CONFERENCE**
  - **Discussion:** Marie reported that the planned dates conflict with the 3,5,7, tests. We find it difficult to ask teachers to leave their classes at this time. Also there will be difficulty with supply teachers. Asked the committee for advice on alternative dates. Pointed out other conflicting times eg QCS, in-school exams, reporting and preparation for certification.
  - If we change the dates till later we will have more time to prepare alternative materials and modules and we could also offer some cluster meetings for the pilot schools before the conference.
  - **questioned the logistics of running clusters to pick up the pilot schools.**
  - **pointed out the need for teachers to be there with their classes for the testing period but with enough forewarning the schools could prepare.**
  - **queried whether the final dates for feedback remained. Changes to the conference dates will impact on the amount of feedback we can take on board before the May 2000 deadline.**
  - **recommended the QCS dates might be the most suitable**

**GENERAL COMMENTS.**

- **raised the issue of the rate of change of the outcomes for a media school. Too many and too fast. Concerned that we may be losing the focus on Engagement and Reflection. Would like to see Media outcomes – lack of technology. Are we working on an inverted model? Are we writing the curriculum for what schools have? Should we be looking at what we want to achieve?**

- Marie responded: agreed the outcomes have been changing at a fast rate. This is in response to the feedback. The difficulty is that we have to make a decision about whether to send them out for consultation or hold them for particular times. She pointed out that the outcomes needed to be clarified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chris sought a broader range of feedback from other arts areas. Asked for the committee to get some more formal feedback. Marie conveyed the procedure for recording feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jackie Conn backed up Chris's request. Wanted to know why changes came about and who is providing advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Julie Chenery pointed out that some of the decisions have been influenced by space on the page. Was this the best decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology – Marie mentioned that we were trying to provide outcomes, which did not scare some teachers off. Modules will provide opportunities for both highly technological and not so technological units of work to be devised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strand organisers - layout on the page has changed but the team is confident that both engagement and reflection are evident in the outcomes. Asked the committee to provide feedback today on these issues. What was presented today is not set in concrete and we ask for detailed feedback from the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sandra Gattenhof asked - What is the position of the outsourced writers? Will they be consulted in the rewriting and will the consultative network they set up be used? Asked for a reinvolvement of the outsourced writing teams in the revision of the outcomes. Emphasised the need for dialogue with professional associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ann C. what was the reason why the committee did not get new outcomes before the meeting and she wasn’t sure of what to do with the materials that were sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marie responded that we did not have a refined set before this week. We were very conscious that we could not provide these earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Julie Chenery pointed out that engagement and reflection is no longer clear and was hotly debated and reinforced as an assistance to teachers in their planning. Marie responded that this would be looked at later in the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regarding responses and feedback, Marie pointed out that feedback has come from schools and the consultative network as well as from inside the office. In terms of layout the council is keen to have the syllabuses set out with a common framework so that teachers can see the pattern across all syllabus documents. There should be a conceptual development through levels. People have asked for more creative layouts. The bulk of text is sometimes daunting. There have been a number of diagrams, which have been devised to illustrate the framework of the syllabus but none of these met all requirements. We have tried to include the idea of technology but we acknowledge we need to strengthen this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>THE DRAFT TRIAL SYLLABUS: RESPONSES AND ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The committee was asked to respond to the information sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The committee worked in groups to discuss the Outcomes section of the syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the role of technology as materials and tools – doesn't make sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- doesn't add to the meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- needs to point out it will be everchanging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- people may think it means computers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestions for rewording: “it promotes the use of the materials and tools of technology”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- suggested we go to the Technology syllabus and make sure that we use the same terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- suggested we go to Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- suggested we point people to the other syllabus documents and they can seek out the information themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestions for rewording: PROMOTES THE ONGOING AND CHANGING ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY TO SUPPORT THE SHAPING AND INFORMING OF EXPRESSION IN THE ARTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- read a definition from the rationale of the technology syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- suggested such definition be identified in the glossary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- pointed out that there may be links across KLA's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- commented that materials and tools should be in the statement somewhere so that people realise it is all technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “it promotes the role of materials tools and knowledge in the creative process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- questioned the beginning of the sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- commented that we are giving ‘agency’ where there is none. Study in this key learning area provides …. Possibly reverse the last two sentences of this paragraph. She also questioned ‘notable contributors to the economy as being repetitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- pointed out that the companies that get the funding are the ones that get media coverage. Many other companies are working independently of funding and providing jobs as well as contributing to the export market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- supported the view that the arts contribute greatly to the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- pointed out it is an undervalued area in our society and this should be acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- queried whether teachers would be challenged by the document. She questioned the stem, “A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement on economic significance to stay as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>lifelong learner is &quot;...&quot; and suggested that possibly the verb is too strong. She suggested: ‘A lifelong learner seeks to be ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggested replacing complex language eg visceral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>noted in the last paragraph that the arts are a means not the means to “shape the future”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggested replacing “Alternative ways to” with “a variety of ways”; expanding opens a world of possibilities’ - are we talking about sensory and emotional worlds eg possibility of changing to gut or intuitive – sensory, which cannot be taught?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commented that teaching is moving from teaching knowledge to teaching for possibilities; links to lifelong learners; the wording may not be perfect but the ideas are important. Literacy is important and his school is pursuing literacy outcomes through the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>WORKSHOP ON SYLLABUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The revised Outcomes section was handed out and Marie explained the changes in layout and numbers of outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The group were asked to read and discuss the section with the following questions in mind:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Do the CLO’s in each strand represent what is essential for all students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Is there a clear sequence of conceptual complexity from Levels 1-6 in each strand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Does this sequence represent a realistic sequence and level of complexity for learning at each level in each strand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do the outcomes match the minimum time allocation for each level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Is engagement and reflection clear in each set of outcomes? Is this adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Do the new outcomes represent an appropriate set of outcomes for each strand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Does the core content page have a clear relationship to the outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Does the core content for each strand represent what is essential, ie. Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Is the format of the core content useful/acceptable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>picked up on the issue of the syllabus being for all students not just those who would traditionally have chosen the arts. For all students, consider the cultural diversity, which will increase in the next century; also increasing diversity in socio-economic circumstances. There is therefore a need to promote the creative processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | General discussion:  
Nevann: music changes are quite obvious. Was there a reason behind them?  
Kevin: in the visual arts we make and in the others we create – why not create across all strands?  
Glenda: this possibly came down from Senior Art syllabus.  
Karen: create may be on paper but the student might never engage in making an art work.  
Do we need it to be consistent across the strands?  
Marie responded: where the word is critical and particular to the arts strand it should remain but where it can be used across the strands we strive to have consistency.  
Lenore: create is not in the Key learning area outcomes nor in engagement and reflection.  
Rae: pattern should be in the foundation level and not left till level three esp. number pattering. Why only stick to software packages. Should add oht’s and photocopiers etc. Design not introduced till level 5 and this can come in much earlier…should be part of all their work. Is fearful that teachers could read through the Vis Arts CLO’s and cover them by painting and drawing and not worry about textiles and other forms and this is a concern.  
Marie referred to the core content, which shows what is mandated for the ten years of schooling.  
Rae: from the earliest levels there is a need to include references to the individual child’s cultural background; also looking at the past in art and not just the present; language development in both oral and written forms should be there, and time should be allowed for children to reflect on their own work.  
Nevann: music outcomes are unacceptable to KMEIA. There is reading and writing but no creating in Level 1; up to level 6 learners are not asked to apply analysis of knowledge. Nevann found the previous set very achievable and important.  
Linda explained that it had been a team decision to limit the number of outcomes in response to concerns raised by primary teachers. Perform changed to Sing and Play as a result of the previous SAC’s suggestions.  
Mary asked about the key - aural learning missing in level 1. Reading and writing but not doing anything with them in 3.1  
Judy responded: we need to say what is achievable, what is assessable and accessible to all teachers. These will be unpacked later in modules and elaborations.  
Leanne: the problem is that the CLO’s are what the teachers will go to. What was wrong with the original outcomes?  
Leanne Enoch-Barlow to provide advice to the project team on this issue.  
there was a perception that some of the outcomes were too complex.  
throughout the document references to cultures and societies are made in a very ethnocentric way. |
<p>|  |  | ‘Create’ to be added to these sections. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John:</td>
<td>in VA there is a lot of reference to electronic means. Why is that in the discretionary and not core? In drama the learning about the context - big picture stuff should be core and not discretionary. Marie pointed out that the level statement (according to the Council) should be a summary of the CLO’s but in fact the statement could assist in finding contexts.</td>
<td>Team to review the original set of discretionary outcomes. Highlight Cross-arts and cross-curricular links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reiterated that the teachers would be looking at the outcomes themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uneven treatment on the languages, codes etc. also in reflection the students need to be introduced to the language of criticism and evaluation. Aesthetics should be given a place in the framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asked if the committee could be made aware of the constraints on the writers. These should be made clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie pointed out the sections of generic text and those which were specific to the syllabus. She stated that there were no specific rules for the writing of the outcomes. Outcomes should be of the same order as the other syllabus documents, which have already been passed by the Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If we need our outcomes to be different then we need to be able to justify them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discretionary outcomes in Drama from the original documents have dropped out. In the original drama outcomes, reference was made to other curriculum areas so that teachers could make links across to other areas of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie stated that she is confident that those links would not be lost by being picked up in modules. Those ‘lost’ outcomes have not been lost in perpetuity but will be looked at by the team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What happened to engagement and reflection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie responded: It seems it is there in the layout. Asked for advice about where they sit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on behalf of QADIE - interested in whether professional associations can offer these documents for consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie responded: Permission would be granted for copies to be made if they are copied for the purpose of a discussion at a meeting and with full disclosure. But they are not to be disseminated broadly by professional associations or other interested groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After lunch:</strong> Feedback on the syllabus section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie asked for mixed specialty groups. She handed out sets of questions and a syllabus section for each group to annotate the single sided copy. The project team members recorded the group discussion. They were not there to respond to questions but instead to pick up on some of the comments and issues, which could have been lost in formal reporting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lenore: Group focussed on question 2 looking for some cultural context for the outcomes, language development and values in our multicultural society, seems ethnocentric. Marie: did you detect any sequences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevann: Went to core content first and suggest that the core content should precede the outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter: clarify language which people will need to know to implement these outcomes. Marie referred to the developing glossary, which the team is currently working on. We don’t want to water down the language and take away from the rigour of the discipline, but we have to make it user friendly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mary: issues of equity and social justice need to be more explicit in the outcomes. Regarding question 2 music no, drama yes. Sequence music no, drama yes. Discretionary outcomes now leave out important links across the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin: warmup should be in level one dance. Marie: Explained that we need to draw the line between what it is that teachers teach and what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chris: special education in terms of equity. How would you actually include equity and social justice in the outcomes? Raised more questions? Concept of 80% who can demonstrate these and what happens to those who do not? We used to start with the content now we are asked to start with an outcome. This will be a big mind shift. Primary focus – primary schools might be better than secondaries at this. Could not see a link across the areas through engagement and reflection. Drama layout is quite clear. Engagement and reflection is clear. Relationship between core content and outcomes had to guess what core content needs to be addressed at which levels. Reporting – will this be reported in terms of engagement and reflection or outcomes or level statements and how does the school and employing authorities make the decision. Elaborations and Sourcebooks will need to be huge documents. This group was nervous as to what goes into these documents because examples can become THE model. We want people to diversify. Queried the use of language and terminology and how the generalist teacher will come to terms with the specificity of terms and that even across arts strands we use terminology differently. Should we be saying that for the purpose of this document the term means this? How much can we realistically expect people to go out and learn in order to teach this area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Nevann: aurally identifying in terms of the ear. In the outcomes we need to be walked through it more; preferred the original set; refer to core content as difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explore possibility of Core Content preceding outcomes in the syllabus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learners will do. We must be cognisant of what we are asking the students to demonstrate independently. Each of these outcomes is an endpoint of the doing and the learning, which takes place during a period of about 18 months. The outcomes are the skeleton and cannot say all of what is needed in all areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lenore:</strong> Foundation level should also apply to the 25% of students who are in mainstream schooling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mary:</strong> what does this mean for children in distance education? How will the students be able to do a dance for example? How will we deal with this? Home tutors will not be able to cope with the demands of these outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kate:</strong> in many primary schools the arts specialist is not necessarily a trained teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORE CONTENT
Marie explained that the team has changed the layout. This is the way it appears in HPE, slightly different in science. We have attempted to use the words of the outcomes. We have tried to make it clear in categories so that it is easy to find. She asked the committee to consider:
1. Does the core content page have a clear relationship to the outcomes?
2. Does the core content for each strand represent what is essential ie core?
3. Is the format of the core content useful/acceptable/adequate – will it serve its purpose?

Comments:
1. Media is too much and is daunting if all has to be covered. Is there room for a discretionary area of content? **Jane:** The outcomes are extraordinarily broad. Conscious of not overloading the core content. Visual arts found it hard to link the processes in the core content to the outcomes. Layout is a lot better. Especially where the words in the outcome link to the core content. Is it possible to highlight? Marie pointed out that this is easier on the cd-rom but difficult in print.
2. **Mark F:** did not think they could do justice to the first question in the allocated time at this meeting. Space on the page tends to mean importance to people. Eg large amount of text gives an imperative. Media has content listed rather than the processes as in the other areas. Recommend media be revisited so that it incorporates the processes. What will the documentation look like? Concerned that schools may turn it into something like the diagnostic net so that the recording becomes unmanageable later.
3. **Mary:** liked the way core content is set out in music. Could not find the relationship in the short time. **Amend drama as**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Would have been useful to have the questions and material ahead of this meeting. Kerry commented that in drama some of the sections and some of the bullet points are in noun form and others are in verb form. This needs to be consistent. Cultural and social context needs to be addressed by others than Vis Arts. Need generic level statements as well as strand specific ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>: tried to find links. Wanted the stem bolded at the top of the core content to contextualise the core content that follows. Need to be able to show how the areas are alike and different.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement and reflection? Marie asked for advice from the group.
Discussion – they are still there but are just not identified clearly any more. If we did identify them as important organisers we should use them consistently through the document. Why is it not apparent in the core content?
The outcomes delimitate engagement and reflection.
If you put some of the scaffolding back we will get back to the nature of weighting and how much time we should spend on them. It seems that in music reflection has dropped out so is it possible to put reflection in the level statements. To impose it on top of what is there adds another level of complexity. With it embedded there then the intent of the syllabus is met with still allowing the individual areas their own ways of organising.
Each area has its own ways of organising learning and across each of these we engage and reflect.
This is another complicating area. The engagement and reflection bullet points do not necessarily relate to the organisation of the overall learning outcomes and the languages, conventions and codes.

Marie asked the group to take away copies and provide feedback to the project team within three weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISIONS &amp; ACTION ARISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suggested. Highlight cultural and social contexts in all strands. Generic level statements to be included. Amend as suggested. Highlight commonalities and differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-consider engagement and reflection to note whether they are sufficiently evident in the outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW DATES FOR PROPOSED August 20 meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project team will endeavour to find a date towards the end of July to avoid an overlap with the Technology Project trial school conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting closed at 3:30 PM.

DATES OF NEXT MEETING: FRIDAYS One in July to be advised [Remaining at August 20], 19 NOVEMBER 1999
Appendix 7.6 Mapping the Drama outcomes
onto the Key Learning Area Outcomes and the Valued Attributes of a Lifelong Learner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kla outcomes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• participate in and enjoy arts experiences, products, and performances with</td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidence, skill, enjoyment and aesthetic awareness;</td>
<td>DR1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• communicate ideas, feelings and experiences through the symbol systems,</td>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td>DR2.2</td>
<td>DR3.2</td>
<td>DR4.2</td>
<td>DR5.2</td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>techniques, technologies and processes appropriate to each of the arts;</td>
<td>DR2.3</td>
<td>DR3.3</td>
<td>DR4.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understand, critically evaluate and appreciate the impact of the social,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural, historical, political and economic contexts of arts works in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of meaning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• respect and value cultural diversity, address equity issues and establish</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive environments to promote their own and others’ involvement in the</td>
<td>DR4.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts as discerning consumers and/or practitioners;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understand the unique contribution of each of the arts, as well as the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR3.2</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborative nature of many arts practices;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR4.2</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR5.2</td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understand the personal and career related skills developed in the arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR3.3</td>
<td>DR4.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross-curricular priorities</td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy</td>
<td>DR1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numeracy</td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td>DR3.2</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR4.2</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifeskills</td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td>DR2.3</td>
<td>DR3.3</td>
<td>DR4.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>futures perspective</td>
<td>DR2.1</td>
<td>DR3.1</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR3.3</td>
<td>DR4.3</td>
<td>DR5.3</td>
<td>DR6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attributes of a Lifelong Learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes of a Lifelong Learner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a knowledgeable person with deep understanding;</td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR3.2</td>
<td>DR4.2</td>
<td>DR5.2</td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a complex thinker;</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR2.1</td>
<td>DR3.1</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td>DR2.3</td>
<td>DR3.3</td>
<td>DR4.2</td>
<td>DR5.2</td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a responsive creator;</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td>DR2.1</td>
<td>DR3.1</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td>DR2.1</td>
<td>DR3.1</td>
<td>DR4.1</td>
<td>DR5.1</td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• an active investigator;</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR3.3</td>
<td>DR4.3</td>
<td>DR5.2</td>
<td>DR6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• an effective communicator;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a participant in an interdependent world;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a reflective and self-directed learner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.7 First Core Content table.
The central dimensions of drama in education are Forming, Presenting and Responding. For the purposes of this syllabus, Forming and Presenting are part of Engagement and Responding is what occurs in Reflection.

Forming in drama involves students in dramatic play and playmaking modes. Student engage in accepting roles and dramatic contexts and gradually learn to recognise and then manipulate the elements of drama. Initially supported by teacher-provided frameworks, students learn to select, sequence and structure their work to build dramatic action and tell ‘stories’. They develop various forms of teacher structured, student devised and scripted drama and also engage in design and planning activities. Presenting in drama involves students in interpreting, rehearsing and performing their own drama and existing texts for audiences (informal and formal), individually and in groups. Students develop characterisation, script interpretation and acting skills and explore a range of forms and styles of drama. Students use basic design and stagecraft elements to complement their performances. Responding in drama involves students in reflecting on their own drama and the drama of other people, times and places. They explore aspects such as the purposes, contexts, elements and impact of dramatic performances. They also reflect on their own learning in, through and about drama.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Skills and Knowledge</th>
<th>Forms and Contexts</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Audiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forms and Contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Audiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming Dramatic Play</td>
<td>Students-devised and within teacher-provided framework:</td>
<td>• Accept the fiction</td>
<td>Drama:</td>
<td>Informal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build &amp; maintain role</td>
<td>• role</td>
<td>• self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvisation skills</td>
<td>• drama games and exercises</td>
<td>• relationships</td>
<td>• teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group interaction skills</td>
<td>• roleplay</td>
<td>• situation</td>
<td>• small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• process drama</td>
<td>• narrative</td>
<td>groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• story drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>• class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playmaking</strong></td>
<td>Students-devised and within teacher-provided framework; individually and in groups</td>
<td>• sequence dramatic action</td>
<td>Dramatic forming:</td>
<td>Informal and formal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• develop scenarios</td>
<td>• time</td>
<td>• small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• apply research</td>
<td>• space and place</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• scriptwriting</td>
<td>• language</td>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• knowledge of different forms and styles</td>
<td>• focus</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenting</strong></td>
<td>Individually and in groups:</td>
<td>• students-devised drama, including:</td>
<td>Purposes of Drama:</td>
<td>Informal and formal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• students devised</td>
<td>• documentary, collage, movement,</td>
<td>• play</td>
<td>• small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• existing text, including scripted drama</td>
<td>• ritual or ceremonial</td>
<td>• explore</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Australian drama</td>
<td>• celebrate</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• world drama, including:</td>
<td>• challenge</td>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Naturalism/realism,</td>
<td>• question</td>
<td>class or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-naturalism,</td>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comic/tragic styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• theatre for young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• storydrama/storytelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• performance poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• readers’ theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responding</strong></td>
<td>• written and oral</td>
<td>• short and extended responses including:</td>
<td>• educate or inform</td>
<td>• family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• reflection</td>
<td>• character/plot profiles</td>
<td>and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis</td>
<td>• text analysis</td>
<td>• specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• synthesis</td>
<td>• program notes</td>
<td>target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluation</td>
<td>• reviews and reports</td>
<td>audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• comparison</td>
<td>• letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.8 Core Content – changed layout.
Core Content: Drama

The significant components of drama in education are **Forming, Presenting and Responding**. **Forming** in drama involves learners in dramatic play and playmaking modes. Learners engage in accepting roles and dramatic contexts and gradually learn to recognise and then manipulate the elements of drama. Initially supported by teacher provided frameworks, learners begin to select, sequence and structure student-devised and scripted drama and also engage in design and planning experiences. **Presenting** in drama involves learners in interpreting, rehearsing and performing their own drama and existing texts for audiences (informal and formal), individually and in groups. Learners develop characterisation, script interpretation and acting skills and explore a range of forms and styles of drama. They use basic design and stagecraft elements to complement their performances. **Responding** in drama involves learners in reflecting on their own drama and the drama of other people, times and places. They explore aspects such as the purposes, contexts, elements and impact of dramatic performances. They also reflect on their own learning in, through and about drama.

### Through Engagement and Reflection

#### Forming - dramatic play and playmaking: student-devised and within teacher-provided framework; individually and in groups
- accept the fiction
- build and maintain role
- improvisation skills
- group interaction skills
- sequence dramatic action
- develop scenarios
- apply research
- scripting
- dramatic play
- drama games and exercises
- roleplay
- process drama
- story drama
- improvisation
- narrative and non-narrative forms
- role descriptions

#### Presenting: individually and in groups
- script/text interpretation
- characterisation
- acting skills
- audience awareness
- ensemble skills
- basic stagecraft
- student-devised drama, including documentary, collage, movement, ritual or ceremonial
- Australian drama and world drama, including naturalism/realism, non-naturalism, comic/tragic styles
- theatre for young people
- storydrama/storytelling
- performance poetry
- readers’ theatre

#### Responding: written and oral
- reflection
- analysis, synthesis, evaluation, comparison
- research
- knowledge of: elements of drama and dramatic forming; purposes of drama; drama from different times and places; work and study options
- character/plot profiles
- text analysis
- program notes, reviews and reports
- letters, interviews
- writing in role
- discussion, seminars, debates/symposiums
- transforming to other art forms

#### Elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama and dramatic forming:</th>
<th>Purposes of drama:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situation</td>
<td>celebrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space and place</td>
<td>educate or inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>entertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus</td>
<td>promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbol</td>
<td>recreate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood</td>
<td>empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrast</td>
<td>express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tension</td>
<td>record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Audiences: informal and formal
- self
- teacher
- small groups and class
- other class or year
- family and friends
- specific target audience
Appendix 7.9 Pilot Draft Core Content table.
# Core content

## Drama

Through Engagement and Reflection learners are
- creating drama by applying the elements and conventions of drama to a range of forms and styles
- presenting drama in a variety of forms and styles with awareness of specific audiences and purposes
- responding to their own drama, the drama of their peers and others

### Create dramatic action
- engage in dramatic play and role-play
- devise, shape and structure (sequence and focus)
- apply elements of drama
- apply dramatic conventions
- improvise
- apply research
- select and apply elements of design and stagecraft
- collaborate
- solve problems
- provide alternatives
- consider audience, context and purpose
- rehearse and refine

### Present dramatic action
- perform student devised drama
- perform scripted texts
- apply voice, movement and characterisation in appropriate style
- apply stagecraft
- develop ensemble skills
- memorise text
- perform with awareness of audience, performance space and purpose

### Respond to dramatic action
- develop knowledge of: elements of drama, forms and styles of drama from a range of contexts
- describe ideas and feelings
- identify meanings created in and through drama
- interpret drama experiences and presentations
- analyse and evaluate own and others’ work

Dramatic action incorporates combinations of:

### Role
- create and accept
- develop and sustain
- role
- relationships
- narrative
- time
- space
- place
- negotiate in and out of role
- communicate in role
- language
- focus
- symbol
- mood
- contrast
- tension
- poetic
- emphasise the symbolic/metaphoric
- reflective
- review the drama
- emphasise thinking within the drama

### Elements of drama
- context-building
  - add information as the drama unfolds
  - set the scene
- narrative
  - develop the story
  - sequence events

### Drama conventions

### Forms and styles
- student-devised scenarios and scripts:
  - documentary, collage, ritual, or ceremonial
- Australian drama and world drama:
  - naturalism/realism, non-naturalism, comic/tragic styles
- Theatre for Young People:
  - Children’s Theatre, Theatre-In-Education, Theatre for Young People, Youth Theatre
- storydrama
- process drama
- storytelling
- oral traditions and oral histories
- performance poetry
- readers’ theatre
Appendix 7.10 Core Content tables and changes.
**Core Content**

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>role</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place</td>
<td>space</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>accepting the role</td>
<td>creating role from simple props &amp; costume</td>
<td>creating roles from given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role</td>
<td>whole &amp; small group roleplay</td>
<td>whole group role as expert</td>
<td>meetings in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dramatic Action</td>
<td>finishing the given story</td>
<td>build narrative</td>
<td>sequence dramatic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms and Styles</td>
<td>dramatic play</td>
<td>storydrama</td>
<td>extended role-plays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance skills</td>
<td>share role and participate with the group in a classroom setting</td>
<td>voice - volume &amp; pace (for a classroom setting)</td>
<td>voice - character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>informal: peers and teachers</td>
<td>informal: peers, teacher, small group</td>
<td>informal and formal: another class or year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>play, explore</td>
<td>re-enact events</td>
<td>express, celebrate, entertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Once introduced, core content is to be revisited and developed in subsequent levels.*
## Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>mood</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>role-reversal</td>
<td>developing roles using status</td>
<td>roles from differing points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Dramatic Action</strong></td>
<td>speaking thoughts aloud (in role)</td>
<td>stream of consciousness</td>
<td>dramatic monologues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Forms and styles</strong></td>
<td>student devised scenarios</td>
<td>process drama</td>
<td>documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chorus drama</td>
<td>realism</td>
<td>non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readers theatre</td>
<td>collage drama</td>
<td>theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published scripts</td>
<td>clowning &amp; physical comedy</td>
<td>forum theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written: character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>improvisation</td>
<td>written: play review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>voice - audibility, pitch &amp; clarity, adapting projection for different spaces</td>
<td>movement - blocking stage action</td>
<td>voice - modulation, articulation and breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement-varies appropriately for character and stage space</td>
<td>adapt performance for different audiences and spaces</td>
<td>movement – in character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiment with different performance spaces</td>
<td>characterisation - purpose and motivation</td>
<td>script interpretation - plot analysis, given circumstances, character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characterisation - maintaining appropriate role</td>
<td>script interpretation - who, what, where, when &amp; why</td>
<td>motivation, context, sub-text, style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>formal &amp; informal: other year levels, family and friends</td>
<td>formal and informal: specific target audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>educate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>question</td>
<td>inform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>promote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Once introduced, core content is to be revisited and developed in subsequent levels.*
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**Core Content**

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Once introduced, core content is to be revised and developed in subsequent levels.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>role</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>accepting the role</td>
<td>whole group role as expert</td>
<td>hot seat role-play (student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role</td>
<td>going in &amp; out of role</td>
<td>use of simple props &amp; costume to establish role</td>
<td>role-play with prepared roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whole &amp; small group roleplay</td>
<td>freeze frames to:</td>
<td>freeze frames to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- build narrative</td>
<td>- sequence dramatic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- use available materials to define drama space</td>
<td>- show relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finishing the given story</td>
<td></td>
<td>- adding captions to freeze frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and Styles</strong></td>
<td>dramatic play</td>
<td>storydrama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>share role and participate with the group in a classroom setting</td>
<td>voice - volume &amp; pace (for a classroom setting)</td>
<td>voice - character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>movement - awareness of who needs to be seen &amp; where</td>
<td>movement - posture, gesture and body position to denote character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demarcation of and awareness of performance space</td>
<td>concentration in presentation of role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>turn taking, awareness of cues</td>
<td>memorisation of lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>informal: peers and teachers</td>
<td>informal: peers, teacher, small group</td>
<td>informal and formal: another class or year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>play</td>
<td>re-enact events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explore</td>
<td></td>
<td>celebrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>mood</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>role</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role-reversal or from differing points of view</td>
<td>improvising in role</td>
<td>dramatic monologues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaking thoughts aloud (in role)</td>
<td>mantle of the expert</td>
<td>frozen effigy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>dramatic action</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readers theatre</td>
<td>process drama</td>
<td>documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student devised scenarios and scripts</td>
<td>realistic</td>
<td>non-realist (abstract and poetic forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chorus drama (ritual and ceremonial)</td>
<td>collage drama</td>
<td>theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published scripts</td>
<td>clowning &amp; physical comedy</td>
<td>forum theatre (teacher as ’joker’ facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>readers theatre</td>
<td>process drama</td>
<td>documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student devised scenarios and scripts</td>
<td>realistic</td>
<td>non-realist (abstract and poetic forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chorus drama (ritual and ceremonial)</td>
<td>collage drama</td>
<td>theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published scripts</td>
<td>clowning &amp; physical comedy</td>
<td>forum theatre (teacher as ’joker’ facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voice - audibility, pitch &amp; clarity, adapting projection for different spaces</td>
<td>voice - modulation, articulation &amp; breathing</td>
<td>movement – in character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement-varies appropriately for character and stage space</td>
<td>movement - blocking stage action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiment with different performance spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space - adapting space to create situation and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characterisation - maintaining appropriate role</td>
<td>adapt performance for different audiences and spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>formal &amp; informal: other year levels, family and friends</td>
<td>formal and informal: specific target audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>educate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>question</td>
<td>inform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once introduced, core content is to be revised and developed in subsequent levels.
**Core Content**

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>role</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place</td>
<td>space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role</td>
<td>accepting the role</td>
<td>creating role from simple props &amp; costume</td>
<td>creating roles from given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whole &amp; small group roleplay</td>
<td>whole group role as expert</td>
<td>meetings in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dramatic Action</td>
<td>finishing the given story</td>
<td>build narrative &amp; use available materials to define drama space</td>
<td>sequence dramatic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and Styles</strong></td>
<td>dramatic play</td>
<td>storydrama</td>
<td>extended role-plays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>share role and participate with the group in a classroom setting</td>
<td>voice - volume &amp; pace (for a classroom setting)</td>
<td>voice - character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement - awareness of who needs to be seen &amp; where</td>
<td>movement - posture, gesture and body position to denote character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demarcation of and awareness of performance space</td>
<td>concentration in presentation of role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>turn taking, awareness of cues</td>
<td>memorisation of lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>informal - peers and teachers</td>
<td>informal - peers, teacher, small group</td>
<td>informal and formal - another class or year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>play</td>
<td>re-enact events</td>
<td>express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explore</td>
<td></td>
<td>celebrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Once introduced, core content is to be revisited and developed in subsequent levels.*
### Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>• mood</td>
<td>• tension</td>
<td>• contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Role</strong></td>
<td>• role-reversal</td>
<td>• developing roles using status</td>
<td>• roles from differing points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Dramatic Action</strong></td>
<td>• speaking thoughts aloud (in role)</td>
<td>• stream of consciousness</td>
<td>• dramatic monologues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• developing action from given circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and styles</strong></td>
<td>• student devised scenarios</td>
<td>• process drama</td>
<td>• documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• chorus drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>• non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• readers theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td>• theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• published scripts</td>
<td></td>
<td>• forum theatre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• written: character profile, plot outline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• written - play review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>• voice - audibility, pitch &amp; clarity, adapting projection for different spaces</td>
<td>• movement - blocking stage action</td>
<td>• voice - modulation, articulation and breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• movement-varies appropriately for character and stage space</td>
<td>• adapt performance for different audiences and spaces</td>
<td>• movement - in character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• experiment with different performance spaces</td>
<td>• characterisation - purpose and motivation</td>
<td>• script interpretation - plot analysis, given circumstances, character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• characterisation - maintaining appropriate role</td>
<td>• script interpretation - who, what, where, when &amp; why</td>
<td>• motivation, context, sub-text, style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>• formal &amp; informal: other year levels, family and friends</td>
<td>• formal and informal: specific target audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• challenge</td>
<td>• educate</td>
<td>• empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• question</td>
<td>• inform</td>
<td>• promote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>role, place</td>
<td>language, space, objects</td>
<td>time, relationships, movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>accepting the role, whole &amp; small group roleplay</td>
<td>creating role from simple props &amp; costume</td>
<td>creating roles from given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>whole group role as expert</td>
<td>meetings in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Dramatic Action</strong></td>
<td>finishing the given story</td>
<td>build narrative, use available materials to define drama space</td>
<td>sequence dramatic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and Styles</strong></td>
<td>dramatic play</td>
<td>storydrama</td>
<td>extended role-plays, storytelling, written - role descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Written</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>written – writing-in-role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>share role and participate with the group in a classroom setting</td>
<td>voice - volume &amp; pace (for a classroom setting), movement - awareness of who needs to be seen &amp; where, demarcation of and awareness of performance space, turn taking, awareness of cues</td>
<td>voice - character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom, movement - posture, gesture and body position to denote character, concentration in presentation of role, memorisation of lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>informal - peers and teachers</td>
<td>informal - peers, teacher, small group</td>
<td>informal and formal - another class or year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>play, explore</td>
<td>re-enact events</td>
<td>express, celebrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Once introduced, core content is to be revisited and developed in subsequent levels.*
### Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various social, historical and cultural contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>• mood</td>
<td>• tension</td>
<td>• contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>• role-reversal</td>
<td>• developing roles using status</td>
<td>• roles from differing points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dramatic Action</td>
<td>• speaking thoughts aloud (in role)</td>
<td>• stream of consciousness</td>
<td>• dramatic monologues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• developing action from given circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms and styles</td>
<td>• student devised scenarios</td>
<td>• student-devised scripts</td>
<td>• documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• published scripts</td>
<td>• process drama</td>
<td>• non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• written: character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>• realism</td>
<td>• theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• collage drama</td>
<td>• forum theatre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• clowning &amp; physical comedy</td>
<td>• written - play review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• improvisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• written: program notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance skills</td>
<td>• voice - audibility, pitch &amp; clarity, adapting projection for different spaces</td>
<td>• voice – adapting for different characters, and performance locations</td>
<td>• voice - modulation, articulation and breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• movement-varies appropriately for character and stage space</td>
<td>• movement - blocking stage action</td>
<td>• movement - in character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• experiment with different performance spaces</td>
<td>• characterisation - purpose and motivation</td>
<td>• script interpretation - plot analysis, given circumstances, character motivation, context, sub-text, style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• characterisation - maintaining appropriate role</td>
<td>• script interpretation - who, what, where, when &amp; why</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>• formal &amp; informal: other year levels, family and friends</td>
<td>• formal and informal: specific target audience</td>
<td>• formal audience: unfamiliar audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>• entertain</td>
<td>• educate</td>
<td>• empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inform</td>
<td>• promote</td>
<td>• challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Core Content**

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various cultural, social and historical contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Once introduced, core content is to be revisited and developed in subsequent levels.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>• role</td>
<td>• language</td>
<td>• time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• place</td>
<td>• space</td>
<td>• relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• objects</td>
<td>• movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions - Role</strong></td>
<td>• accepting the role</td>
<td>• creating role from simple props and costume</td>
<td>• creating roles from given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• whole &amp; small group roleplay</td>
<td>• whole group role as expert</td>
<td>• meetings in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramatic Action</strong></td>
<td>• finishing the given story</td>
<td>• build narrative</td>
<td>• sequence dramatic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use available materials to define drama space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and Styles</strong></td>
<td>• dramatic play</td>
<td>• storydrama</td>
<td>• extended role-play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• written – writing-in-role</td>
<td>• storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• written – role description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>• share role and participate with the group in a classroom setting</td>
<td>• voice – volume and pace (for a classroom setting)</td>
<td>• voice – character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• movement – awareness of who needs to be seen and where</td>
<td>• movement – posture, gesture and body position to denote character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• demarcation of and awareness of performance space</td>
<td>• concentration in presentation of role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• turn taking, awareness of cues</td>
<td>• memorisation of lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>• informal – peers and teachers</td>
<td>• informal – peers, teacher, small group</td>
<td>• informal and formal – another class or year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• play</td>
<td>• re-enact events</td>
<td>• express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• explore</td>
<td></td>
<td>• celebrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various cultural, social and historical contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>mood</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>role-reversal</td>
<td>developing roles using status</td>
<td>roles from differing points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Dramatic Action</strong></td>
<td>speaking thoughts aloud (in role)</td>
<td>developing action from given circumstances</td>
<td>stream of consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and styles</strong></td>
<td>student devised scenarios</td>
<td>student-devised scripts</td>
<td>documentary drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvisation</td>
<td>process drama</td>
<td>non-realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published scripts</td>
<td>realism</td>
<td>theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written – character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>collage drama</td>
<td>forum theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>voice – audibility, pitch and clarity, adapting projection for different spaces</td>
<td>voice – adapting for different characters, and performance locations</td>
<td>voice – modulation, articulation and breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement – varies appropriately for character and stage space</td>
<td>movement – blocking stage action</td>
<td>movement – in character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiment with different performance spaces</td>
<td>characterisation - purpose and motivation</td>
<td>script interpretation - plot analysis, given circumstances, character motivation, context, sub-text, style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characterisation – maintaining appropriate role</td>
<td>script interpretation – who, what, where, when &amp; why</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>formal &amp; informal – other year levels, family and friends</td>
<td>formal and informal – specific target audience</td>
<td>formal audience – unfamiliar audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>entertain</td>
<td>educate</td>
<td>empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inform</td>
<td>promote</td>
<td>challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Content

Drama

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various cultural, social and historical contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>place</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role</td>
<td>objects</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>accept the role</td>
<td>create roles from simple props and costume</td>
<td>create roles from given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— role</td>
<td>whole- and small-group roleplay</td>
<td>whole-group role as expert</td>
<td>meetings in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>— dramatic action</strong></td>
<td>finish the given story</td>
<td>build narrative</td>
<td>sequence dramatic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and styles</strong></td>
<td>dramatic play</td>
<td>storydrama</td>
<td>extended roleplay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>participate in role</td>
<td>awareness of cues and turn-taking</td>
<td>concentration in presentation of role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participate with the group in a classroom setting</td>
<td>demarcation of and awareness of performance space</td>
<td>memorisation of lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>movement — awareness of who needs to be seen and where</td>
<td>movement — posture, gesture and body position to denote character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voice — character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>informal — peers and teachers</td>
<td>informal — peers, teacher, small group</td>
<td>informal and formal — another class or year level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>exploration</td>
<td>re-enactment of events</td>
<td>celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>play</td>
<td></td>
<td>expression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Content

**Drama**

Students form, present and respond to drama using dramatic elements and conventions within a range of forms and styles drawn from various cultural, social and historical contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td>role-reversal</td>
<td>develop roles using status</td>
<td>convey roles from differing points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— dramatic action</td>
<td>develop action from given circumstances, speak thoughts aloud (in role)</td>
<td>stream of consciousness</td>
<td>dramatic monologue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms and styles</strong></td>
<td>improvisation</td>
<td>clownsing and physical comedy, collage drama, process drama</td>
<td>documentary drama, forum theatre, non-realist, theatre for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published scripts</td>
<td>student-devised scenarios</td>
<td>written — short scenes in correct layout, play review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student-devised scenarios</td>
<td>realism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written — character profile, plot outline</td>
<td>student-devised scripts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance skills</strong></td>
<td>characterisation — maintain appropriate role</td>
<td>characterisation — purpose and motivation</td>
<td>characterisation — derived from script interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experimentation with different performance spaces</td>
<td>movement — blocking stage action</td>
<td>movement — in character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement — vary for character and stage space</td>
<td>script interpretation — who, what, where, when and why</td>
<td>script interpretation — plot analysis, style, sub-text, given circumstances, context, character motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voice — audibility, pitch and clarity, adapting projection for different spaces</td>
<td>voice — adapting for different characters and performance locations</td>
<td>voice — modulation, articulation and breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>formal and informal — other year levels, family and friends</td>
<td>formal and informal — specific target audience</td>
<td>formal — unfamiliar audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>entertainment</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information</td>
<td>promotion</td>
<td>empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td><strong><strong>/</strong></strong>/______</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Officer</td>
<td>Author</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong><strong>/</strong></strong>/______</td>
<td><strong><strong>/</strong></strong>/______</td>
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</tr>
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Appendix 9.2 Extracts from Draft Elaborations.
| DR3.1 Learners create, develop and negotiate in and out of the drama, a range of dramatic roles and relationships. They build and shape dramatic situations, roles and narratives, individually and in groups, by applying choices about place, time, language, movement, space and symbol. | DR3.2 Learners participate in rehearsed group presentations of devised drama with an awareness of audience in informal and formal settings. | DR3.3 Learners identify and describe, the learnings and understandings developed in and through drama experiences. They make informal, but supported critical judgements about the use of dramatic elements and skills using appropriate drama terminology. |

**Building dramatic action by creating, developing, negotiating and shaping dramatic situations with appropriate techniques and strategies.**

- **Developing the fiction:** using personal experience and external stimuli to establish roles, relationships and situations.
- **Negotiating the fiction:** supporting each other both in and out of role i.e. listening, accepting, offering, planning, decision-making.
- **Shaping the fiction:**
  - time - exploring causes and effects through time-jumps, flashbacks, changes in

| Participating in rehearsed drama presentations with an awareness of audience. |

- **Presenting skills:** voice (preparation, audibility, clarity), maintaining role, relaxation, concentration, awareness of space, posture and body language.
- **Rehearsal:** practice, accepting feedback, experimenting, meeting deadlines.
- **Audience awareness:** responsibilities of audience members, making action visible and audible.
- **Group skills:** cooperation, tolerance, negotiation, problem solving, decision making, arriving at consensus, compromising, planning, reworking.

| Describing and Identifying drama experiences and purposes using appropriate drama terminology. |

- **Thinking skills:** identifying, describing, interpreting, evaluating, justifying, transforming.
- **Vocabulary:** role, character, in-role, out-of-role, fiction, fictional, rehearse, rehearsal, elements, shaping.
- **Forms, genres, types of drama:**
  - interviews
  - short answer responses
  - letters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>tempo</strong></th>
<th><strong>seeing task through to completion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* space - place, use of levels, physical space</td>
<td>* <strong>Forms, genres, types of drama:</strong> story drama, storytelling, short scripted scenes, movement-based drama (drama with few or no words, e.g. ritual, dance drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* movement - body language including gesture, posture, facial expression, movement through space</td>
<td>* <strong>Cross-Arts:</strong> puppetry (shadow), character mask, dance-drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* language - use of tone (vocal variation) and register (language variations e.g. informal - domestic, social; formal - classic, technical) to suggest roles and relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* simple symbols - investing objects/colours with symbolic significance eg. costume, props</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramatic forming techniques and strategies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* freeze frames (series of linked depictions that are presented to an audience to demonstrate key issues in a dramatic moment) to sequence dramatic action and explore situations and relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* teacher and student hot-seat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interviews
* teacher narration
* dream sequence
* tap and talk (freeze frame - when participant is tapped on the shoulder and speaks inner thoughts related to the moment)

- *Forms, genres, types of drama:* dramatic play, role play, story drama, storytelling, short scripts, movement-based drama, games and exercises
Level statement  Learners, individually and in groups, select dramatic elements while building and shaping their own dramatic action. Contexts are drawn from both non-fictional and fictional sources. They participate in group-devised drama for presentation in informal and more formal settings. Through teacher guided responses learners use drama terminology to describe and evaluate drama experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaborations for planning</th>
<th>Elaborations for planning</th>
<th>Elaborations for planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiate in and out of the drama:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Participate in rehearsed group presentations:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identify and describe learnings and understandings developed through:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners support each other in and out of role: listening, accepting, offering, planning, decision-making</td>
<td>• Rehearsal: practice, accepting feedback, experimenting, meeting deadlines</td>
<td>• Whole class and small group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A range of dramatic roles and relationships drawn from:</td>
<td>• Group skills: cooperation, tolerance, negotiation, problem solving, decision making, arriving at consensus, compromising, planning, reworking, seeing task through to completion</td>
<td>• Guided writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Real-life experiences</td>
<td>• Selection and refinement of chosen scenes</td>
<td>• Short answer responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fiction and non-fiction</td>
<td>• Exploration of different requirements of performance spaces</td>
<td>• Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shaping dramatic action using conventions:</strong></td>
<td>Devised drama - Forms of drama:</td>
<td>• Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role-on-the-wall: role is represented in picture form, adding information as the drama progresses</td>
<td>• Story drama</td>
<td>• Diaries and journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defining space: materials are used to represent the place where the drama is situated</td>
<td>• Storytelling</td>
<td>• Writing in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diaries</td>
<td>• Short scripted scenes, movement-based drama</td>
<td>Developed in and through drama experiences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meetings: in role</td>
<td>• Cross-arts: puppetry: shadow, character mask</td>
<td>As in level 3.2 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hot-seating: teacher or child assumes a role with specialist knowledge and is questioned by the group</td>
<td>• Dance-drama</td>
<td>• Genres, types of drama: story drama, storytelling, short scripted scenes, movement-based drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role cards: written information which provides detail about role</td>
<td>• Plays devised as a result of conventions under 3.1</td>
<td>• Cross-arts: puppetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storyboarding: breaking down sequence of main events</td>
<td>• Ritual/ceremonial</td>
<td>• Character mask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caption-making: words or phrases that represent the action</td>
<td>Awareness of audience in both informal and formal settings:</td>
<td>• Dance-drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mark the moment: use a convention to ‘mark’ when a feeling is aroused or understanding occurs</td>
<td>• Audience awareness, responsibilities of audience members, making action visible and audible</td>
<td>• Viewing of live performances by professional artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thought tracking: private thoughts or reactions of</td>
<td>• Presenting skills: voice preparation, audibility, clarity, warm-up exercises for vocal health</td>
<td>Informal but supported critical judgments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vocal exercises to develop efficient and effective</td>
<td>• Thinking skills: identifying, describing, interpreting, evaluating, justifying, transforming;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Audiences: self, small group, teacher, class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Using terms and elements of drama: role, relationships, narrative, space, place, language, time, movement, objects, simple symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of appropriate terminology including:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Person in the drama are spoken aloud
  - Dance drama: expressive movement interpreting story or theme to music; can include language
  - Small group play-making: groups devise short scenes according to the requirements of the drama
  - Ritual: stylistic & repetitious enactment, selecting essence of situation, place, group, issue

Elements: *as for level 2 plus*
- Language: use of tone and register, language variations to suggest roles and relationships
- Space: use of levels, physical space
- Time: causes and effects, time-jumps, flashbacks
- Movement: body language, gesture, posture, facial expression, movement through space
- Simple symbols: investing objects/colours with symbolic significance (costume, objects, props)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical demonstrations – the learner may:</th>
<th>Breathing, projection, articulation and modulation; maintaining role</th>
<th>Typical demonstrations – the learner may:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Step in and out of role</td>
<td>- Concentration</td>
<td>- Role, character, in-role, out-of-role, fiction, fictional, rehearse, rehearsal, elements, shaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accept roles of experts</td>
<td>- Awareness of space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support others in and out of role</td>
<td>- Posture and body language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accept a range of roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use specialist vocabulary as appropriate to a specific context and the role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explore and control different time frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apply a variety of movement styles eg. Naturalistic and expressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modify the space to reflect the dramatic context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Endow objects, props or costumes with special meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical demonstrations – the learner may:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Sustain role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Face the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apply movement to suit the role and stage space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speak audibly and clarity in enclosed spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical demonstrations – the learner may:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Use drama terminology to describe elements, application of skills in own and others’ works, substantiate opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify their own learnings in and through drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sequence of core learning outcomes with elaborations and typical demonstrations – Drama – Level Three (extract from June 2000 draft)

**Level statement:** Students, individually and in groups, experience selected dramatic forms and styles. The stimulus for drama work is drawn from real-life and fictional contexts. They shape dramatic action by negotiating in and out of role, selecting and using a range of elements including time, movement and relationships, and conventions as appropriate to the selected form or style. Their dramas celebrate and express ideas, feelings or events. They participate in group-devised drama for presentation in informal and more formal settings, to audiences including other classes and year levels. They convey character through vocal expression, posture and gesture. They concentrate on sustaining roles, memorising lines where appropriate. Within teacher guided responses students use drama terminology to describe learnings and understandings developed through drama experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Content elements</th>
<th>conventions</th>
<th>forms and styles</th>
<th>performance skills</th>
<th>audience</th>
<th>purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>creating roles from given information</td>
<td>extended role-plays</td>
<td>voice - character and expression in voice, projection within the classroom</td>
<td>informal and formal -another class or year level</td>
<td>express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>meetings in role</td>
<td>storytelling</td>
<td>movement - posture, gesture and body position to denote character</td>
<td></td>
<td>celebrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement</td>
<td>sequence dramatic action</td>
<td>written - role descriptions</td>
<td>concentration in presentation of role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>memorisation of lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DR3.1 Students negotiate, in and out of role, a range of situations and narratives.**

**Negotiate in and out of role**
- students support each other in and out of role by listening, accepting, offering, planning, decision making

**Range of situations and narratives**
- explore different status such as high, low
- explore different purposes, such as seeking help or information, providing advice

**Elements as for previous levels, plus**
- language: use of tone and register, language variations
- space: use of levels
- time: causes and effects
- movement: posture, facial expression
- symbol: investing objects/colours with symbolic significance

**Shaping narratives**
Linear (sequenced according to time) or non-linear (such as collage, ritual, symbolic)

**The student may –**
- use specialist vocabulary (language) as appropriate to a specific context and the role, modulating voice to convey role
- modify the space to reflect the dramatic context and place
- apply a variety of movement styles e.g. naturalistic and expressive, robotic etc.
- explore and control different time frames highlighting cause and effect
- endow objects, props or costumes with special (symbolic) meaning

Negotiate in and out of the drama
- step in and out of role
- support others in and out of role

**Range of roles**
- accept and work in a range of roles as designated by the teacher
- accept a range of experts roles
- accept and work in a range of roles derived from conventions such as role-on-the-wall and role cards
### DR3.2 Students rehearse and present dramatic action for a specific purpose.

**Rehearse**
- rehearsal: practise, accept feedback, experiment, meet deadlines
- group skills: cooperate, tolerate, negotiate, problem solve, make decisions, arrive at consensus, compromise, plan, rework, see task through to completion
- selection and refinement of chosen scenes
- exploration of different requirements of performance spaces

**Present**

**Purpose**
- Awareness of audience in both informal and formal settings
  - audience awareness, responsibilities of audience members, making action visible and audible
  - vocal exercises to develop effective breathing, projection, vocal clarity and modulation; vocal warm-up exercises prior to formal presentation
- maintaining role
- concentration
- awareness of space
- posture and body language
- storytelling
- short plays devised as a result of conventions under DR3.1

### DR3.3 Students discuss and interpret the learnings and understandings developed through drama experiences.

**Discuss and interpret learnings and understandings**

**Describe using drama vocabulary identify own strengths and challenges**
- identify personal progress
- describe feelings in and about drama
- identify key elements in the drama role, in-role, out-of-role, rehearse, rehearse elements from previous levels

**Developed through drama experiences**
- viewing of live performances by professional artists

**Informal but supported critical judgments**
- identify, describe, interpret, evaluate, justify, transform
- using terms and elements of drama from previous levels, plus

### The student may –

- Participate in rehearsed group presentations
- cooperate while rehearsing
- refine work during rehearsals
- select sections to rehearse and polish
- consider performance space while rehearsing
- Awareness of audience in both informal and formal settings
- sustain role while sharing
- face the audience as appropriate
- apply movement to suit the role and stage space
- speak audibly and with clarity in small performance spaces, such as a classroom

**Describe learnings and understandings**
- use drama terminology to describe elements used in own and others’ work
- use drama terminology to describe application of skills in own and others’ work

**Skills may include**
- depth and control of role
- concentration
- cooperation
- vocal projection and clarity
- movement and gesture
- guided writing
- short answer responses
- letters
- interviews
- diaries and journals
- writing in role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal but supported critical judgments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• substantiate opinion by providing examples and reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identify their own learnings in drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9.3 The Arts modules.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td>At your fingertips</td>
<td>Creeping creatures</td>
<td>A dance for all seasons</td>
<td>Dance of the people</td>
<td>In the spotlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creeping creatures</td>
<td>Movement of life</td>
<td>Dance in another dimension</td>
<td>Move like me!</td>
<td>The art of dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving stories</td>
<td>Sporty steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two to tango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drama</strong></td>
<td>A home for Teeny-Tiny</td>
<td>Circles and sawdust</td>
<td>Pig's can fly</td>
<td>Carnival</td>
<td>A spotlight on script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Dreammaker</td>
<td>The Pied Piper</td>
<td>The disappearing sands</td>
<td>Medieval mysteries</td>
<td>In my own words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td>Anime!</td>
<td>Making choices</td>
<td>Making meaning</td>
<td>Getting personal</td>
<td>Corporate image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media and me</td>
<td>Moving stories</td>
<td>Pizzazz! Where information comes alive</td>
<td>Gotcha covered</td>
<td>Pump up the volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td>Musical beginnings</td>
<td>Sound waves</td>
<td>Medieval musical mayhem</td>
<td>De Capo</td>
<td>Protest in popular song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singing stories</td>
<td>Time and Tied</td>
<td>Sound waves</td>
<td>Medieval musical mayhem</td>
<td>Working in harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound waves</td>
<td>Tune in and make notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch that rhythm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Arts</strong></td>
<td>At your fingertips</td>
<td>Harbours of life</td>
<td>At the beach</td>
<td>Artists' books</td>
<td>The object of my obsession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbours of life</td>
<td>The very hungry tadpole</td>
<td>Dragon dreams</td>
<td>Dragon dreams</td>
<td>Virtual visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The very hungry tadpole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbours of life</td>
<td>Going bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pigs can fly</td>
<td>Harbours of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9.4 Drama modules.
## Drama modules

### Level 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Home for Teeny-Tiny</strong> – co-written with my drama colleague, Elaine – a group of ‘little people’ (puppets) take refuge in the classroom and ask the ‘big people’ (the students) to help them find a safe place to live. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with English, HPE, Mathematics, Science, and Visual Arts.</td>
<td><strong>The Dream-maker</strong> – co-written with Julie Dunn – the ‘dream-maker’ has gone missing and we are faced with a world without dreams. The module builds on students independent dramatic play in the ‘dream factory’ until the dream-maker returns and provides opportunities for integration of learning with Dance, Media, Music and Visual Arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circles and Sawdust</strong> – Jo has inherited a circus and asks the students to help her practice being a circus owner so that she is confident when she meets the circus troupe. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with HPE, Mathematics, SOSE, English, Dance, Media, and Visual Arts.</td>
<td><strong>The Pied Piper</strong> – co-written with Sandra Gattenhof – the students are enroled as the inhabitants of Hamelin once the children have gone missing. They try to persuade the Mayor and the Pied Piper to reach a compromise. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with SOSE, English, Dance, Media, Music and Visual Arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pigs Can Fly</strong> – co-written with Deb Ruellan, my visual arts colleague on the team. Students solve the mystery of what is causing the art works in the Jigsaw Gallery, to move around. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with Visual Arts, English, and Mathematics.</td>
<td><strong>The Disappearing Sands</strong> – co-written with Elaine, and Sandra Gattenhof. The small community of ‘Sleepy Beach’ is threatened by the development of an international resort. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with SOSE, English, and Science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnivale – students devise and present a celebratory event in the form of a street parade combined with promenade theatre The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with HPE, SOSE, Dance, Media, and Visual Arts.</td>
<td><strong>Medieval Mysteries</strong> – co-written with John O’Toole – students enrol as guild members preparing festivities to welcome ‘Sir Godfrey’ back from the crusades. Their knight presents a different version of his journey than the one they were expecting. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with SOSE, English, Mathematics, Science, and Music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A novel idea</strong> – draws from the canon of works that are stage adaptations of a novel. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with English.</td>
<td><strong>Race Around the Block: a process drama</strong> – co-written with Sue Davis. This was based on a popular television program ‘Race around the world’ and investigates the representation of young people in the media. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with SOSE and Media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A Spotlight On Script</strong> – co-written with Sharon Evers and Adrianne Jones in response to secondary teachers requests to provide a module on script interpretation. The module provides opportunities for integration of learning with English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>