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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Arts Statement</td>
<td>A Statement on the Arts for Australian Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Arts Profile</td>
<td>The Arts - a Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts CARG</td>
<td>Arts Course Advice Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts KLAC</td>
<td>Arts Key Learning Area Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISV</td>
<td>Association of Independent Schools of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Australia Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACER</td>
<td>Australian Council for Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEC</td>
<td>Australian Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEU</td>
<td>Australian Education Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEB</td>
<td>Australian Music Examinations Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Australian Schools Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies</td>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATS</td>
<td>Common Assessment Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Catholic Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURASS</td>
<td>Curriculum and Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Corporation</td>
<td>Curriculum Corporation of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEET</td>
<td>Department of Employment, Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSE</td>
<td>Directorate of School Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DsGE</td>
<td>Directors General of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDMAP</td>
<td>Assessment and Reporting Computer Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLA</td>
<td>Key Learning Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Key Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>Languages other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Learning Assessment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENC</td>
<td>Music Educators National Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAS</td>
<td>National Arts in Australian Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAE</td>
<td>National Affiliation of Arts Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFNet</td>
<td>Department of Education (Victoria) Satellite Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFWeb</td>
<td>Department of Education (Victoria) Internet Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSE</td>
<td>Studies of Society and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTF</td>
<td>Schools of the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPS</td>
<td>Science and Technology Education in Primary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCE</td>
<td>Victorian Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Arts CSF</td>
<td>The Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian CSF</td>
<td>The Curriculum and Standards Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSAM</td>
<td>Victorian Student Achievement Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSTA</td>
<td>Victorian Secondary Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XAV</td>
<td>Cross Arts Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY

Arts Course Advice

A curriculum support document for the Arts CSF prepared by the Department of Education Victoria. Course Advice was prepared for each Key Learning Area.

Arts Course Advice Reference Group

A group of educators representing the Arts Key Learning Area across all education sectors and systems in Victoria. This group provided advice to the Arts Course Advice writers. A Course Advice Reference Group was established for each Key Learning Area.

Arts Expert Panel

A group of people where one person represented expertise in each Arts form. This group advised the Arts Course Advice writers. An expert panel was established for each Key Learning Area.

Cross Arts Victoria

Cross Arts Victoria comprises the following groups - Art Craft Teachers' Association, Ausdance Victoria, Australian Society for Music Education (Victorian Chapter), Australian Teachers of Media (Victoria), Drama Victoria, Graphic Communication Teachers' Association, Victorian Schools Music Association, Artists and Environmental Designers in Schools, National Gallery of Victoria, Australian Catholic University, Deakin University, La Trobe University, Melbourne University, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT University), Catholic Education Office, Department of School Education, Incorporated Association of Registered Teachers of Victoria, and the Victorian Board of Studies.

CURASS

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee was established as a committee of the Australian Education Council (AEC) in early 1991 and came into operation in September 1991. CURASS consisted of Directors of Curriculum, members of the Australian

**KIDMAP**

Assessment and Reporting Computer package developed by Mercator Software, Western Australia. The Department of Education (Victoria) has purchased a site licence for all Victorian Government schools and the software has been distributed to all schools as part of the Schools of the Future program. The Victorian Catholic Education has distributed the software to all Catholic primary schools.

**Key Competencies**

The seven "Key Competencies" of the Mayer report are: collecting, analysing and organising information, communicating ideas and information, planning and organising activities, working with others and in teams, using mathematical ideas and techniques, solving problems, using technology (AEC: The Mayer Committee, 1992:8). Bryce and Livermore (1996) have researched the eighth Key Competency - Cultural Understanding - and its relationship to Arts Education.

**Learning Outcomes**

The term used in the Victorian CSF to describe in progressive order the various skills and knowledge typically achieved by students as they become proficient in a Key Learning Area.

**Music Working Party**

A group of Music Educators representing all education sectors and systems who participated on the Arts Key Learning Area Committee associated with the development of the CSF. A working party was established for each Arts form.
National Affiliation of Arts Educators

The affiliated associations of NAAE are: Australian Dance Council (Ausdance), Australian Institute of Art Education, Australian Society for Music Education, Council of Australasian Media Education Organisations, Design and Education Council of Australia, and National Association for Drama in Education. This group was formed in 1989.

Outcome Statements

The term used in the Australian Statements and Profiles to describe in progressive order the various skills and knowledge typically achieved by students as they become proficient in a Key Learning Area.

Strand

The major segments or divisions of all the Key Learning Areas in the Australian Statements and Profiles. Some of the Key Learning Areas in the Victorian CSF also used this term, e.g. Music strand, Visual Arts strand in the Arts KLA.

Strand Organiser

The learning processes that constitute a strand. The term is associated with the Australian Statements and Profiles. There are three learning processes that are used in the Music strand, namely Creating, Making and Presenting; Arts Criticism and Aesthetics; Past and Present Contexts.

Substrand Organiser

The term adopted to describe the three parts of the Strand Organiser Creating, Making and Presenting. They are Exploring and Developing Ideas; Using Skills, Techniques and Processes; Presenting.

Substrand

This term is associated with the Victorian CSF and is the equivalent of Strand Organiser in the Australian document.
Sub-strand

This term is associated with the Victorian CSF and is the equivalent of Substrand Organiser in the Australian document.

The Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework

The Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework (1995) is sometimes incorrectly referred to as “Arts Frameworks”, a curriculum document published in 1988 which preceded the Arts CSF.

Victorian School News and Victorian School Education News

Victorian School News and its predecessor Victorian School Education News are published by the Department of Education and are the official communication medium of the DoE. Publication has varied between weekly and fortnightly and commenced in 1993.
SUMMARY

This study has investigated the issues and debate pertinent to the development of the Australian Arts Key Learning Area, with a specific focus on Music, in the Victorian Curriculum and Standards Framework. This has been undertaken with reference to international developments. The study focussed on two areas: (a) the characteristics of the Arts Key Learning Area (and specifically Music) in the Victorian Curriculum and Standards Framework and, (b) the characteristics and relationships of Music to other Arts disciplines in the design of “national curricula” in Australia and other countries.

The study combined four major sources of data. These were:

1. A review of literature about “national curricula” and Arts “national curricula” from Australia, Victoria and internationally
2. A review of Victorian Arts curricula and support documents since 1981, and Australian and Victorian Arts curricula reports since 1977
3. Responses to a questionnaire completed by representatives of Music professional associations in all member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD and affiliated countries of the International Society for Music Education (ISME), and
4. Interviews with Arts and Music writers and other personnel who contributed to the development of the following documents: A Statement on the Arts for Australian Schools; The Arts - a Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools; Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework (Arts CSF); Arts Course Advice

The study was conducted during the development and implementation phase of the Curriculum and Standards Framework and Arts Course Advice (a Victorian support document) and during intensive Australia-wide Professional Development activities that took place between 1994 and 1996.
The decision to interview only those personnel involved in the construction of the documents listed above is a recognised limitation. This study has gathered the knowledge of the Arts Educators responsible for the design and development of the documents cited as opposed to classroom teachers who are required by a Victorian Government law to implement the Arts CSF. A further study would be necessary to investigate teachers' interpretation and subsequent implementation of the Arts CSF.

A survey involving all member countries of the OECD and countries affiliated with ISME sought information related to Arts Education, and specifically Music Education, in terms of "national curricula". This survey elicited information on the compulsory nature of "national curricula"; the schools years covered by "national curricula"; the subjects, together with the reasons for their inclusion; the approach (if any) to Multi-Arts in "national curricula"; and the criteria used by teachers to describe and report the standard achieved by students in the subject of Music in "national curricula".

The interview questions posed of those involved in the design and development of the Australian and Victorian current documents addressed four topics. These were:

- suggestions of modifications that might be made to the Australian and Victorian Arts documents, and specifically the Music strand, if an opportunity were available
- which Arts subjects should be included in an Australian Arts Key Learning Area
- the contribution of Multi-Arts to the Australian and Victorian Arts documents, and
- the place of ranked Performance Standards and their possible effects on Music teaching and learning.

Responses to the Australian and Victorian interviews are collated under three major headings. These are the development of the Victorian Arts CSF with special reference to the development of the Music strand; the construction of an Arts Key Learning Area; and the varying types of standards used in the Arts.
The discussion chapter of this study is structured in three sections. Section one considers the characteristics of an Arts Learning Area. Section two focusses on the issue of setting standards in education and the place of standards in Arts Education. The final section addresses two topics associated with the implementation of the Victorian Arts CSF, specifically, and the Victorian CSF in general.

The study concludes with a consideration of issues according to an international focus and an Australian/Victorian focus. Twenty-two recommendations for further research conclude the study.
CHAPTER ONE
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preamble
This study examines the issues surrounding the design and development of the Australian Arts Key Learning Area, specifically the Music strand, in the Victorian *Curriculum and Standards Framework*.

The *Curriculum and Standards Framework* (1995) was developed by the Victorian Board of Studies at the request of the Victorian Government. The Victorian Board of Studies (referred to throughout this study as the Board of Studies) was established in 1993 and is a Government appointed group of educators accountable to the Victorian Parliament. The Board of Studies (Newsletter, 1994b:6) is responsible for “providing a framework for what is taught in Victoria's schools and for providing guidelines on how students' achievement is assessed - at all levels, from Preparatory Year to Year 12”. The Department of Education (a separate Government department) is responsible for the administration of education including the implementation of curriculum in Victorian Government schools.

The *Curriculum and Standards Framework* (referred to in this study as the Victorian CSF) was the Victorian Government's response to the Australian curriculum documents, written under the auspices of the Australian Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments as a cooperative curriculum development. The Australian documents were completed in June 1993 and contain a *Statement* and a *Profile* for each of eight Key Learning Areas. The eight Key Learning Areas are the Arts, English, Health and Physical Education, Languages other than English (LOTE), Mathematics, Science, Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE), and Technology. These same eight Key Learning Areas are also used in the Victorian CSF.

The development of the Australian documents stem from the *Hobart Declaration on Schooling* (April 1989), a communiqué formulated by Australia's Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers of Education, meeting as the Australian Education Council (AEC). The *Hobart Declaration on Schooling* (included in appendix one of this study) represents an
agreed framework of 10 goals for the school education of Australia's children. As a result of this project 16 “framework documents”, a Statement and a Profile in each of the eight Key Learning Areas, were produced. Collectively these documents are known as the Statements and Profiles for Australian Schools (referred to in this study as the Australian Statements and Profiles). The Statements provide a framework for curriculum development describing a sequence for developing knowledge and skills in each Key Learning Area. The Profiles are designed to provide a common language for reporting student progress over eight levels of achievement. The eight levels were designed to reflect the full range of student achievement during the compulsory years of schooling in Australia (Years 1 to 10).

Education is the constitutional responsibility of each Australian State and Territory Government. A national “agreement” on behalf of all State and Territory Governments, or a constitutional change, would be necessary to establish a “national curriculum”. The Australian Statements and Profiles fall short of being a “national curriculum”: instead, they have provided the basis for each State and Territory to develop its own curriculum. When the collaborative writing process was finished, the Australian States and Territories decided to adapt or adopt, and implement, the Australian Statements and Profiles locally according to their own timelines. This decision was made by the States and Territories at the Australian Education Council meeting on 2 July 1993 in Perth, Western Australia. The Australian Education Council comprises all Australian Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers of Education.

The writing of each Statement and each Profile for the eight Key Learning Areas was a complicated procedure. Although in the initial stages the AEC allocated the Mathematics Key Learning Area to New South Wales, and the English Key Learning Area jointly to the Australian Capital Territory and South Australia, after the establishment of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CURASS) in September 1991, a formal collaborative Australia-wide tendering process was introduced. This process was used for the remaining six Key Learning Areas. Separate tenders for each Statement and each Profile in these Learning
Areas were called for and in many instances a different collaborative writing team from more than one State and/or Territory was appointed.

The Arts Key Learning Area was an exceptional case: the same key writers (two Victorian academics) were awarded the contract to write *A Statement on the Arts for Australian Schools* (1994) and *The Arts - a Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools* (1994). Throughout this study these two documents are referred to as the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*. As a sign of collaboration, developing the curriculum for the individual Arts disciplines that collectively constitute the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, was a task allocated to writers from around Australia: Dance - Queensland, Drama - Western Australia, Media and Music - Victoria, and Visual Art - South Australia (Whittaker, 1996:99).

1.2 The Victorian Response to the Australian Statements and Profiles

Prior to the implementation of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*, the Victorian Government decided to write its own curriculum document based on the *Statements and Profiles*. Known as the *Curriculum and Standards Framework*, this is a centralised, *compulsory* curriculum covering the eight Key Learning Areas and was to be implemented in all Victorian Government schools by the end of the 1997 school year (December). Each Government school is expected to use the Victorian *CSF* to plan curriculum, to assess and report according to the Victorian *CSF* Level structure to parents, and to report annually to the Victorian Government's Department of Education. The annual reporting process to Government commenced at the end of 1995, and each report includes the achievements of all students in the school in the Key Learning Areas of English, Mathematics and one other, chosen at the discretion of the school. This information is gathered from students' written school reports as given to parents and generally completed twice a year.

Testing of students in Victorian Government primary schools commenced in 1995 with students in Years 3 and 5 tested in the Key Learning Areas of English, Mathematics. According to the Board of Studies Newsletter (1994c) the timetable for the testing of the remaining Key Learning Areas was Science (1996), Studies of Society and Environment
Languages other than English is not to be included because the compulsory “phasing in” of Language teaching in primary schools is not complete. Testing is conducted by the Board of Studies and the test content is taken from the Victorian CSF. The testing procedure is known as the Learning Assessment Project (LAP). The publication “Learning Assessment Project” (1994) - a supplement to the Victorian School Education News (1994) - states that the LAP will benefit students by identifying whether they have acquired basic Literacy and Numeracy skills during the primary school years and their progress in these areas is measured against statewide standards. The individual report produced for each student indicates aspects of weakness and strength in Literacy and Numeracy and the Key Learning Area identified for assessment in each year.

A similar testing instrument is to be introduced for Victorian Government secondary schools and will be called the Victorian Student Achievement Monitor (VSAM). It is proposed that students in Years 7 and 9 will be tested in 1998. However, in a recent article entitled “Student Achievement Trial to Continue” (1998:4) - published in Victorian School News (1998) - it is reported that the testing of students in Years 7 and 9 in Mathematics and English is still in the trial stages. Students will complete the tests via an interactive website on the internet.

The school years of 3 and 5 (primary school) and 7 and 9 (secondary school) have been selected as testing stages because these school years afford time for any strengths and weaknesses indicated by the respective tests to be acted upon by teachers, prior to students completing primary or secondary school.

Coupled with the introduction of the CSF is the requirement that all students from Year 4 to Year 10 will study a Language other than English, and that all schools are required to timetable 100 minutes for both Sport and Physical Education each week. These two Victorian Government directives have provided challenges for the timetabling of the remaining Key Learning Areas of the CSF. In an article entitled “Prep to Year 10 Subject Review” (1998)
the Minister for Education announced a review of the CSF which is to include the establishment of curriculum priority areas.

Accompanying the Victorian CSF are four implementation documents. The Victorian Department of Education developed and published Course Advice, and Assessment and Reporting Support Materials. The Board of Studies developed and published a series entitled Using the CSF and a collection of Exemplary Assessment Materials.

Chamberlin (1997), a curriculum consultant with the Victorian Catholic Education Office (CEO), in an interview with the researcher, explained that the Catholic schools in Victoria - which do not come under the responsibility of the Department of Education - have accepted the Victorian CSF as the current curriculum framework. The Victorian Catholic Education Office has decided that the CSF will be non-compulsory for schools under its jurisdiction. Chamberlin comments that the majority of primary schools in the Catholic system participate in the Learning Assessment Project and the schools that have not participated have realised the benefits of the test for their students.

Schools that are grouped under the umbrella of the Association of Independent Schools of Victoria (AISV) represent a number of different education philosophies and religious affiliations as well as a wide selection of opinions about the Victorian CSF. Membership of AISV is not compulsory and it does not have the same function as the Department of Education in relation to Government schools and the CEO in relation to Catholic schools. Membership of the AISV is available to Catholic schools but not to Government schools. Perry (1997), an education consultant with the Association of Independent Schools of Victoria, commented to the researcher that no representative opinion regarding aspects of the Victorian CSF can be gathered from these schools, adding that, as a general overview, schools in the non-government sector have taken the Victorian CSF to be the base standard of education in Victoria and adapted it to suit their individual requirements.
Approximately 75 to 80 percent of schools in Victoria are classified as Government schools. According to the Department of Education census conducted in February 1998, there is a total of 1647 Government schools in Victoria. This comprises 1245 primary schools (Preparatory Year to Year 6), 270 secondary school (Year 7 to Year 12), 39 combined primary and secondary schools (Preparatory Year to Year 12), 81 special schools (Preparatory Year to Year 12) and 3 language schools (Preparatory Year to Year 12). The remaining 20 to 25 percent of schools are categorised as non-Government, comprising denominational and non-denominational schools. Within this sector, Catholic schools account for the largest number of primary schools.

1.3 Adaptation of the Statements and Profiles in the Australian States and Territories

Victoria and Western Australia are the only two Australian States to have written completely new documents based upon the Australian Statements and Profiles. Although the adaptation of the Australian Statements and Profiles has been in a state of flux for the past few years, all States and Territories with the exception of New South Wales are using the documents for curriculum development. As has been indicated earlier, education is the responsibility of each Australian State and Territory Government and this situation has lead to different timelines and approaches being taken by individual Governments regarding the implementation of the Australian Statements and Profiles. Holt (1997) provides a summary of the approach taken by each Australian State and Territory. The Australian Capital Territory has renamed the modified Statements “ACT Curriculum Frameworks” and kept the generic national title “Curriculum Profiles for Australian Schools”. Throughout 1997 a small number of schools in Queensland have trialed the Statements and Profiles for English and Mathematics only, and the title “Australian Profiles” has been changed to “Queensland Levels of Student Performance”. The Northern Territory has changed the names of the Australian documents to “NT Learning Area Curriculum Statements, incorporating NT Outcome Profiles”; formal implementation is to begin in 1998. South Australia and Tasmania have devised a “combination name” for the two documents: “Curriculum Statements and Profiles for Australian Schools”. From 1997, schools in South Australia are to report against the Profile
Levels, and in Tasmania all schools are expected to be reporting all Key Learning Areas in at least one of the eight learning levels from 2000.

Following the Eltis Review of 1995, New South Wales has taken the decision not to adopt the implementation of the Australian Statements and Profiles. Instead, syllabi are being developed using outcomes which are in keeping with the five stages of compulsory schooling in that State. The compulsory stages of schooling are based on years of schooling: Kindergarten to Year 2, Years 3 to 4, Years 5 to 6, Years 7 to 8, and Years 9 to 10. Eltis and Mowbray (1997:91) comment that the Eltis Review of Profiles and Outcomes established in April 1995, “acknowledged substantial support for an outcomes-based approach . . . [but] widespread dissatisfaction with the implementation” [of the Statements and Profiles]. Eltis and Mowbray (1997) report that among the Review findings, concerns were expressed about

- the quality of the Australian outcomes
- the use of “jargon” and lack of clarity of language to describe the parts of the documents
- a mismatch between the eight levels of achievement and the five compulsory stages of New South Wales schooling established by Government Act, and
- the increase in teacher workload which would be brought about by implementation.

The decision of the Review was to continue with the development of State syllabi where the outcomes would be directly linked to subject content and then related to the Australian Statements and Profiles.

Throughout 1994 and 1995, Western Australia was the only Australian State to undertake a complete review of the Australian curriculum documents, especially the Australian Profiles. In 1996, as a result of the review, the Western Australian Government initiated the development of the Curriculum Framework for Western Australian Schools (based on the Australian Statement). The name of the Australian Profiles has been changed to “Student Outcome Statements”. The Curriculum Framework for Western Australian Schools covers
all the years of schooling, Kindergarten to Year 12, and is compulsory for all school systems, including Government, non-Government and home schooling. The eight Key Learning Areas of the Australian Statements and Profiles are included with two slight changes of name. Studies of Society and Environment has been renamed Society and Environment, and Technology has been renamed Technology and Enterprise. Progressive implementation will take place between 1999 and 2003.

In mid-1993, The Honourable Don Hayward, the then Victorian Government Minister for Education, requested that the Board of Studies undertake a broad consultation within the education community to determine the usefulness of the Australian Statements and Profiles. In December 1993, the Board of Studies provided its advice to the Minister. In its report it indicated that the Australian Statements and Profiles in the eight Key Learning Areas provided a basis for the development of a “Curriculum and Standards Framework” for Victoria. However, it was indicated that the Australian Statements and Profiles in their current form were inadequate for implementation. In structural terms, the documents, especially the Australian Profiles, were generally seen as too complex and unwieldy for school use in reporting to parents and for collecting system-wide data on student achievement. An article entitled “Major Directions for Curriculum in 1994” (1994:7) advised that the CSF should be easier to use than the current Australian Profiles and that the development of the CSF would provide:

- a clear rationale and statement of purpose;
- a clear explanation of its relationship to the Statements and Profiles;
- documents which are able to be used at all levels of compulsory schooling; and
- a framework for reporting student achievement that provides clear statements of general expectations related to key stages of development.

It is significant that the published Australian Statements and Profiles were not placed in Victorian Government schools - a decision made by the State's Minister for Education. All schools in the other Australian States and Territories received copies. This decision meant that when the Victorian CSF was distributed to schools as a draft document, the majority of teachers were unaware of its origins and were unable to compare any differences between the CSF and the Statements and Profiles.
The importance of teachers having easy access to copies of the *Statements and Profiles* is emphasised by Howes (1997:110) who says that the completed Victorian CSF “is derived directly and explicitly” from the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. The content of each Key Learning Area Australian Profile is adapted in varying degrees to form the Key Learning Areas of the Victorian CSF. Different “language” is used in the Victorian CSF to describe the parts of the Australian Profile. The Victorian CSF Arts Key Learning Area is almost identical to the Australian Arts Profile, with a different set of examples used to describe the attainment of a Victorian CSF Level. The Arts are described in the *Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework* (referred to in this study as the Victorian Arts CSF). On the other hand, the parallels between the Victorian CSF Key Learning Areas of Mathematics, Science, and Studies of Society and Environment and the respective Australian Profiles are few. The major difference between the “national” Australian documents and the Victorian CSF is one of levels of attainment for student achievement. The Australian Profiles have eight levels of achievement with no relationship to school years. The Victorian CSF has seven levels of achievement which are equated to school years from Preparatory Year to Year 10.

1.4 Rationale for the Study

The present study has a Victorian focus within a broader Australian context. Although not the central issue, reference has been made to “national curricula” developments in selected countries overseas. The objective of the study is to identify and critically analyse the issues and debate involved in the design and development of the Arts Key Learning Area, and specifically Music, in the Victorian CSF within a context of developing an “Australian curriculum” in the Arts. The study focusses on two areas: (a) the characteristics of the Arts Key Learning Area (and specifically Music) in the Victorian CSF and, (b) the characteristics and relationships of Music to other Arts disciplines in the design of a “national curriculum” in Australia with reference to selected countries overseas; this involves the relationship of Music to the other Arts, the number of disciplines that are included in the Arts, and the use of Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Foci in the Music strand.
Given that Australia has recently adopted “national curriculum” guidelines and that the Arts have been brought together within one document for the first time, it is appropriate to investigate the Australian document and curriculum development process with respect to the Arts. The study reveals how the Arts, with particular reference to Music, are constructed as part of the development of a broad conceptual framework. The study provides a basis for future developments of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF, and it lays the foundation for related research projects in Victoria and nationally. Further, it could provide useful information for those undertaking similar projects overseas.

It is important to note that this study has taken place during the design, development and implementation phase of the Victorian CSF and Arts Course Advice. The Government department responsible for Victorian Government schools experienced a name change during this process from the Victorian Directorate of School Education to the Victorian Department of Education in mid-1996. For the purpose of this study the name Department of Education (DoE) is used. At the directive of the Department of Education, Victorian Government schools were required to have the implementation process completed by December 1997, which is the end of the school year. Although no official data is available at this stage (mid-1998) anecdotal evidence suggests that some schools have not yet complied with this directive.

The DoE requires schools to use the Victorian CSF for assessment and reporting. In contrast, the developer of the Victorian CSF, the Board of Studies, considers the CSF to be a curriculum planning document. The draft Victorian CSF was circulated for comment to schools in August 1994, and the subsequent formal published document was distributed to schools in February 1995 (the commencement of the school year). As well as being the developer of the CSF, the Board of Studies is also involved in the implementation process with the development and distribution of CSF support materials. Unlike the DoE, the Board of Studies has not stipulated a set timeline for implementation of the CSF.
To facilitate the implementation process, intensive Professional Development activities have taken place across Victoria. In the Arts Key Learning Area these have been coordinated by Cross Arts Victoria, a consortium of professional associations, tertiary institutions, Government and non-Government education authorities. For the last three years Cross Arts Victoria has been chaired by Dr. David Forrest.

The present study recognises the different meanings applied to the term “national curriculum”. Definitions include a framework which loosely incorporates all “States” of a country; a set of standards which are “imposed” on a compulsory or non-compulsory basis; or a set curriculum which encompasses a nation, dividing the education system into levels. Any accompanying school-based or external assessment of the content of a “national curriculum” also varies in nature. The assessment guidelines range from suggested ideas to compulsory (and even prescriptive) testing at designated points through the school years.

The term “Arts curriculum” has many definitions. It may represent a group of Arts disciplines linked together by a common structure, it have a focus on Multi-Arts, or it may comprise individual Arts subjects. Where it can be discerned, the learning theory chosen to implement a “national curriculum” differs across countries and ranges from being relatively implicit to relatively explicit.

1.5 Data accessed for the Study

The study draws data from four sources:

1. A review of literature about “national curricula” and Arts “national curricula” from Australia, Victoria and internationally.

2. A review of the past and current Arts documents and reports from Australia and Victoria. This includes:
   - the relevant support material and the drafts of the current documents
   - a review of the Arts and Music curriculum documents used in Victorian schools from 1981
• a review of both Australian and Victorian Government reports into Arts Education since 1977.

3. Responses to a questionnaire developed by the researcher and completed by representatives of Music professional associations in all member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and affiliated countries of the International Society for Music Education (ISME). An analysis of overseas Arts curricula, in particular the English National Curriculum (Music) and the National Standards for the Arts (USA), complement this survey.

4. Interviews with Arts and Music writers and other personnel contributing to the design and development of the Australian and Victorian curriculum documents.

1.6 The Literature Review

The literature review of this study identifies the issues associated with the development of both compulsory and non-compulsory “national curricula”. The issues are divided into two sections - those relating to “national curricula” in general, and those relating to Arts “national curricula”.

1.7 Review of Past Australian and Victorian Documents

This study includes an analysis of the past and current Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents, reports and support materials. The past Victorian Arts/Music curriculum documents date from 1981. The Australian and Victorian Government reports into Arts Education date from 1977. The decision was made to commence with the curriculum documents written since 1981 because they address the content of the Music curriculum in terms of processes, levels of achievement, and the relationship between Music and the other Arts taught in schools. These curriculum documents are included as support documents for the Arts CSF.

The titles of the past Victorian documents are:

• School Curriculum and Organisation Framework: P-12 (1988)
• Arts Framework: P-10 (1988)
• Designing an Instrumental Music Program (1988-1990)
A Guide to Music in the Primary School (1981) is a publication of the Victorian Education Department Music Branch. Ferris (1993) describes the Music curriculum innovations that occurred within the Music Branch in the 1970s which led to the publication of the 1981 Music Guide. She identifies the influences of Orff-Schulwerk (Austria) and Kodály (Hungary), “Creative Music” approaches from Paynter (Britain) and Schafer (Canada), and the “Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program Synthesis” (USA) as being important during this time.

The Victorian curriculum documents reflect the influence of a number of Australian Government reports. These are:

- Expressive Arts Study Group (1976-1977)
- Education and the Arts (1977)
- Arts on Course (1980)
- Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980)

The joint Australian and Victorian Government reports of 1977, Education and the Arts, and the Australian 1984 report, Action: Education and the Arts, are important for Arts Education. The joint 1977 report defines national objectives for Arts Education programs and expresses a national concern and commitment to the Arts as an important part of school curricula. The joint 1977 report provided the terms of reference for the 1984 report. The 1984 report comments on the need for a broad range of Arts experiences to be offered in schools and expresses concern about the specific focus on teaching Arts forms as isolated entities. The 1977 and 1984 reports and the Music curriculum documents published from 1981 established a policy for Victorian schools - both primary and secondary - to offer Music and the other Arts forms as essential core curricula.

Other influences are acknowledged in this study, such as the Victorian Ministerial Papers (1982 to 1984). The Ministerial Papers are the result of a Victorian Government review into State education and set out policy in areas of the structure of Victorian Government.
education, individual school structure, and curriculum design. The Victorian CSF supersedes these directives.

1.8 Review of Current Australian and Victorian Documents

The titles of the current Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents are:

- *A Statement on the Arts for Australian Schools* (1994)
- *The Arts - a Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools* (1994)

The titles of the draft documents are:

- *Brief for the Arts National Curriculum Statement and Profile* (1992)
- *National Profile for the Arts* (1993)
- *National Arts Profile* (1993)

The titles of the support documents are:

- *Arts Course Advice* (1996)
- *Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting* (1996)
- *Using the CSF: The Transition Years* (in press)

The series, *Using the CSF*, produced by the Board of Studies, together with *Arts Course Advice* and the *Assessment and Reporting Support Materials*, written by the Department of Education, are designed as support material for implementing the Victorian *Arts CSF*. *Using the CSF* focusses on the curriculum auditing process and the changes which a school setting
may need to make to accommodate the Victorian Arts CSF. Arts Course Advice illustrates sample units of work for each of the seven CSF Levels in the Arts Key Learning Area. Assessment and Reporting Support Materials in the Arts discusses approaches to making a judgement about a level achieved by students in the Victorian Arts CSF.

1.9 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire referred to earlier was circulated to 25 member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and 22 countries where the Music organisation is affiliated with the International Society for Music Education (ISME). Excluding Australia, seventeen of the countries surveyed were both members of the OECD and affiliates of ISME. Although not a member country of the OECD nor an affiliate member of ISME, South Africa has been included, as it is of significance that the ISME 23rd World Conference will be hosted by South Africa in 1998. In total, 34 questionnaires were circulated and returned. The list of countries is included in appendix two of this study. To enable questionnaires to be distributed to all member countries of the OECD and those countries where the Music organisation is affiliated with ISME, the questionnaires were sent to correspondents for ISME. In the main, the questionnaire focussed on areas of information which could not be obtained from an analysis of available Arts/Music curriculum documents. The questions referred to the compulsory nature of “national curriculum”; the subjects included in the curriculum; the reasons for selecting the chosen Arts subjects, including any approaches to Multi-Arts in the curriculum; and the criteria used by teachers to describe and report the standard achieved by students in the subject of Music. The questionnaire is included in appendix three of this study and the list of respondents in appendix four.

The formal questionnaire was preceded by a draft questionnaire sent by post and facsimile in mid-June 1996 to selected overseas countries. The northern hemisphere summer vacation and major examination period limited the gathering of responses to these draft questions. The decision was thus made to take the draft questionnaire to the International Society for Music Education Conference (ISME) in Amsterdam in July 1996. Representatives of professional Music associations who were in attendance were able to respond to the draft questionnaire. In
total, twelve people representing eleven countries received a draft questionnaire. Of these ten people replied, representing nine countries. The responses helped in the design of the formal questionnaire which was sent by post, facsimile and electronic mail at the end of October 1996 to all OECD member countries and ISME affiliated countries, excluding Australia.

1.10 The Interviews
The researcher conducted audiotaped interviews with key writers and other contributing personnel to the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, the Victorian *Arts CSF*, and *Arts Course Advice*. The positions and number of personnel involved in the development of both the Australian and Victorian Arts documents are included in appendix five of this study. The interviewees have been involved in the development of the Australian and Victorian curriculum documents in the following capacities:

- Key writer of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*
- Associate writer of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*
- Contributing Music writer of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*
- Music writer of the Victorian *Arts CSF*
- Convenor of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee (Victoria)
- Deputy Convenor of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee (Victoria)
- Convenor of the Arts Key Learning Area Level 1 to 4 working party (Victoria)
- Convenor of the Arts Key Learning Area Level 5 to 7 working party (Victoria)
- Member of the Music working party within the Arts Key Learning Area Committee (Victoria)
- Music *Course Advice* Level 1 to 4 writer (Victoria)
- Music *Course Advice* Level 5 to 7 writer (Victoria)
- Member of the *Arts Course Advice* Reference Group, Music representative (Victoria)
- Member of the *Arts Course Advice* Expert Panel, Music representative (Victoria)

The interviewees all have written and spoken professionally about the design and development of the Australian and/or Victorian Arts curriculum documents which are at the centre of this study. As they are “public figures” presenting in verbal and written form on a
regular basis, it can be assumed that their information is a valuable primary source. The interviewees were made aware that the responses received in the interviews would be published in papers written in the course of this study, with the appropriate acknowledgment, as well as in the final report, thus ensuring as much as possible reliable answers to questions.

The interviewees were asked to express their opinions and share their insights into the design and development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. Most interviews were conducted in person, but some took place over the telephone by means of an audiotaped teleconference. The interview questions were presented in writing to the respondents prior to the interview and are included in appendix six of this study. The interview questions addressed the following issues:

- modifications that might be made in the Arts documents and specifically the Music strand if an opportunity were available
- which Arts subjects should be included in an Australian curriculum
- the contribution of Multi-Arts in the Australian and Victorian documents, and
- the place of ranked performance outcomes and possible affects on Music teaching and learning.

Copies of the taped transcripts are held by both the researcher and the interviewees. The interviewees were requested to check the transcript of their conversation with the researcher and make any necessary alterations or additions. The interviewees were given the option of being identified by name and position held in the writing process (as above), identification by position only, or total anonymity. This information was recorded by the interviewee on the Ethics Consent Form, a sample of which is included in appendix seven of this study. The Plain Language Statement which accompanies the Ethics Consent Form is also included in appendix seven.

Many of the positions described above were held by one person only and as some of those individuals are presently employed by the Victorian Government, seven interviewees opted for total anonymity. Victorian Government employees are bound by the Code of Conduct for
the Victorian Public Sector (1995). Specific clauses regarding the release of Victorian Government information are included in the Code and employees who breach the standards of conduct may face disciplinary action. The relevant clauses are included in appendix eight.

1.11 Methodology

This study involved the need to compare and equate data from different sources. The four major sources of data used for this study were listed earlier in this chapter. The comments of Przeworski and Teune (1970), Armer (1973), Walton (1973), Warwick and Osherson (1973), Etzioni-Halevy (1990), Øyen (1990), and Teune (1990) regarding approaches to making comparisons between different sources of information and establishing equivalence between that information has been considered by the researcher in the development of this study.

Armer (1973:69) reports that in carrying out the process of comparison and establishing equivalence, it can be presumed that different research methods will produce different effects. To accommodate this situation he recommends that researchers should make a greater effort firstly to “include measures to detect potential method effects that may reduce validity” and secondly “to incorporate combinations of methods and data to measure the same variables for cross-validation purposes”.

The analysis of the data requires some comparison of education systems and meanings of terms. Przeworski and Teune (1970:36-37) describe comparative research as a means of inquiry “in which more than one level of analysis is possible and the units of observation are identifiable by name at each of these levels”. Warwick and Osherson (1973:7) comment that “Comparison in its broadest sense is the process of discovering similarities and differences among phenomena. Comparison is central to the very acts of knowing and perceiving”. Walton (1973) classifies comparative research under three headings, one of which is original comparative studies employing standardised (usually survey) methods.

Etzioni-Halevy (1990:118) cites the Almond and Verba study (1963) and remarks that it is widely recognised that no perfect solution is available for the problem of equivalence. To
minimalise its effects it is suggested that “the comparison of countries in which the cultural contexts surrounding the 'something' to be compared are as similar as possible”. Teune (1990:53-54) comments that the process of comparison requires the establishment of equivalence. He says that “In order to compare something across systems it is necessary to have confidence that the components and their properties being compared are the 'same' or indicate something equivalent”. Øyen (1990:13) quotes Sztompka who suggests that in comparing two attributes it is now more appropriate “to search for uniqueness and comparisons that point out the peculiarities of a country” rather than the accepted focus of looking for commonalities. Armer (1973:55) acknowledges that concepts when used cross-culturally tend to have different connotations. He makes reference to Sjoberg (1955) who suggests that such concepts need to be “non-culture” bound, and to Sears (1961) and Whiting (1968), who use the term “trans-cultural”. Armer (1973:55) continues that as a minimum requirement, concepts “should be comparable among the cultures that are to be included in the research, or to which generalisations will be made”. Considerations such as these have provided direction to the present study.

The present study is limited by the decision to interview only those personnel involved in the design and development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. Teaching staff with the responsibility of interpreting and implementing the Victorian Arts CSF in the classroom have not been interviewed. The present study seeks to gather the knowledge of those involved in the development process rather than classroom teachers, who are required by law in the Victorian Government school system to implement the Victorian Arts CSF. A subsequent study might well look at teachers' implementation of the Victorian CSF. It is not the intention of the present study to provide an indepth analysis of the Arts documents of all the overseas countries included in this study. A comparison of content between Arts disciplines contained within the available overseas Arts “national curricula” has not been made. The present study has not analysed the other seven Key Learning Areas of the Australian Statements and Profiles or the other seven Key Learning Area booklets of the Victorian CSF. Within the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF the focus of analysis has taken place on the Music strand with reference to the other Arts
strands; an indepth study of each of the Arts forms that parallels that done here with Music might be undertaken by future researchers. Similarly, the other Learning Areas of overseas “national curricula” are not considered. Hopefully, comparative research into each of these aspects will be undertaken by other researchers.

The decision to interview key writers and other personnel contributing to the design and development of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, the Victorian *Arts CSF* and *Arts Course Advice* provides the opportunity to gather first-hand knowledge about the development process. It allows the interviewees to express their opinions and insights into the curriculum documents being used by the school community at present.

By choosing to interview the key writers and other contributors and analysing the documents they have written, a connection has been made between the interviewees' responses and the written material. The review of overseas Arts curricula and questionnaire responses provides an important reference point in the Australian and Victorian curriculum material. The interviewees have written and spoken in a professional capacity on many occasions and their resultant papers serve as part of the process of validating the material collected for this present study.

1.12 Chapter Summaries

Chapter Two reviews literature with a focus on two areas: issues relating to “national curricula” and issues relating to the Arts in “national curricula”. The topics collated under the heading of general “national curricula” issues include the concepts of “national curricula”; approaches to implementing “national curricula”; assessment in “national curricula”; Outcomes-Based Education; and Benchmarking. The Arts “national curricula” section focusses on the elements which contribute to an Arts Learning Area in “national curricula”, and the inclusion of Multi-Arts teaching within the Arts curriculum.

The collated data from the overseas countries is presented in Chapter Three. The responses to the questionnaires are collated and discussed under similar headings to those in Chapter Two.
These include the compulsory nature of a "national curriculum"; the subjects included in the curriculum; the structure of an Arts Learning Area; approaches to Multi-Arts in the curriculum; and the criteria used by teachers to describe and report the standard achieved by students in the subject of Music.

Chapter Four focusses on the past Australian and Victorian Arts Education reports and curriculum documents. These significant past Australian and Victorian reports and curriculum documents have guided Arts and Music Education policy development in schools. They provide the background for the design and development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. The reports make reference to a core curriculum; subjects to be included in a curriculum cross-curricula themes; an Arts Learning Area; the inclusion of Multi-Arts; and approaches to dividing curriculum into stages to assist with assessment and reporting. The important elements of these documents are summarised under similar headings to those used in Chapters Two and Three.

The current Australian and Victorian curriculum documents are the subject of Chapter Five. An historical development of the Australian Statements and Profiles and the Victorian CSF is included. The Arts curriculum booklets and the drafts of these documents are analysed. Concerns expressed by the writing team about the development of the Arts Learning Area are highlighted. Two booklets comprise the Australian Arts documents: the Australian Arts Statement and Arts Profile. The Victorian curriculum material is contained in one booklet: the Arts CSF. In addition, many support documents have been published to accompany the Arts CSF. The chapter summary links with the previous chapters by using similar headings. The specific influences of the past curriculum documents and reports (as presented in Chapter Four) on the current Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents are noted.

The interview data is presented in Chapter Six. As noted, personnel involved in the writing of the Australian and Victorian Arts documents were interviewed. Each interviewee responded to questions made available prior to the interview. The interviewees reflected on the design and development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF,
specifically the Music strand. The interviewees also offered opinions about the implementation process of the Arts CSF in schools. The interview data is collated under three main headings. These are the development of the Victorian Arts CSF, specifically the Music strand; the construction of an Arts Key Learning Area; and the varying types of standards used in the Arts.

Chapter Seven draws together major issues highlighted in this study for discussion. The chapter is divided into three main sections. Section one focusses on the characteristics of an Arts Learning Area. Seven major issues arising from the design and development of an Arts Learning Area are addressed from a Victorian, Australian and international perspective. Section two focusses on the issue of setting standards in education and their place in the Arts. The section covers two elements: a general overview of standards in education followed by issues associated with standards in Arts Education. Section three addresses two topics associated with the implementation of the Victorian Arts CSF, specifically, and the Victorian CSF in general. The chapter summary addresses the points raised in the discussion with specific reference to Victoria.

The conclusions and recommendations of this study are the focus of Chapter Eight. The conclusions are grouped in ten sections. The first three sections consider issues in relation to an international context. These issues are the Arts Key Learning Area; Multi-Arts; and standards in education. The remaining seven sections address the Australian and Victorian settings. These conclusions focus on an Arts Key Learning Area; Music and its relationship to a Visual Arts model; the interpretation of language; and issues associated with standards, complexity and implementation. Twenty-two recommendations for further research conclude the study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The Literature Review for this study is divided into two parts. The first part addresses issues relating to "national curricula" and the second part considers issues relating to the Arts in "national curricula".

Investigations by the researcher have identified two Doctor of Philosophy studies from Great Britain that focus on the structure and implementation of a "national curriculum" in the Arts. Sweeney (1993) focusses on the pertinent issues that relate to the assessment of Music learning in the English National Curriculum. Harrison (1993) considers the development of Design and Technology, a "new" subject in the English National Curriculum. Design and Technology is taught cooperatively by teachers of several existing subjects. In addition to the two studies mentioned, a third study authored by Steers (1994), a Visual Arts Educator, investigates factors that determined the development of the National Curriculum in England and Wales. Many research studies have focussed on facets of planning and implementing the English National Curriculum from a general perspective.

2.2 Part One: Issues relating to National Curricula

The issues discussed in this first part of the review are grouped under the following headings:

- Concepts of National Curricula
- Adapations and Implementation of National Curricula
- Assessment
- Outcomes-Based Education
- Benchmarking
2.2.1 Concepts of National Curricula

Writers of the literature discuss different types of approaches to designing “national curricula”. They also discuss the perceived advantages and concerns of the notion of “national curricula”. The types of approaches used to design “national curricula” include Curriculum Frameworks, Centrally-Based Curriculum Development, and Core Curriculum.

2.2.1.1 Curriculum Frameworks.

A Curriculum Framework depicts a structure which outlines of a school curriculum. Schools and school systems are encouraged to expand on a Curriculum Framework to reflect specific needs at a local school level. Marsh (1992) comments that education systems in many countries have moved to using Curriculum Frameworks in an attempt to rationalise and control the number of subjects that are taught. Hardy (1990) observes that education systems use Curriculum Frameworks to improve the quality of curriculum through evaluation of the existing curriculum. The English National Curriculum, he suggests, is an example where curriculum revision has enabled a country to reflect present and future economic needs.

2.2.1.2 Centrally-Based Curriculum Development.

Centrally-Based Curriculum Development is a school curriculum designed most often by the education department of a State, Territory or Country. Such a curriculum is often both compulsory and delineates very descriptive expectations. Johnston (1990) identifies the major advantages and disadvantages in the process known as Centrally-Based Curriculum Development. He suggests that the advantages include a uniform delivery of school curricula, with a specific focus on the standardisation of curricula; and the redistribution of scarce resources among the school system. He considers the major disadvantage to be the inadequate provision of opportunities for teachers to display initiatives. Marsh (1992) describes Centrally-Based Curriculum Development as being determined by the head office personnel in an educational system. These people make decisions about what is to be taught, how often it is to be taught, and how it is to be assessed. Marsh refers to the English National Curriculum and the provincial control in each of the Canadian provinces as examples of this
approach. Aldrich (1995) also comments that the English National Curriculum is an example of a centrally-controlled “national curriculum”.

Guthrie and Pierce (1990), Skilbeck (1990) and Ramsey (1991) express views about two seemingly opposite events in education, namely, the international trend towards centralised curriculum development accompanied by the devolution of decision-making to local school sites. Skilbeck believes that the issue of accountability holds these two opposing forces together, in that schools are required to report back to a Government on the procedures they have used to implement the centralised curriculum. McLean (1995:73) comments on the trend towards standardising curriculum and using local responsibility for implementation, describing it as an “ambiguity of educational administration”.

2.2.1.3 Core Curriculum.

A Core Curriculum states the subjects and content to be included in a school curriculum with some flexibility for schools to include other subjects considered important at the local level. Skilbeck (1990) identifies a belief that the Core Curriculum movement is seen as discouraging innovations such as integrated studies, group work and inquiry-based learning. Within the Core Curriculum debate, many member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are moving towards using a whole or cross-curricula approach to structuring school curricula. The Core Curriculum structure includes new forms and organisation of knowledge, moving away from the subject-centred and subject-timetabled approach. Writers also consider whether access to knowledge or process skills will be enhanced or depressed as a Core Curriculum is strengthened. Blackburn (1989) says that school-based interpretation must accompany a common Core Curriculum to allow for the advancement of ideas as students move through the compulsory years of schooling. Skilbeck (1990) indicates that it is not clear how a national drive towards compulsory subjects and testing will avoid rigidity in teaching and learning and achieve the goals expected in a modern workforce: independence, flexibility and adaptability.
Hannan (1989) reports two weakness when subjects are grouped as part of a common Core Curriculum. Firstly, the grouping of subjects represents an integration of subject matter leading to less clarity being taught in the content of each subject making up the grouping. Secondly, subjects arranged in groups do not allow for aspects of learning that occur across the curriculum. As an alternative, Hannan suggests a study design approach where the content is set out in more general terms, with more choice available to the user. Tripp (1989) proposes a structure where the focus of the curriculum is not bound to specific subjects. He suggests a three-part curriculum consisting of information, skills and generalisations.

Hughes and Skilbeck (1994) isolate five common issues associated with the establishment of a Core Curriculum. These are the influence of education on the economy and employment; the need for a high quality education, with a particular focus on the development of base levels of knowledge, understanding and skills; the importance of cultural and moral values in society; the changing nature of work; and finally, the management of change.

Kennedy (1989a) warns that it is important to distinguish between a “national curriculum” and the idea of a common core of subjects which are available to students. He considers that a common core of subjects reflects the fundamental curriculum question: What knowledge is of most worth? Kennedy (1989b) identifies a push by Australian State, Territory and Commonwealth Governments for the development of a Core Curriculum, defining what should be basic and essential for all students; central to this is a focus in the areas of technology, Asian and community languages, literacy, numeracy, and labour market reforms in the name of economic rationalism.

Chapman (1994) and Hughes (1994) also address the issue: What knowledge is of most worth? Hughes observes that the flood of new knowledge makes it necessary to select the most valuable knowledge and focus on the importance of applying knowledge, including an emphasis on problem solving. Hughes (1994) believes a balance between content and process is important in a Core Curriculum, and predicts that in the future this balance may involve less knowledge than has been traditionally included with a greater emphasis on assessing that
knowledge. Chapman (1994:59) considers that the current discussions about curriculum reform need to focus on the following points: “What counts as knowledge?, How should it be acquired?, What knowledge is of most worth, [and] How shall a balance between breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding be addressed?”

The report by the OECD (1994:94) expresses an opinion on the differing approaches to Core Curriculum in a few countries. In England and Wales, specifying the number of subject areas in the curriculum is considered an inadequate expression of the idea of “basic and essential learnings”. The concern with this approach is that the subject areas identified as part of the Core Curriculum limits the learning opportunities for students. The traditional academic subjects are also a focus in the United States of America, and the report by the OECD suggests that this approach neglects the possibilities of interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary studies. New Zealand uses a multidimensional specification of Principles, Learning Areas, Essential Skills, Attitudes, Values and Assessment procedures. The OECD report states that attempts to achieve a high quality of education has implied a levelling-down effect in the form of a Core Curriculum. In arguing that the “essential learnings” approach reflects a narrow focus on teaching basic knowledge, the report by the OECD suggests that such an approach should be expanded to include “essential ways of thinking, of solving problems, [and] of relating knowledge to everyday life”.

In an analysis of an OECD project initiated in 1987, Skilbeck (1994) comments that a “top-down” approach to primary and secondary curriculum is now all but universal in member countries of the OECD, with a trend for secondary school curricula to be built around an enlarged core of compulsory subjects. This development has given rise to a tension between the concept of a commonly shared set of values and beliefs as a means of shaping a curriculum and pedagogy, and the opposite idea that there is no common pathway and many venues need to be followed. Cumming (1992), in a summary of “national curriculum” developments on an international scale, reports support for “national” frameworks with guidelines and principles, but opposition to a “top-down” development where prescribed content and methodology are influenced by the activities of Government. Skilbeck (1992:11)
comments that where countries have reduced central prescription of specific curriculum content and processes, a monitoring and evaluation process has been introduced, referred to as "steering by goals". The process allows Governments to ensure that goals are achieved in the outcomes of schooling and that standards are set in relation to school performance. Lawton (1981) comments that if attendance in a school system is compulsory, then it needs to establish compulsory curriculum intentions where the curriculum of a school becomes an entitlement that will enable students to effectively participate in a democratic society.

2.2.1.4 Other Concerns.

Piper (1989, 1991) presents four unresolved issues to do with "national curriculum" policy that he considers to be problematic in the central understanding of "national curricula". His concerns are to do with the meaning of development of a national perspective; a common curriculum (content); a common framework (form and function); and a common approach to assessment. Piper (1991) suggests that using "national curricula" to balance the challenge of curriculum reform as a means of reconciling demands for professional autonomy, versus protecting the rights of consumers and the public interest, is a hotly contested activity.

A. O'Hear (1993) presents arguments for and against "national curricula". His arguments for "national curricula" include a guarantee for a basic knowledge entitlement in each subject for every child; the setting of minimal curriculum standards that schools are required to meet; and the establishment of a clear framework stating what pupils should know, understand and be able to do at each stage of their schooling. His arguments against "national curricula" specifically focus on the possibilities of political interference and stagnation in knowledge development.

Dempster (1992) states that the use of "national curricula" to service an education system has been a political activity since public education began, and the question is revived at times of political, social, cultural or economic upheaval. Skilbeck (1992) adds that it is often an exaggerated fear of falling standards which fuels the concern that knowledge, skills and competencies need to be added to curriculum for national survival and development. As a
result, argues Skilbeck, business, industry and community interests have become involved in the processes of curriculum making, validation and appraisal. Although there is a growing feeling that standardised national curricula goals and guidelines are essential to raise standards; Smith, O'Day and Cohen (1991) comment that establishing educational reform on the cheap through “national curricula” could be considered a mistake. Francis (1991:31) agrees that economics is influencing educational thinking and he pursues three questions behind the development of a common curriculum: “What should be taught and learned?, How should learning proceed?, and What should be achieved?” In the development of a common curriculum, Francis (1991) comments that two further areas of concern are an emphasis on the prescription of content, and the use of words to describe expected outcomes.

The adoption of a “national curriculum” in a country is sometimes associated with policies of the “New Right” at a Government level. Skilbeck (1990) views the “New Right” influence on schooling as a means of creating and re-creating social order. Apple (1993) comments that the influence of the “New Right” focusses on various aspects of knowledge: What should be included?, How should it be organised?, Who is empowered to teach the knowledge?, What method of assessment should be used to indicate that the knowledge has been learned?

2.2.2 Adaptations and Implementation of National Curricula

Countries have adopted different approaches to the overall design and implementation of “national curricula”. Some countries have established and implemented “national curricula” through the use of parliamentary legislation: the influence of the “New Right” is often associated with this approach. In contrast, other countries have used a national collaborative effort to design “national curricula”, with implementation of the completed document being left to the discretion of State and Territory Governments. The organisation of subject content included in “national curricula” is generally either organised according to a list of subjects or by grouping subjects into Areas of Learning.
In Australia, a collaborative approach between the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments was used to develop a *non-compulsory* "national curriculum". The Australian *Statements and Profiles* resulted from a collaborative effort in curriculum development initiated by the Australian Education Council (AEC) in June 1986. Francis (1993:4) has noted that the Council, comprising State, Territory and Commonwealth Ministers for Education, wanted to "Support the concept of a national collaborative effort in curriculum development in Australia to utilise to maximum effect scarce curriculum resources and to ensure that unnecessary differences in curricula from state to state be minimised". Marsh (1994:26) itemises the four major educational and economic advantages of the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* as emphasised by the AEC Curriculum and Assessment Committee in 1992:

- Improved quality of curriculum through the utilisation and sharing of expertise of officers beyond system boundaries.
- Cohesion through reduction of unnecessary differences and overlaps in curriculum and thereby remedying present problems for mobile students.
- Pooling of resources and resources savings through adoption of programs and materials.
- Developing a more consistent approach to student reporting.

According to Piper (1992) a collaborative approach to Australian curriculum development has been an ongoing event for at least 25 years. Spaull (1987) supports this interpretation of curriculum events in Australia with the comment that State education departments have persistently supported or undermined the efforts to develop a "national curriculum" in Australia. Kennedy (1993b) expresses a personal view that the "national curriculum" development in Australia has been a political process and the end result has been a conservative approach to curriculum, no different from that experienced by curriculum developers in the past. Gough (1995) claims that the curriculum collaboration in the 1980s was spurred on by the release of *Strengthening Australia's Schools: A Consideration of the Focus and Content of Schooling* (a paper presented to the Australian Parliament by the then Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training, John Dawkins, in 1988). Two agendas were evident, firstly that of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CURASS)
with a focus on teaching and learning influenced by an Outcomes-Based Education approach, and secondly Dawkins' concern for economic performance.

Hannan (1989, 1992), Morris (1992), Piper (1989) and Stringer (1991) stress the "framework" nature of the then developing Australian Statements and Profiles and highlight the need for flexibility of content, variations in teaching and learning, and methods of assessment. In contrast, McTaggart (1991) expresses the views of a number of authors, saying that the Australian "national curriculum" project has nothing to do with curriculum, but is more aligned with monitoring resource allocation, revitalising the economy, establishing equality of opportunity and an entitlement curriculum to control the production of a distinctive Australian identity. Skilbeck (1992:11) comments that one group of factors that stand out in the desire to develop "national curricula" in OECD countries is the "need for perceived economic, technological and social change".

Boston (1994) favours the "national curriculum" approach to schooling in Australia, arguing that it will bring improvement of educational standards as well as rationalise resources and eliminate curriculum differences between the States and Territories. Graham (1992) argues that the Australian Statements and Profiles are designed to centralise the curriculum, controlling the productivity of schools, and have been written in response to limited resources. Graham's major concerns about the Profiles centre on their quality and effects on the curriculum. Tickell (1994) proposes the theory that the Australian Statements and Profiles represent an Australian Government attempt to tie education to economic features instituting a productivity measure. Hughes (1993) predicts that the Australian Statements and Profiles may be used to make comparisons between individual schools, teachers and students; a situation he views with concern.

Bartlett (1992:218), Kenway (1992:66) and Reid (1992:14) all view the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles to be under the influence of the policies of "corporate federalism", a reference to the influence of the "New Right". Kenway and Reid also express special concern about the effect of the Australian "national curriculum" on previously
developed social justice policies, where the educational needs of disadvantaged and minority groups were incorporated into the curriculum, claiming that the Australian developments have followed those of England and Wales. Kennedy (1992), Foggio and Martin (1992) and Morris (1992) draw attention to the failure rate of the “top-down” approach to curriculum design as has been used in the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. Watkins (1992) considers that the development of a “national curriculum” in Australia (the *Statements and Profiles*) will remove the conceptual element of teachers’ work from the specific context of a school and relocate it to a central “planning” body.

McLean and Wilson (1995) comment that the Australian “national curriculum” framework has been identified as the most interesting and positive approach on the international scene. McLean and Wilson (1995), together with Francis (1993), acknowledge the “uniqueness” of the collaborative model used to create the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. Willmott (1994a), similarly, reflects on Australia’s track record in education and considers the collaborative effort a remarkable achievement. Whittaker (1996) says that largely for political reasons, through a change in balance of conservative Governments from a minority to a majority, a national “phasing in” of the documents did not result. Instead, each State and Territory Government has made an individual decision regarding the use of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. Donnelly (1993:37-38) is of the opinion that the failure of the Australian “national curriculum” to be accepted by each State and Territory is not related to the States enforcing their constitutional rights, but can be attributed to the belief that education should be used to promote “a left wing, progressive view in matters of gender, ethnicity and class”.

Kennedy (1994) considers that the Australian *Statements and Profiles* provide an opportunity to explore cross-curricula issues such as integration of content, organising curriculum around skills and competencies, and addressing inclusivity in the curriculum. Inclusivity in the Australian curriculum refers to meeting the needs of students with disabilities and including all groups irrespective of ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status. Grundy (1994) proposes that the Australian *Statements and Profiles* could be used as a resource to assist in
the construction and reconstruction of the curriculum of schools as opposed to being “implemented” in each State and Territory. Hannan and Ashenden (1996:14) report that a common reaction of teachers to the Australian Profiles is that they “provide clarity and a sense sequence”.

Like Australia, the United States of America (USA) has also used a collaborative approach between Federal and State Governments to develop a “national curriculum”. Apple (1993) remarks that the USA assumed it would be left behind if it did not follow Britain, and especially Japan, in the establishment of a “national curriculum”. Davidson (1993b) notes that in response to the educational “crisis” where students were perceived not to be learning what they would need for the future, the solution has been a reduction in the number of subjects studied, the premise being (1993a:4) “that teaching fewer subjects will mean more intensive learning”.

In contrast to the goals of the Australian Education Council in the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles, Ravitch (1993:768) lists the three fundamental objectives of the 1991 America 2000 plan which resulted in the development of the National Standards:

1. to encourage every community to adopt the national goals, develop its own local strategy, and prepare an annual community report card on its progress towards the goals;
2. to stimulate the creation of thousands of “break-the-mold schools” that would approach education in totally new ways to meet the needs of today's children and families; and
3. to develop voluntary “world-class” Standards and American Achievement Tests.

The Scottish “national curriculum guidelines” were also developed using a collaborative approach and they arose from a 1987 consultative paper entitled Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990s. In the paper, the Secretary of State identified a need for a clearer definition of the content and objectives of the 5-14 curriculum, the establishment of satisfactory assessment policies in all schools, and better communication including reporting on students' progress. Hartley (1990b), Roger (1990), Kirk (1991), Brown (1992) and Clark
(1992) discuss the Scottish Office Education Department's attraction to the implementation of national standards as being the main thrust of the 1987 consultative paper. Review and development groups for each curriculum area were established to discuss the consultative paper with the result being a non-compulsory set of national guidelines covering the curriculum content and programs of study for primary and secondary schools, issued by the Scottish Office Education Department in 1993. Although Gatherer (1990) and Hartley (1990a, 1990b) discuss the influence of the "New Right's" education policies on the Scottish Office Education Department's managerial style of the 1980s, the decision not to use legislation to implement a "national curriculum" has lead to only a slight influence in the 1990s. The resulting 5-14 curriculum offers scope for schools to implement a curriculum that suits local needs.

2.2.2.2 Legislation.
In contrast to the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles, the Australian State of Victoria has used Government legislation to adapt and implement the Australian Statements and Profiles to suit the individual needs of the State. A new document named the Curriculum and Standards Framework (CSF) was created. J. Graham (1993:27) reports that the then Victorian Minister for Education (The Honourable Don Hayward) would not allow Victorian students to be held back by the "levelling uniformity" created by the Australian Statements and Profiles. He requested that Victoria develop its own equivalent curriculum of the Statements and Profiles which would equal the "quality" and "standards" of Victoria's present curriculum. Angus and Brown (1995) remark on the contradiction of the Victorian Government using legislation to centralise the school curriculum and at the same time devolving the management of the system back to schools. Angus and Brown (1995:16) report that the reaction of teachers to the externally imposed Victorian CSF was seen as a means to "enhance the power of consumers [parents] by providing them with a framework for assessing the 'quality' of the educational service provided by particular schools". Painter (1994:1) refers to the draft Victorian CSF, covering the Preparatory Year through to Year 10, as "a document which would strengthen central control of the curriculum and outcomes expected from schools".
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Further examples of the use of Government legislation to develop and implement a “national curriculum” can be found in a number of countries. The English National Curriculum is most often recognised as a curriculum which was established by legislation. Although the aims of the English National Curriculum include the desire to establish a curriculum which would raise standards, the lack of a theoretical basis for the structure of the English National Curriculum is referred to by writers including Aldrich (1988), Lawton (1988), Bennett (1990), Fowler (1990), Hartnett and Naish (1990), Kelly (1990), Chitty (1993), Waterhouse (1993) and Kushner (1994). These writers question how the stated aims of the English National Curriculum couched in economic terms, together with a centralised curriculum content expressed in terms of subjects, can raise the standard of student achievement. Watkins (1993:73) states: “There is one fundamental problem from which all other stem. The National Curriculum had no architect, only builders”. The legislated English National Curriculum also met with widespread teacher dissatisfaction causing the Government to commission a review into the document. In a discussion of his review into the English National Curriculum, Dearing (1993a, 1993b) continues to push economic reasons for the initial establishment of the curriculum, along with the need to include breadth in education and to raise educational standards through national assessment.

The influence of the “New Right” is also a strong feature of the English National Curriculum with writers such as Spours and Young (1988), White (1990), Sedgwick (1991) and Goodson (1994) referring to the use of the English National Curriculum to prepare children for their specific position in the socio-economic order.

The New Zealand “national curriculum” has been designed and implemented through legislation. Capper (1991), Lee (1992), McCulloch (1992), Smith (1992), Philips (1993) and O'Neill (1995) all refer to the development of The New Zealand Curriculum Framework as a means of addressing the economic needs of the country. Peters (1995:52) describes the introduction of the “national curriculum” into New Zealand as an “attempt to build a national culture of enterprise and competition”. He remarks that the “national curriculum” ignores issues associated with the nature and structure of knowledge and places a focus on skills which are considered easy to measure, generic and transferable. The policies of the “New
Right” have also been of influence in the establishment of *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*; McCulloch (1992) provides as examples the dezoning of school enrolment structures and the voluntary registration of teachers. Peters (1995) uses the example of a focus on enterprise and competition in *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. Smith (1992:224) comments that it was argued “that New Zealand ought to conform to the international context underpinned by the ideologies of the 'New Right'”.

In a number of countries, legislation has been used to ensure a level of national control over procedures and outputs in the curriculum; the “national curriculum” in France, Hungary, The Netherlands, Norway and Spain are examples. Corbett (1990:136) says that rather than talking about a “crisis”, the French talked about “making education the national priority”. McLean (1993) indicates that the reasons for developing a French national education system were based on a desire to prepare students for the information age.

In relation to Hungary, Kárpáti and Gaul (1995:15) quote the purpose of the sixth version of the *Hungarian National Core Curriculum* (December 1993):

> The National Core Curriculum is the centrally issued set of goals and thematic guidelines that acts as a regulatory agent and assures that a national cultural minimum is taught in all Hungarian schools. ... the National Core Curriculum is intended to outline contents and requirements for 50 percent of teaching material only, while local adaptations and programs may be developed at school level.

Tripp (1989:80) comments that the legislated “core” of information, skills and attitudes in The Netherlands curriculum describes a minimal level to be taught. This is to accommodate the strong desire for freedom in the education system which McLean (1993) and Van den Brink (1993) argue creates a hindrance to the implementation of a “national curriculum” in The Netherlands. Gundem (1993:259) explains that the main emphasis of the Norwegian “national curriculum” is on improving the quality of education as well as maintaining the Norwegian tradition of stressing “educational processes” more than “efficacy and results”. McLean (1993:132) considers that the development of the “national curriculum” (1993) in Spain was to achieve “a social, moral and technology-based education appropriate to the new industrial urban Spain”.
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2.2.2.3 Organisation of Subject Content.

Two approaches are most often used to organise the subject content in “national curricula”: either by a list of subjects or by grouping subjects into Learning Areas. Alternative groupings have been proposed by some writers, especially in connection with the English National Curriculum.

The Australian Statements and Profiles use Key Learning Areas to describe the content of each subject. The eight Australian Key Learning Areas were agreed upon in 1991. Hannan (1989) comments that the paper, Strengthening Australia's Schools, written by the Minister for Education in the Commonwealth Government, John Dawkins, refers to “major subject areas”, as well as knowledge, skills, values and attitudes as the basis for the mapping exercise which preceded the development of the Learning Areas. Piper (1989) believes that the use of Learning Areas introduced an element of confusion into the Australian Statements and Profiles. He refers to the proposed Australian Statements as representing a mixture of traditional subjects (e.g. Mathematics), groups of subjects (e.g. Languages other than English), broad curriculum areas (e.g. Arts) and areas disguised as subjects (e.g. Health and Physical Education). Graham (1994a) considers that some of the components of the Learning Areas are more coherent than others. He comments that although there is commonality between the subjects grouped in each Learning Area, the structure serves as a convenience for “awkward” subject areas and designated curriculum priorities. The “parcelling-up” of the curriculum into Learning Areas has created concerns about “disputed territory”, with some cross-curricula areas being weighted into one Key Learning Area more than another.

Gough (1995) comments that the Australian Education Council did not intend the chosen eight Key Learning Areas to encompass the whole curriculum, and he cites as evidence for this the fact that subjects such as Moral and Religious Education were not included. He acknowledges Marsh's (1994) comments that the Curriculum and Assessment Committee has not produced a written rationale for the Key Learning Areas and questions remain about the combination Key Learning Areas and the chosen number of eight Learning Areas. Wilson (1997) confirms that not only was there no comprehensive analysis of the basis of the
combined Learning Areas but that the rationale for the establishment of the Learning Areas, in general, was less comprehensive than it might have been. Kenway (1992) comments that the Australian Education Council rushed into the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles before an overarching conceptual approach was researched and developed. The Australian Senate Inquiry entitled Arts Education (1995) comments that nowhere in the national documents is there mention of the “purpose” of the exercise.

The “national curriculum guidelines” in Scotland is based on Learning Areas. Similar to the Australian situation, Adams (1994:7) remarks that the rationale for each curriculum area receives little attention. He comments that there is little overall rationale for the entire curriculum, except to achieve the central principles of “breadth, balance, coherence, continuity and progression within an overall assessment focussed context”. Adams refers to an “uneasy tension” in the combination curriculum areas, particularly Expressive Arts and Environmental Studies.

*The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* is also based on Learning Areas. Each Learning Area specifies rigid learning objectives and behavioural and measurable outcomes across what is considered to be eight evenly spaced levels of learning. Elley (1993:38) provides an analysis of this approach:

> the Government is presuming a similarity across subjects, which has no basis in research or teacher experience. A neat uniform structure across all subjects may please the tidy mind, but teachers know, even if politicians do not, that the link between content and aims is not the same in mathematics or technology as it is in English or Social Science . . . there is no rationale for dividing any of the curriculum areas into eight (or ten) evenly spaced levels. There are no natural breaks in development at the selected cut-off points and no pilot studies have been carried out to determine whether they represent challenges of similar magnitude, within or across subjects.

Alternative groupings of subjects that have been proposed by writers are in particular response to the list of subjects approach used in the *English National Curriculum*. Hirst (1993:35) proposes an alternative structure in which six “practices of living” represent the foundation of education “with subjects as secondary, specialist significance”. The “practices
of living” are concerned with the physical world, communication, personal and family life, wider social relationships, Art and design, and religious beliefs and fundamental values. Radnor (1994:11) describes a model consisting of two parts which she terms “productive” (learning skills that are useful to the individual and community) and “practical” (learning how to select knowledge, and use knowledge to make choices and solve problems). P. O'Hear's (1993:17) model has four parts consisting of content, the wider curriculum, a structure for progression and choice, and a system for assessment and reporting. He describes the content as containing three areas of knowledge and understanding: these being Personal and Social, Scientific and Technological, and Experience of the Arts; and four areas of practical competencies which he names as Communication and Numeracy, Physical Movement and Health and Safety, Social Interaction, and Planning and Organisation. Lawton (1993:40) in arguing for the HMI Entitlement Curriculum Model (1977-1983), based on “areas of experience”, comments that it was ignored because it looked like an educational theory, whereas the list of subjects was recognised as a common sense approach. Fowler (1990), Moon (1990) and Kirk (1991) each put forward a favourable case for the use of the “areas of experience” structure. Fowler (1990: 77) reports that the model contained “areas” of learning, complemented by “elements” of learning with the inclusion of characteristics such as breadth, balance, relevance, differentiation, and progression and continuity.

The particular list of subjects chosen for the English National Curriculum - devised according to a list of subjects - has been widely debated. A number of authors including Bennett (1990), Gyte (1990), Hughes (1990), Bolton (1993), A O'Hear (1993) and Woodhead (1993) support the use of a list of subjects. They reflect that a list of individual subjects allows for the content and associated methodology of each to be taught with clarity. On the other hand, many writers comment on the absence of an explanation for the use of a subject-based approach as being the most suitable means to implement the aims of the English National Curriculum. Lawton and Chitty (1988) note that Moral Education, Social and Personal Development, and Economic and Political Understanding - all of which have been considered to be important in the construction of a curriculum which is broad, balanced and relevant - have been neglected in the English National Curriculum. Fowler (1990) argues that the
justification for the inclusion of a subject in a timetable must be for reasons stronger than its
title and it must contribute to a particular area of experience. Lawton (1987) remarks that
there is nothing wrong with the use of subjects as a curriculum base as long as they are treated
as a means and not an end. White (1993:9) claims that the use of the subjects in the *English
National Curriculum* has not been made clear, except that they are “to promote the ‘spiritual,
moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils’, and prepare them for adult life”.
Burwood (1992) views the division of subjects into core and foundation as implying a
hierarchy of subjects within the curriculum. Radnor (1994) comments that in the context of
the *English National Curriculum* the word “curriculum” has become synonymous with the
word “subject”. The inclusion of cross-curricula themes in the *English National Curriculum*
prompted writers such as Stringer (1991), Ball and Bowe (1992), Hall (1992), Hirst (1993),
Leech (1993), White (1993) and Radnor (1994) to comment on the unexplained relationship
between the cross-curricula themes and the subject structure. At the same time they all
acknowledge the contribution that the essential, but non-statutory cross-curricula themes have
made to the *English National Curriculum*.

The content of the curriculum described in the USA *National Standards* is also set out as a list
of subjects. In this case they are defined as standards and discussion about various types of
standards has been the subject of intense debate in the USA. As a result, The National
Council on Education Standards and Testing (quoted in O'Neil, 1993a:4-5) recommends that:

*National Standards* should be developed that include *Content Standards* (what
students should know and be able to do), *Student Performance Standards* (the
level(s) of student competence in the content), and *System Performance
Standards* (to assess the success of schools, districts, states and the nations as a
whole in helping all students attain high Performance Standards). In addition, the
council said that states should develop *School Delivery Standards* to judge
whether schools are providing students with the opportunities to attain these high
standards.

Writers comment on various issues associated with a standards-based education. O'Neil
(1993a:5) asks the question: “Is it really possible to create standards that apply equally to all
students?” Smith (1994:13) remarks that “Standards-driven education marries the ideas of
quality and equality in a way that they have never been married before”. Lewis (1994) argues
for a strong focus to be given to Opportunity-to-Learn Standards, rather than Content or Performance Standards. She ponders (1995) how the different types of standards will be accommodated by teachers in conjunction with a move towards thematic or interdisciplinary instruction in schools. Alexander (1993) and Cohen (1955) view the development of the National Standards as providing opportunities for creativity and innovation in the classroom and as a tool to assist educational improvement. Gandal (1995), a Senior Associate of the American Federation of Teachers, argues for standards that focus on academic achievement, rather than on social and behavioural issues, which he suggests are often labelled as a form of "Outcomes-Based Education". He maintains that academic standards should be presented in traditional subject areas rather than as interdisciplinary areas. Kamii, Clark and Dominick (1994) remark on the absence within the National Standards to references to self worth, relationships with other people, and developing problem solving skills: all qualities necessary for employment. Davis (1996) believes that the challenge for the standards movement is to design an integrated package to satisfy the business community.

Eisner (1993, 1995) suggests that "criteria" be established in conjunction with the National Standards to encourage individuality in student work and to cater for the range of ability in the education system. He cautions that a specific focus on standards obscures the potential of education and schooling. Cohen (1995) argues for work samples and criteria as the basis for establishing standards. Clinchy (1995:390) says that the National Standards emphasise "constraint rather than freedom" and she proposes that the National Standards should also promote enjoyment of learning for the future, rather than absorption of subject matter only while at school. Sizer and Rogers (1993) suggest that collating exhibitions of student work should be the mechanism to begin to set education standards nationally.

2.2.3 Assessment

The issue of assessment is closely linked with the establishment of "national curricula". Piper (1989:6) acknowledges that it would be reasonable to expect that a common Core Curriculum would be accompanied by a common national approach to assessment but he warns that "Unless assessment works hand in hand with curriculum development, and is subordinate to
it, there is a danger that it will become a surrogate curriculum in its own right and obstruct rather than facilitate the realisation of national goals". Marsh (1990) identifies the main purpose of "national curricula" as providing a framework for the assessment of student achievement, leading to an eventual assessment of teachers, and as a means of establishing the effectiveness of individual schools. In contrast, Smith, O'Day and Cohen (1991) comment that if the notion of "national curricula" is viewed as a technical process to develop and implement new examinations, the process would fail. They suggest that "national curricula" can only be considered successful if it is seen as a cooperative learning experience.

Piper (1991) reflects that *Strengthening Australia's Schools*, the paper that set the guidelines for the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*, was vague about a common approach to assessment and instead placed an emphasis on reporting, with the underlying concern being accountability rather than educational improvement. Hughes (1990) says that the assessment patterns associated with the English *National Curriculum* serve as a warning to develop voluntary open reporting procedures - or have one imposed centrally. He suggests that Australian teachers can learn from this approach. Ashenden (1994) considers that the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* provides an opportunity to put in place a national assessment and reporting framework.

Resnick and Nolan (1995) comment that the challenge for the USA is to develop a national agenda which raises standards without creating a national examination system or curriculum. O'Neil (1991) comments that some policy-makers believe student achievement will not increase until high standards are set and rewarded. Others stress that the establishment of the *National Standards* and the measurement of students against them, is vital to monitoring the outcomes of schooling. In referring to Koretz, O'Neil (1991) comments that introducing a high-stakes testing program is a misguided response to low standards. O'Neil (1993a) comments that a national assessment system should feature assessments to produce results for individual students and to obtain large scale sampling. Simmons, in O'Neil (1993b), and Smith (1994) remark that with the development of the *National Standards* and an assessment system, the American education system would be faced with two new ideas: Content
Standards that apply to all students, and assessment that is aligned to curriculum. Resnick, in O'Neil (1993b), adds that in assessing national Content Standards, a graded system of high standards may need to be developed instead of stipulating one Performance Standard for all students.

Assessment is a strong point in the *English National Curriculum*. Kirk (1991:31) focusses on the reasons for legislating the *English National Curriculum*, in that it was seen as the quickest way to equip all young people “with the knowledge, skills and understandings that they need for adult life and employment”, as well as a way of reducing the power of local authorities and restraining teacher industrial action. Croll and Moses (1990) and Owen (1991) suggest that the attainment targets in the *English National Curriculum* exist to ensure that the document is properly implemented. B. Moon (1994:22) states that “The National Curriculum provides a national yardstick against which unrecognised potential can be realised and acknowledged”. Hartnett and Naish (1990) comment that the English Government's belief that only testing can raise the standard of student attainment, is given as an explanation for the central role taken by testing in the document. Stringer (1991) considers the fundamental point of the *English National Curriculum* is to use assessment to control teachers who are believed by some to be inefficient, and not supportive of Government education policies.

A national assessment policy is planned to be developed in conjunction with *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. On the issue of assessment, Renwick and Gray (1995), the authors of a report describing the implementation of the Framework in primary schools, comment that familiarity with the Framework and the national curriculum statements, which specify the Learning Outcomes for each essential Learning Area, are essential before school-wide assessment policies can be developed. In their study, Renwick and Gray report that one school principal estimated that it would take 10 years before teachers were familiar with all the curriculum statements. They continue that teachers have more experience with assessment in some curriculum areas and less in others, for example, the Arts.
Greaves (1994) comments that the assessment of knowledge in the French “national curriculum” is now for the purpose of discovery, as opposed to the past, where the focus was on the question: What do students know?

2.2.4 Outcomes-Based Education

The development of “national curricula” is associated with a shift towards designing a curriculum based on outcomes. The definition of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) that is applied to “national curricula” varies between countries. This section of the Literature Review explores Outcomes-Based Education as it is applied to Australia in general and the State of Victoria in particular.

Mann (1994b) and Wilson and Mann (1995) focus their definitions of Outcomes-Based Education in the context of the Australian Statements and Profiles. Mann describes the Profiles as representing a shift in focus from a process skills-based curriculum to outcome-based statements, where all students are making progress in each Key Learning Area at different rates. Wilson and Mann describe the shift to outcomes as highlighting what is important in education: the issue of student learning. They (1995:5) pose four questions which are suggested by moving to an outcomes-based approach to teaching and learning: “Do you know what to teach?, Do you know what you want students to learn?, Do you focus on the individual student?, and Do you know what your students are learning?”

Francis (1993) describes the Australian Profiles as an example of the national and international trend towards Outcomes-Based Education. He emphasises that the chief motive for using an Outcomes-Based Education approach is the desire to be clear about where teaching is headed, moving away from the exclusive focus on subject matter and teaching methods. Boston (1993, 1994) and Hill (1994) are keen to note that as a response to an outcomes-based system teachers will need to clearly state what every student has learned and the future progress expected.
Hannan (1994:52) refers to Marshall, who suggests that good outcomes have three elements: the content knowledge, the competence (what the student is doing) and the setting (under what conditions the student is performing). Hannan (1994:52) continues to quote Marshall's comments on content knowledge:

> The drafting of common outcomes requires enormous time and care. Even then, outcomes appear too vague for some or too specific for others. If outcomes are too 'global'... critics ask, 'Where's the beef?' But if a State specifies dozens or hundreds of outcomes, it is attacked for 'prescribing the curriculum' and treading on local initiative.

Harris and Hirst (1995) make the distinction between the term “Outcomes-Based Education” (OBE) as defined by Spady (1993) and the current Australian interpretation which is more appropriately named an “Outcomes and Profiles Approach”. Griffin and Smith (1996:15) comment that the Australian Profiles are an example of traditional Outcomes-Based Education, as defined by Spady and Marshall (1991). They remark that the Australian interpretation of Spady’s definition of traditional OBE does not allow students to have significant control over their learning, “as a sequential series of outcomes are listed to be achieved”. Brady (1996a, 1996b) comments that although a 1995 Curriculum Corporation (Australia) report claims that there is general acceptance amongst the States and Territories of Australia towards an outcomes approach to teaching and learning, it is too early to determine the form of Outcomes-Based Education practice, as defined by Spady and Marshall (1991), that will be used and the benefits that will be derived. Griffin (1997:3) comments that the shift towards outcomes-based learning in schools has not been accompanied by a “generally agreed operational definition”. Mackay (1995:6) suggests that the incorporation of outcomes in the Australian education system should take place over several years:

> It will require, in its fullest development, changes to teachers' work, new instructional strategies, greater understanding of how students learn, earlier and more sophisticated ways of monitoring student progress, intervention based on diagnosis, and flexibility in school organisation to respond adequately to student needs.

Ellerton and Clements (1994) claim that the Australian Education Council developed a policy of Outcomes-Based Education which was at odds with recent research findings of Mathematics Education and possibly with the other Key Learning Areas. McGaw (1993)
suggests that because of the ambiguities associated with OBE it is difficult to know exactly what supporters are advocating. In a later paper, McGaw (1997) reinforces this view, commenting that a focus on outcomes is a way of avoiding any agreement about the specific detail of a school curriculum.

Brady (1996a) accepts that there is a danger that outcomes can be substituted for objectives and the approach to learning becomes one of curriculum-based objectives rather than Outcomes-Based Education. He says (1996b) that specific adherence to outcomes may result in a product with associated assessment, rather than a focus on process and opportunities for enrichment. Evans and King (1994:263) say in part that Outcomes-Based Education "treats excellence as something tied to outcomes and determined by standards", resulting in a situation where the more capable student is often not given challenging work. Kennedy (1995b) questions the choice and benefits to be derived from an outcomes-based approach, and he comments that in a political sense that the benefactors of an outcomes-based approach is unclear. McGaw (1994) views Outcomes-Based Education as one way in which a Government can measure whether it is getting value for money through the results of student performance. Ellerton and Clements (1994) advise that education bureaucracies have realised that OBE was a means of regaining control over school curricula from the 1970s and it promised an "entitlement curriculum", the outcomes of which could be measured, averaged and compared.

O'Connor (1995) notes that the Victorian CSF does not give a definition of Outcomes-Based Education, and that Learning Outcomes is only one approach to implementing an outcomes-based program. She continues that if Learning Outcomes are taken to mean a series of activities, then a narrow view of Outcomes-Based Education is expressed. She further remarks that the Board of Studies has suggested that little change is needed to implement the Victorian CSF in terms of its Learning Outcomes as schools are presently operating in this manner. O'Connor observes that this could be taken as a simplistic view of Outcomes-Based Education in Victorian schools.
Two statements from the Victorian Department of Education are significant in terms of the current focus on Outcomes-Based Education. The first occurs in an article entitled “Implementing the CSF: Twelve Common Questions” (1996:8):

The broader context that informed the development of the CSF was the current consensus in the education community that an outcomes-based approach to teaching leads to improved student learning. This is a consensus shared in the United Kingdom and, increasingly, in the United States.

And in another article entitled “Teaching and Learning in The Arts” (1996:9), the statement reads “All indications from Australia and similar countries are that an outcomes-based approach will remain in place for a considerable period of time”. A contradiction to these two statements is found in the literature associated with National Standards for the Arts in the USA. The Music Educators National Conference (MENC) makes it clear in the literature that they have published that the National Standards in all subjects, including Music, are not based on the theory of Outcomes-Based Education. The article entitled “National Standards for Arts Education: The Truth from Behind the Clouds” (1994) takes this matter one step further by stating that the National Standards focus only on academic achievement and do not include non-academic outcomes which are a feature of OBE.

2.2.5 Benchmarking

Literature on the topic of benchmarking is associated with that about Outcomes-Based Education and “national curricula”. An outcomes-based curriculum may lead to a consideration of using that curriculum to establish measurable benchmarks. Any discussion about benchmarking also includes references to “Total Quality Management” and “continuous improvement”. These terms are usually defined according to an industrial setting, with the “definitions” being transferred to the educational environment. Although the notion of benchmarking educational standards is a new concept in Australia, this section of the Literature Review takes an Australian and Victorian perspective.

Kennedy (1995a) states that there has been no evidence produced about the potential of benchmarking in education and he warns of the danger of transferring the industry process model to education. He reports that the present debate on benchmarking is focussing on an
inexpensive option for the provision of education, a direction which is likely to reduce educational standards.

Grundy (1995) suggests that the concept of benchmarking is concerned with what does work, rather than the possibilities of what might or ought to work. She comments that with the diversity surrounding the interpretation and meaning of benchmarking, there is confusion about what is to be benchmarked - outcomes or practices.

L. Watson (1995) identifies two areas for benchmarking which require different data. These are benchmarking best practice for system change and benchmarking student outcomes for system-wide accountability.

Masters (1996:22) describes two types of benchmarks which can be used as points of reference. Comparative benchmarks are set with reference to the achievements of other students, either in the past or in the present. Absolute benchmarks or standards describe preferred levels of performance. Masters lists three ways of describing absolute benchmarks. These are “by developing a list of what students should know and be able to do by the time they reach particular year levels; by specifying a desired level of attainment against an existing standards framework; [and] by identifying a desired level of performance on a particular . . . task”.

Collins (1994b:5) quotes Praetz and L. Watson as both arguing “that the [Australian] ‘national curriculum’ is about the solid conservative goal of setting benchmarks for standards”. Brady (1996a) acknowledges that the introduction of Outcomes-Based Education into Australia will establish benchmarks of student achievement at each level.

McGaw (1995) comments that in industry the focus for a benchmarking activity is on process, but in education the focus is generally on outcomes. He suggests that it could be argued that the Australian Profiles are in themselves benchmarks, since they provide outcomes for students against which both individuals and a group of students can be measured. However,
McGaw does not support this argument as the Australian Profiles are simply outlining a sequence of learning, and apart from the Victorian CSF, the Profiles do not tie the sequence of Learning Outcomes directly to school years. Morrisroe (1995c:25) describes the benchmarking capacity of the Victorian Arts CSF:

It also provides sequentially-developed benchmarks spanning eleven years of formal Music Education. These benchmarks or Learning Outcomes are behavioural goals relating to students' ability to use their acquired skills and knowledge in a Musicianly manner (1995c:25).

She further notes (Morrisroe, 1996:3):

These outcome statements are mainly concerned with benchmarks for directing and supporting students as they develop as Artists, interpreters and participants in society.

Kennedy (1992, 1995a) comments that the Australian Statements and Profiles are a suitable structure that could be used for any benchmarking process that is based on a proper understanding of the education production process. For benchmarking to improve educational quality, Kennedy suggests that it will need to consider student outcome Performance Standards and constructs such as Opportunity-to-Learn Standards and System Delivery Standards.

McGaw (1995:11) proposes that the Australian Profiles could be used to develop one type of benchmark, "a baseline approach". With the aid of materials designed to assess student performance level in terms of outcome statements, the results for particular educational systems could be mapped onto the sequences in the Profiles. Thus, benchmarks would be formed and subsequent student performances could be compared.

In line with the suggestions that the Australian Profiles could be used to accommodate a benchmark facility, McLean (1997:7) reports that the Australian Ministers for Education have approved draft benchmarks for students in Years 3 and 5 in literacy and numeracy. Three levels of benchmark have been described: Benchmark Standard, Proficient, and Exceptional,
with a note that “achievement of Benchmark Standard is no guarantee of continued progress and success”.

2.2.6 Summary of Issues relating to National Curricula
The first part of the Literature Review has identified issues relating to “national curricula”. The issues have been collated under five major headings. Writers have considered the variety of structures that could be used to establish “national curricula”. The second issue considered focusses on the types of approaches taken by countries to implement “national curricula”. The political and cultural environment of a country plays a major part in the approach taken. Similar and contrasting approaches are illustrated by writers. Centralised “national curricula” implemented through legislation are generally influenced by the “New Right” of the political spectrum. Writers describe the effect this influence has had on education. The different approaches taken with respect to the dissemination of content in “national curricula” are discussed. In general, countries have either grouped subjects in Learning Areas or listed them as separate entities within “national curricula”. Assessment is considered to be a necessary and supporting element of “national curricula” and writers discuss the value of assessment in this structure. Outcomes-Based Education and Benchmarking are two elements that reflect current changes in education and writers have discussed their contribution to the education environment, with a special focus on Australia and Victoria.

2.3 Part Two: Issues relating to the Arts in National Curricula

The issues in this section of the review are grouped under two headings:

An Arts Learning Area
Multi-Arts

2.3.1 An Arts Learning Area
One attribute of “national curricula” is the grouping of subjects into Learning Areas. Writers have expressed a variety of opinions about the grouping of different Arts forms into one Arts Learning Area.
Abbs (1993:10) insists that “there is no logical connection between the idea of the Arts as a coherent group of disciplines and combined Arts courses”. He considers that ideally the Arts should be taught as independent subjects and then links made between the Arts. In a later paper, Abbs (1996:65) identifies a shift in the approach towards teaching the Arts in schools in England. Although he comments that the Arts do not have a “common curricula history” and that categorising the Arts as an identifiable group is a very new phenomena, it can now be assumed that, in education, the Arts belong together. Abbs lists six Arts forms in this autonomous yet related family: Visual Arts (including Architecture and Photography), Drama, Dance, Music, Film and Literature.

With reference to the National Standards for the Arts, Herbert (1995) suggests that at the State level a unified platform should be developed that embraces all the Arts disciplines, and these should include the Visual Arts, Design, Media, Dance, Music, Theatre, and Creative Writing.

Hoffa (1994a:20) contemplates the origins of “Arts Education”, and asserts that there is little commonality that binds Arts teachers of different disciplines together. He states that “there is no such thing as a discipline, a body of content, or a coherent area of study called 'Arts Education’”. Rush (1997:2) poses the question: “Where is the Model for Teaching 'the Arts’?” She argues that although the Arts share many attributes along with their individual characteristics, it will not be until teachers recognise the educative effectiveness of the separate Arts forms that commonalities can be considered and teachers referred to as Arts Educators. Stevens (1993) raises the dilemma of including Music and the other Arts forms as separate disciplines within one document, as distinct from creating an integrated generic Arts Education curriculum area. He argues that pursuing the present trend of placing the Arts forms as discrete subjects under one umbrella, with a similarity developed between them, could be seen to be down-grading the status of each of the Arts forms. He concludes that the challenge for Music Educators, in particular, is to maintain Music as an independent subject area in the face of the current trend towards generically-based Arts curriculum areas.
Paterson (1997) comments that the Key Learning Area concept is problematic for Music as it is being expected to fit into the same format as all the Arts forms - a Visual Arts structure - and to demonstrate the same style of thinking. Weate (1993) suggests that Arts Education in a number of countries is being influenced by Government and economic forces, rather than from forces within, and this is demonstrated by the combining of discrete Arts disciplines into "the Arts".

The Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* is an example of an Arts Learning Area where five Arts forms are linked together by a common framework. The literature concerning the *Arts Statement and Profile* can be delineated into three areas: the economic influence, concerns about the structure of the documents, and the positive aspects of the publications. The influence of economics is considered by some writers to be the reason for the development of an Australian Arts Learning Area. Boughton (1992:37) reports that the development of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* has taken place in a climate dominated by "nationalist corporate federalism ideologies". He says that the potential exists for the content and practice of Arts Education to be controlled federally through the Australian *Arts Profile*. Grenfell (1993) draws attention to the Arts historically being used for propaganda, and as a vehicle for change, and she issues a warning that in a time of economic rationalism the Australian *Arts Statement* could be used as a method of control. McPherson (1995b) asserts that at the planning stage of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, economic forces resulted in Visual Arts being broadened to include Design as well as Art and Craft. Media also joined the ranks of the Arts. Brown (1994:62) comments that the common framework used to describe the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* allows the Arts in educational settings to be seen as interchangeable, and for politicians to use the Arts to satisfy economic ends. He suggests that the use of umbrella concepts such as "expression", "creativity" and "aesthetics" deprives the separate Arts subjects of their unique forms of knowing and understanding. Many writers express concerns about the structure of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* and question how it will be implemented in Australian classrooms. Stowasser (1993b), referring to the June 1992 draft of the *Arts Statement and Profile*, comments on the return to a preoccupation of students learning "about" the Arts, rather than participating in the
Arts. She comments that it still must be recognised that discrete content is the focal point of each Arts form. Stowasser proposes that it will be difficult to develop an integral program in any one Arts form if continuity of study cannot be assured. Rosevear (1994) notes the absence across the whole Australian Arts Statement and Profile of reference to “extra-curricula” Arts activities, for example school productions and Music ensembles, which contribute significantly to the Music learning process. Meyer (1995) addresses Arts Education as a cultural issue and she refers to the lack of public discussion surrounding the planning of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, leading to the development of a broad document allowing interpretation in many ways. Meyer considers that the first step to solving the lack of direction in the Arts is to encourage debate on the value of the Arts in our culture.

Flood (1994:16) finds it difficult to accept that the creativity of the Arts can be formatted into bands and levels. She is concerned that the outcomes listed in the Australian Arts Profile will be used as a checklist to measure student achievement and teacher effectiveness. She asks: “What happens if a child continually does not exhibit the desired outcome?”, implying that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile is not a suitable structure for recording the Artistic achievements of students. Brown (1994) considers that the Australian Profile Levels indicate an average performance in conjunction with an age level. In placing a student in a level, he comments that a teacher's independent judgement will be compromised and the whole process will disempower teachers and pigeonhole students into rigid Arts stereotypes. Rizvi, Deegan, Creen, Martoo, and Ratana (1993) applaud the existence of the Australian Arts Profile as a framework to guide learning in the Arts, but as an assessment tool they consider it narrow and likely to promote inequalities. Rizvi et al. remark that as learning in the Arts is not linear, teachers must continue to use their professional judgement to support individuality in student work. They also express concern that a dynamic, changing environment such as the Arts may not benefit by a “national curriculum” organised around a fixed template.

The Australian Government's response (Commonwealth of Australia, Senate Hansard, 13 May 1997:1) to the Australian Senate Inquiry entitled Arts Education (1995) claims that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile could have a negative impact on Arts Education as “the establishment of clearly defined standards and outcomes and an emphasis on competencies
are inappropriate for the Arts curriculum Learning Area”. A further comment from the Commonwealth of Australia Hansard extract (1997:1) reflects on the Chairman's Foreword in *Arts Education* which states “that the *Arts Statement and Profile* attempt to squeeze Artistic activity into the restrictive mould, a mould determined by the needs of vocational training”. And Hansard (Commonwealth of Australia, 1997:1) continues “that the *Arts Profile* may encourage teachers to teach skills so that they can judge whether or not the students have achieved the outcome, ignoring how well the outcome was achieved”.

Brown (1994) comments that his misgivings about the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* include the reduction of the uniqueness of the Arts to easily quantifiable and transferable outcomes, the veiling of the *Profile* outcomes as competencies, and the representation of average “Arts” values. Similarly, Boughton (1993a) lists his objections to the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* and they include the reductionist nature of the achievement levels, the development of prespecified outcomes and exemplars, the use of words that trivialise the aesthetic qualities of the Arts, the possibility that the outcomes will become fixed in time, and the absence of a database to support the development of prescriptive or descriptive *Profile* outcomes appropriate to the Arts. Bryce (1996) argues that outcomes-based assessment in the form of Learning Outcomes closes off the risk-taking environment encouraged by the Arts. Such risks cannot be written down and she refers to Boughton (1993b) in suggesting that only the visible outcomes will be assessed. Livermore (1996) is concerned that the Australian *Arts Profile* will be influenced by the English developments and that Performance Standards for each level of the *Arts Profile* may be designed. She cautions that the Performance Standards developed may not be appropriate for each level of the Arts.

The Australian Senate Inquiry entitled *Arts Education* (1995) states that the creative and expressive elements of the Arts cannot be easily accommodated in a framework with the use of terms such as outcomes (describing understandings) and pointers (describing behaviours). The *Arts Education* report continues that it doubts the logicality of the *Profile* structure and suggests that the definition of outcomes and pointers could both be reversed given they are reporting the same thing at different levels of detail. The report notes that the pointers do not
indicate a quality statement to describe the outcome and it questions whether the higher level outcomes are intended to act as pointers or to exhaust a student's knowledge of an Arts form. Boughton (1992) comments that the assumption that learning objectives can be defined in performance terms and that subject content can be divided into sequential units, has been derived from and influenced by industry. Boughton (1993b) argues that to couple Arts Education with competencies is to confuse education with training, providing the opportunity for the competencies that can be easily described to win out at the expense of Arts Learning Outcomes which are not so easily described. He continues that a framework devised according to standards is not necessary to improve Arts Education and that such things are built upon a mistrust of Arts teachers. This leads to a deskilling of the profession and eliminating the need to use professional judgement in the classroom.

As in any debate, contrasting views are expressed supporting the positive aspects of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. Emery (1994b:6) argues that the Arts Statement and Profile encourage diversity in the teaching of the Arts. A key writer of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, Emery highlights three aspects that emerged in the writing process. The first issue involved the debate between offering the Arts as an integrated experience or as specific Arts forms. The second debate focussed on the categorisation of Arts experiences into “Visual” and “Performing” Arts, leaving “Media” floating somewhere in the middle. Emery’s third issue focussed on which aspects of the Arts should be emphasised, noting that the documents had to accommodate inclusivity and the idiosyncratic qualities of each Arts form.

Bannister (1993) acknowledges the value of the draft Arts Statement (1992) as it supports a strong relationship between the five learning processes in the Arts described as aesthetic, cognitive, physical, sensory, and social and in combination make for an wholistic experience in Music Education in particular. Stewart (1993) in writing about learning and teaching in the Visual Arts, suggests that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile offers an approach to learning in Arts Education through reflection, responding and appraising. McMillan (1993) argues that the structure of the Australian Arts Profile will encourage teachers to develop
composition and improvisation as the basis of all Music programs. Knight-Mudie (1994:38) reflects on the opportunity for the Australian Arts Profile to provide stimulation and enrich the imagination of Arts Educators, particularly when the “wet Friday afternoon” approach in primary schools and a lack of relevant content in secondary schools has dominated Arts teaching in the past. Hoepper (1995:3) acknowledges the significance of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile for Drama Education, commenting that it involves “students in aesthetic learning with the focus of learning being on making, presenting, understanding, and valuing drama in a variety of contexts”.

Hammond (1995, 1996), a key writer of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, comments that the Key Learning Area notion has reflected more on how the Arts can operate as a group in education, rather than as traditional individual subjects. With the grouping of the Arts, Hammond identifies collaborative opportunities for experimentation, diversity, and the presentation of strands in combinations. He recommends that specialist teachers in secondary schools develop an understanding of the characteristics of the other Arts forms, while primary teachers broaden their knowledge of each Arts form and consider worthwhile opportunities for integrating the Arts. He acknowledges the concern that the structure of the Arts Profile invites administrators to reduce the number of Arts subjects on offer in the curriculum. For a successful approach using the Key Learning Area phenomenon, Hammond states that all strands must be maintained with opportunities to experience each subject in its own right. Stefanakis (1996) values the Arts Learning Area because the consistent Learning Outcomes allow for both uniquenesses and commonalities of the Arts forms to flourish, and the substrands in the Arts encourage each part of an Arts strand to be viewed in context, rather than as an isolated entity. Morrisroe (1996:3) argues that the Arts cannot be rolled into one, as each discipline is unique, but the aim of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, and its Victorian equivalent, the Arts CSF, has been “to provide a link that would bring the Arts subjects closer together to improve the quality of curriculum provided in schools”. Hammond (1996) and Crampton (1995) both point to practical work remaining as the central element of Arts Education, with Arts Criticism and Aesthetics, and Past and Present Contexts being identified in the planned activities to enable meaning to be given to the Arts works.
Crampton (1995:2) views the strand organisers of the Arts “as aspects of knowing in the Arts that are inevitably interlocked”, rather than as separate entities.

Grenfell (1993) acknowledges that one of the most important developments of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile is that the Arts curriculum is now viewed in a social and cultural context. Livermore (1993) comments that the “national curriculum” has a vital place in Arts Education, as it is at school where community attitudes to the Arts are first established. If the Arts are not visibly valued in the school system, she alerts, the battle is lost. Barrett (1993) suggests that essential questions relating to the “value” of Music Education should be kept in mind as curriculum developments which will be formulated in response to the Australian Arts Statement and Profile proceed.

McPherson (1995b) comments that the most contentious issue in the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile was the design of a generically-based Arts model, together with a concern as to whether all five Arts disciplines should have a common set of outcomes. This approach is considered by some Arts Educators to weaken each Arts discipline. McPherson (1995a) argues that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile provides sufficient scope for each Arts discipline to retain its uniqueness and, at the same time, challenges Music teachers to provide a Music Education that incorporates the experiences of the other Arts forms. Stowasser (1993a:19) suggests that the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile provides the opportunity for Music Education to demonstrate “transferable cognitive, psychomotor, technical, social and affective skills” and to broaden the approach to Music Education in schools.

Some authors consider the positive influence of an Outcomes-Based Education approach on Arts Education in the Australian setting. Hammond (1996:7) states that “[This] approach is well suited to the Arts as it allows diversity in teaching approaches and content and caters for individual differences”. Crampton (1995) addresses the issue in terms of assessment. She argues that in matching the activities undertaken by students to their level of achievement, the outcomes-based approach relies heavily on formative and descriptive reporting. With a
specific focus on Music teaching, Richards (1995:53) proposes that an outcomes-based approach is a valuable tool for the secondary classroom, as it considers in the first instant the interests, skills, motivation and learning styles of the students before decisions are made about the content to be taught.

The *Expressive Arts* curriculum which forms part of the “national curriculum guidelines” in Scotland is another example of Arts subjects being grouped into a Learning Area coupled with a common structural framework. Brown (1992) comments that the common scheme used for the Scottish *Expressive Arts* curriculum, where the Arts are grouped under three sets of outcomes, has been designed purely as a convenience. She remarks that the scheme allows for the making of assumptions about the different kinds of knowledge, distorting some more than others. Brown is particularly concerned about the effect upon the *Expressive Arts* curriculum in a system which identifies attainment targets at five levels and takes a behaviourist approach to learning in all curriculum areas. She comments that the learning process is more complicated than defining educational standards purely as a hierarchy and she believes that the gathering of the *Expressive Arts* into five levels under three sets of outcomes is unhelpful. She considers that the outcomes used are lacking in coherence and bear little resemblance to the ways in which Arts performances are assessed in real life.

The Arts subjects within the *National Standards for the Arts* in the United States of America have also been grouped into a Learning Area. A common framework for the structuring of the content of each Arts form has been introduced. Down and Mitchell (1993:34) support this approach with the comment that the common framework for the Arts will “focus attention . . . to make them equally valuable . . . [and] equally taught”. The publication of the *National Standards for the Arts* was endorsed by Richard Dreyfuss (1996) when commenting about the movie *Mr Holland's Opus*. Fallis (1994), Fehrs-Rampolla (1994), Hoffa (1994a, 1994b), Hope (1994), the article “National Standards for Arts Education Summary Statement” (1994), Ambach (1996), Mahlmann (1996) and Shuler (1996) discuss the value of all the Arts forms sharing a common knowledge structure, allowing for the integrity of each Arts form to be maintained, as well as encouraging connections to be made between the Arts forms. Hoffa
(1994b) considers that the National Standards for the Arts has the power to transform what is taught, as the document discourages teachers from the old idea that the only worthwhile learning in the Arts is through making and doing.

Asmus and Haack (1996), Bresler (1996), Goodson and Duling (1996), Patchen (1996a, 1996b), Shuler (1996), Fehr (1997) comment on the influence of the Discipline-Based Arts Education approach (DBAE) on the National Standards for the Arts. This Arts Education model, originally designed for the Visual Arts, has been blended with the common framework used to structure the National Standards for the Arts. Patchen (1996b) views the DBAE approach as a conceptual framework that expands learning and teaching in the Arts beyond the traditional “production” (Visual Art) and “performance” (Performing Arts). In contrast, Colwell (1996a) remarks that DBAE places a stress on sequential curriculum development which does not take account of the cultural backgrounds and learning styles of students.

Writers have expressed various concerns about the National Standards for the Arts. Hoffa (1994a) remarks that establishing uniform and unvarying standards in the Arts is foreign to most Arts Educators and questions remain about their effects on jealously guarded academic and Artistic freedoms. Ambach (1996) suggests that more room for professional discretion should be made available, so that creativity is not stifled by an inflexible set of standards. Dyer (1996) would prefer a set of essential learnings at the school level rather than top-down standards. Wilson (1996:3) asserts that the most severe failing of the National Standards for the Arts “is that the individual standards do not form a coherent vision of the purposes of Arts Education”. Ross (1994) argues that if the National Standards for the Arts are to succeed they need to include details describing the appropriate methodology and how long it will take students to learn the material.

Colwell (1995a:8) considers that the focus on breadth in the Arts standards has had “an adverse effect on clarifying both objectives and standards in the Arts”. He comments further (1996a, 1996b) that although the four different Arts forms in the National Standards for the Arts are described as “equal”, the Arts forms have not been graded by research. He argues
that the Arts forms and the standards contained within are not all of equal importance. He further suggests that the National Standards for the Arts do not accommodate gifted and talented students and that the National Standards for the Arts focus on the development of "products" rather than the development of Arts processes. Reimer (1996) remarks that he does not believe that some of the National Standards for the Arts are more important than other standards, or that they are presented in a specific order.

Colwell (1996a) is concerned about the decision to adopt Arts Education as opposed to Music Education as basic education. He remarks that Arts Education produces different goals and by-products than Music Education and with the Arts standing as dominant, the question "What knowledge is of most worth?" is important. He poses the unanswered question: "What are the consequences of having Arts Education as basic, instead of Music Education as basic?" (1996a:12). Colwell (1996b:119) remarks that failure to achieve competence in the basic subject of Music will result in consequences, but at present these are unclear. Similarly, Boyle (1996:115), with reference to the Arts and especially Music asks: "What should we do if our students don't achieve these standards?".

With a specific focus on Music Education, other writers such as Froseth (1996), Jordanoff (1996), Lindeman (1996b), MacCagno Neel (1996), Reimer (1996, 1997) and Schmid (1996) comment on the possibility that the National Standards for the Arts will be used to develop a more comprehensive approach to teaching Music and training Music teachers rather than the current focus on performance. Reimer (1997:12) points out that performance is not the most common way through which people come to appreciate Music and he argues that there appears to be an international understanding that performance-based Music Education has "served students poorly".

Although focusing on the Arts specifically, and not Music, Colwell (1995a) identifies that support for the Arts has moved away from performance and has a current focus on the activities of creativity, improvisation, history, and criticism. He acknowledges that these activities present difficulties for educators with respect to developing program priorities in
terms of curricula. Support for Colwell's opinions also come from an article entitled “National Standards: What Preservice Teachers Think” (1994).

The issue of assessment in the National Standards for the Arts is also important and support for the development of an assessment program comes from a number of writers, including Fallis (1994), Colwell (1995b), Lehman (1995, 1996), Lindeman (1996a), Mahlmann (1996), Schmid (1996) and Shuler (1996). Shuler (1996:82) states that assessment through the collection of work samples will help clarify the exact of the meaning of the National Standards for the Arts. He advises that “Using words to write standards for the Arts is inherently problematic, because it is impossible for words to describe with precision such important non-verbal Artistic behaviours as quality performance and improvisation”. Lehman (1993) also reflects on the difficulty of explicitly stating standards in the Arts. Colwell (1995a:5) offers support by saying that what makes the Arts unique is “expression and performance in the Art forms themselves” and not an emphasis on words.

Other writers express concerns about the development of an assessment program. Ambach (1996:12) offers a warning about the use of assessment in conjunction with the National Standards, asserting that the type of connections made between assessment and the standards “will make or break the use of standards”. Wilson (1996:8) expresses a concern that testing individual achievement standards by the use of individual assessment tasks may unnecessarily fragment Arts Education. He states that “Artistic behaviour should never be fragmented merely to make assessment easier and more convenient for evaluators”. Ambach (1996:11) asks if the National Standards for the Arts in schools are to be used in business terms, for establishing best practice, or in educational terms to set the “minimum or threshold level requirements”.

Although the Arts subjects in the English National Curriculum are listed as individual Arts forms, some writers discuss the value of grouping the Arts in a Learning Area. B. Moon (1994) is concerned about the naming of individual Arts subjects in the English National Curriculum, which become optional in the secondary school, when the trend in primary
schools and increasingly in secondary schools is to adopt a broadly-based approach to Creative Arts. Abbs (1993:10) comments that the English National Curriculum has focussed on the Arts as unrelated subjects, and not as a collaborative union, which had been envisaged. He describes the present arrangement of the Arts curriculum as being divided into two “privileged” parts (Visual Art, Music) and four “marginalised” parts (Dance, Drama, Literature, Film). He notes that Literature has been kept separate from the Arts. Kushner (1994) suggests that Arts curriculum in England has been moving towards integrating the Arts forms in terms of combined Arts courses and exploring overlapping areas. Robinson (1993) identifies five Arts forms in the English National Curriculum: Visual Art and Music as stand-alone subjects, Drama and Dance as branches of English and Physical Education respectively, and Literature as part of English (a subject which also incorporates Media Education, including films and television). He suggests that this arrangement is inadequate as it promotes a narrow view of the Arts, and it does not recognise the differing interests and skills of students. Pring (1989), Hargreaves (1990), Francis (1992) and D. Graham (1993) acknowledge the weakness created by the inclusion of only two Arts forms in the English National Curriculum. Francis says (1992:36) remarks that “there was no attempt to calculate their value as an educational experience”, a reference to the fact that the educational values of the other Arts forms was overlooked. Redsell (1993) predicts that a split may occur at the secondary level where the Performing Arts of Dance, Drama, and Music are offered in a combined form, with Visual Arts being linked to Design and Technology.

2.3.2 Multi-Arts

Multi-Arts, Aesthetic Education and Integrated Arts are topics discussed in the literature associated with Arts curricula. Although in Australia the debate was lost, the possible inclusion of Multi-Arts in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile was strongly debated in the design and development stages. The topic was also revisited during the development of the Victorian Arts CSF, where once again the decision was made not to include Multi-Arts. Writers present various definitions and interpretations of these terms. They also raise issues associated with Multi-Arts teaching as opposed to teaching Arts forms as individual entities.
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2.3.2.1 **Definitions of Multi-Arts Teaching.**

Lett (1976) and Worby (1994) delineate a number of different approaches to Multi-Arts teaching. Lett defines and discusses eight approaches. These approaches include a single unit Multi-Arts teacher, a focus on composition across the Arts, developing idea-images across the Arts, using thematic activities across the Arts, exploring the languages and technical vocabularies of the Arts, and student participation in intensive Cross-Arts experiences such as workshops, demonstrations, exhibitions and discussions. Lett acknowledges that all the Multi-Arts approaches suggested are based on encouraging students to work through a task rather than providing them with information about each of the Arts. He cautions that the selection of the appropriate teaching processes is often the determining factor in the success or failure of a Multi-Arts project.

Worby (1994) proposes that there are three concepts of Multi-Arts teaching in existence. The first is an integrated approach where students experience the skills of different Arts forms, in a program delivered by one teacher. Worby considers this approach to be “inadequate”. The second approach, he suggests, is an expansion on the first, where specialist teachers provide specific skills in each Arts form and the students produce a product which involves aspects of a number of Arts forms. Worby's (1994:12) preference is for the third approach where the Arts are placed at the centre of the school curriculum and there is equal involvement from both Arts specialists and teachers of other school subjects “where the Arts can be of use”. A contrasting position to Worby's first two approaches is made by Colwell (1996a). He considers that the process of Integrated Arts can only be taught by one specialist teacher who has a knowledge of all Arts forms as a team teaching approach is too difficult to implement. A possible weakness in the second approach to Multi-Arts teaching as stated by Worby is also addressed by Colwell (1995a:5) who stresses that cooperation of Arts departments in, for example, a school production, “does not automatically mean that students or teachers are developing either disciplinary or interdisciplinary competence”. Support for Worby's third approach to Multi-Arts teaching comes from Down, the chair of the National Committee for the National Arts Standards Project, who is quoted by Smith (1995:21) as saying that “the Arts are the best conduit for interdisciplinary instruction”. Down discusses how the Arts can
benefit the study of other subjects. On the other hand, Smith (1995) argues that a focus on integrating the Arts with other subjects, rather than supporting the teaching of the Arts in a stand-alone capacity, will weaken the drive to have the Arts taught in schools.

Haseman (1993) and Comte (1993) focus on the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile as an opportunity to encourage Multi-Arts teaching. Haseman identifies the discrepancy between references to collaborative experiences in the Australian Arts Statement and the layout of the Arts forms as separate disciplines in the Australian Arts Profile. He notes that no examples of a Multi-Arts approach are illustrated in the Arts Profile. Comte argues that when children begin formal education at the early childhood stage they come with a wealth of Multi-Arts experiences, and this is the time to be inviting them to experience the world of Multi-Arts without labels and experiences “boxed” into disciplines.

In terms of Multi-Arts teaching, McPherson (1995b) comments that Arts Educators need to find a balance between Multi-Arts and cross-disciplinary approaches and he makes two points about this matter. First, the Arts as a coherent body form a distinct component within the curriculum and they contribute to the goals of general education; and second, Arts Educators are concerned that students receive a sequenced learning pattern in each separate Arts discipline.

Herbert (1995:13) advocates that the Arts should not be a “‘melting pot’ of all Arts education approaches”, but they should maintain their diversity, unique knowledge and skills as an influence on the main issues of educational reform in the 1990s. Herbert (1995:18) believes that no useful purpose is served comparing one discipline to another, although he does acknowledge “an increasing number of studies that point to connections . . . between learning in the Arts and the extrinsic by-products of acquiring knowledge and skills in the Arts”.

Elliot (1995) stresses that each performing and non-performing Arts form exhibits an independent way of thinking and knowing, and so each kind of Artistic knowing needs to be taught and learned in its own context through active involvement in that Arts form. He comments that although a person may understand the elements of one kind of Artistic product
or practice, these elements do not apply to all the Arts. Elliot believes that the political implications of a Multi-Arts Education approach will lead to the destruction of school Music programs as it will be possible for Music to be taught and learned along with all the other Arts but without due attention being given to its unique qualities.

2.3.2.2 Approaches to Multi-Arts Teaching.

Many of the writers focus on the concept of making a link or a connection as the most popular way to describe an approach to the teaching of Multi-Arts. An alternative approach is that of integration.

Stephens (1996) takes a common maxim that the learning process is about making connections from the known to the unknown. He argues that the creative process is enriched through perceiving associations within an Arts form, between the Arts, and from the Arts to all aspects of the natural and synthetic world. Stephens' model of integration allows for different layers of association to be explored developing security, understanding, knowledge and skill in one or more of the Arts. The model includes a balance between specialisation and integration of the Arts. Stephens continues that integration without a particular specialisation in one or more of the Arts forms may result in exploration of only similarities and differences between the Arts, without the development of knowledge and skills in any Arts form. He comments that Arts integration avoids treating the world as a series of unrelated blocks of knowledge and reflects the experiences of early childhood.

Wiggins and Wiggins (1997) suggest that Multi-Arts projects allow each Arts form to command an equal emphasis can be achieved by making a link or a connection through learning processes. With a focus on important concepts rather than content, each Arts form maintains its integrity. Emery (1995) also uses the term “linking”, in this instance to avoid confusion surrounding the notion of integration. She comments that “linking” Arts experiences allows a number of Arts forms to be taught in one activity whilst retaining the individuality of each. The article, “Setting the Record Straight: Give and Take on the National Standards for Arts Education” (1996), also supports the approach of making links
between Arts forms, but cautions that Arts Education cannot be taught without a prior study of individual disciplines in order to absorb the uniqueness of each discipline.

Hope (1993, 1994, 1995) comments that in the development of the USA National Standards for the Arts attention was to be given to "integration" or "correlation" within the Arts, and between the Arts and other subjects. The developers of the National Standards for the Arts choose the term "integration" and Hope (1993:37) describes this complex process within the Arts as one that often results in knowledge and skills from the separate Arts disciplines producing "an integrative aesthetic result". Hope advances the notion that "the greatest chance for true integration in the Arts Education arena is within a single Arts discipline". He argues that the opportunity exists to "develop real understanding of the interdependence of knowledge and skills associated with various Arts processes and subject matter". Hope (1995) stresses the importance of maintaining integrity when studies are combined, either across the Arts or in relationship with other disciplines, without creating the impression that competence in all disciplines will be achieved.

With a focus on timetabling, Boyd (1993) considers that the integration of Arts forms may be a possible solution to fitting additional Arts forms into a space once dominated by Music and Visual Arts. She comments that tensions arise when the Arts are integrated and it is especially important in the Arts to understand the various ideas involved in integration.

2.3.3 Summary of Issues relating to the Arts in National Curricula

This part of the Literature Review has focussed on the Arts as a Learning Area and the inclusion of Multi-Arts in an Arts curriculum. Writers have suggested that the concept of an Arts Learning Area is not sustainable, although it has been accepted that the Arts can be grouped together. Countries that have used an Arts Learning Area to accommodate the content of a number of Arts forms have also included a common framework. Although England has left the Arts forms as individual entities, writers have remarked on the value of grouping the Arts forms. Discipline-Based Arts Education is an approach which is particularly strong in the USA and is reflected in the National Standards for the Arts.
Approaches to assessment in Arts Education are also discussed. Multi-Arts, Aesthetic Education or Integrated Arts are topics that are associated with Arts Education. Writers have listed definitions of Multi-Arts teaching and approaches to Multi-Arts teaching; one of the most commonly suggested approaches for using a Multi-Arts approach is to make a link or connection between a number of Arts forms.

2.4 Chapter Summary

The Literature Review has addressed issues associated with the development of “national curricula” and Arts Education in “national curricula”. The first part of the review addressed five issues. First, the types of structure that could be used as a basis for design of “national curricula”. Second, the approaches taken by countries to implement “national curricula”. Third, the contribution that assessment structures make to “national curricula”. Fourth, the interpretation of Outcomes-Based Education on “national curricula”, and finally the influence of Benchmarking on education. The second part of the Literature Review focussed on an Arts Learning Area in “national curricula” and the inclusion of Multi-Arts teaching within the Arts curriculum.

Chapter Three focusses on the details of Arts curricula from overseas countries. Information has been gathered from the 25 member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the 22 affiliate countries of the International Society for Music Education (ISME). The issues highlighted in the Literature Review are expanded in Chapter Three with reference to specific countries.
CHAPTER THREE
3.0 OVERSEAS ARTS CURRICULA

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a general overview of Arts Education, specifically Music, in a number of countries. This overview establishes a background for the discussion of developments in Arts curricula in both Australia and the State of Victoria. The Australian and Victorian developments are the focus of Chapter Four and Chapter Five respectively.

The discussion in this chapter refers to some of the issues highlighted in Chapter Two. These are the different concepts of “national curricula”, using “national curricula” to set national standards, the inclusion of cross-curricula themes in “national curricula”, grouping Arts forms in a Learning Area, Multi-Arts and assessment.

Data relating to the Arts in “national curricula” overseas was collected principally through a questionnaire (see appendix two) circulated to 25 member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and 22 countries where the national Music organisation is affiliated with the International Society of Music Education (ISME). Seventeen of the countries surveyed were members of both the OECD and affiliates of ISME. For the purpose of this study, a questionnaire was sent to each of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales although they are grouped as the United Kingdom in the categories used by the OECD and ISME. Australia was excluded from both lists. Although not a member country of the OECD nor an affiliate member of ISME, South Africa has been included, as it is significant that the ISME 23rd World Conference will be hosted by South Africa in 1998.

In total, 34 questionnaires were circulated and returned. The questionnaire is included in appendix three of this study. Questionnaires were sent to correspondents for ISME (see appendix four) and this procedure ensured that the information was received by all member countries of the OECD and all countries where the national Music organisation is affiliated with ISME.
Additional information on Arts curricula overseas has come from the literature, Arts curriculum documents, conference papers and correspondence with the researcher. The questionnaire was designed to gather information on the following:

- the *compulsory* nature of a country's curriculum
- the school years and subjects covered by the curriculum
- details about the Arts subjects in the curriculum, and
- the way in which standards are allocated to the Arts subjects in the curriculum.

This chapter does not include specific detail about the content of any subjects, teaching methodologies and processes associated with any subject, assessment practices, the precise gradings used to describe achievement, the hours of tuition given to each subject, the resources available for the teaching of subjects, as well as the skills and interests of teachers, or the training of teachers. The chapter does provide however a sketch of Arts Education in overseas countries as a setting for the discussion of the Arts curricula developments in Australia and Victoria.

Seven countries sent the questionnaire represented a number of Federal States, Territories or Cantons where the responsibility for education is invested with the Government of the individual State, Territory or Canton. These countries are Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Germany, Switzerland and the USA. With respect to these countries the information provided by the respondent of the questionnaire is in some instances representative of one State, Territory or Canton, and in other instances a more encompassing comment has been provided in an attempt to give a "global" view. The three countries where the respondents answered the questionnaire with respect to one State were Belgium (Flanders), Canada (Saskatchewan) and Germany (Brandenburg). The respondent for Flanders noted that the same structure of school years applied to the three Belgium States. A significant point about the Saskatchewan Arts curriculum is that it has been adapted for use by the Education Departments of the North West Territories and British Columbia, where it has been recognised as a comprehensive Arts curriculum. The remaining six Canadian Provinces and
Territories have not adapted the Saskatchewan model. The respondents for Argentina, Brazil, Switzerland and the USA answered the questionnaire from a general perspective.

The decision to survey all member countries of the OECD and all affiliate countries of ISME recognises that although no perfect solution is available to the problem of “equivalence”, as discussed by Etzioni-Halevy (1990:118), being a member of a “group” signifies that the countries potentially have some elements of similarity. As Sztompka in Øyen (1990:13) has suggested, a comparison of data between countries provides the opportunity to find the peculiarities of a country, as well as the accepted practice of looking for commonalities. The specific Arts forms included as part of each country's curriculum provide examples of commonalities (e.g. Music and Visual Arts) and diversity (e.g. Literature and Home Economics). Armer (1973:55) warns that concepts when used cross-culturally tend to have different connotations; the inclusion of a question about “Multi-Arts” or “Integrated Arts” in the questionnaire is such an example.

Throughout this chapter the same terms have been adopted for consistency. The term “year” rather than “grade” has been used to describe the stages of schooling in all the countries surveyed. The term “primary” as used in Australia has been adopted instead of “elementary” to refer to the early years of formal schooling.

The information gathered in response to the questionnaires is presented in five tables. The same five tables, with the addition of the Australian data, are included in appendices nine to thirteen respectively.

The issues arising from the information gathered about the curriculum in the countries surveyed has been collated under seven headings. These are:

National Curricula and National Standards
School Years and School Subjects
Cross-Curricula Themes
Arts Learning Area
3.2 National Curricula and National Standards

In general, a “national curriculum” in a country is designated as being *compulsory* or *non-compulsory*. Some *compulsory* “national curricula” are tightly controlled at a Governmental level where central decisions apply to all schools in the country. Other *compulsory* “national curricula” are implemented in conjunction with a State or Territory allowing for some contribution to the curriculum at the local level. A third way of implementing a *compulsory* “national curriculum” is at the school level, incorporating some school-based development of the curriculum. Some countries have a *non-compulsory* “national curriculum”. Others countries have used a process of collaboration to establish *non-compulsory* centrally prepared curriculum guidelines, which are then implemented at a State, Territory, Canton or individual school level. Some countries have neither a “national curriculum” nor centrally prepared curriculum guidelines. The following table illustrates the occurrence of “national curricula” and national standards in the countries surveyed.

Table 3.1: Summary of *compulsory* and *non-compulsory* “national curricula” and national standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National Curriculum</th>
<th>National Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Saskatchewan)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table the “ticks” indicate countries having a “national curriculum” and those which set national standards. It should be noted that not all countries that set national standards also have a national curriculum. Some countries have neither a “national curriculum” nor do they set national standards. The term “undecided” has been used to indicate those countries where a decision regarding the development of national standards is still unresolved.

Countries which were surveyed that have a compulsory “national curriculum” are Argentina, Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, England, France, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and Wales. Varying levels of Government control of a compulsory “national curriculum” can, for example, be found in Austria, England, Flanders (Belgium) Wales, Northern Ireland, the Czech Republic, New Zealand, Ghana, Mexico, Norway, Japan, Luxembourg, Turkey. More freedom in the implementation of a compulsory “national curriculum” can be found in Argentina, The Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, France, Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Hungary where local contribution to the curriculum is accepted. The South African curriculum known as the National Qualifications Framework or the Curriculum 2005 initiative (Van Niekerk, 1997) has a long “phasing in” time and therefore it is inappropriate to comment of the level of possible Government control.
Countries that have non-compulsory centrally prepared curriculum guidelines are Finland, Scotland, and the USA. Countries with a non-compulsory "national curriculum" are Denmark, Hong Kong, Iceland, and Italy. The countries of Brazil, Canada, Germany, and Switzerland do not have a "national curriculum" or centrally prepared curriculum guidelines. Education in these countries is the responsibility of each State Government and therefore varying arrangements for education prevent the development of an overall statement.

It would be expected that a country with a compulsory "national curriculum" would also use the document to set national standards. Greece is an example of a country where the opposite is true. In most other cases countries with compulsory "national curricula" the curriculum is used to determine national standards. New Zealand and South Africa have compulsory "national curricula" but decisions about the establishment of national standards are still to be made in both cases. On the other hand, examples of countries that have non-compulsory "national curricula" but use the curriculum to set national standards are Iceland, Italy, and the USA. The non-compulsory centrally prepared curriculum guidelines produced by Saskatchewan Education (Canada) are an example of a curriculum that is used to set standards within one State. Finland is an example of a country that has a broad curriculum framework and is moving towards developing national tests, but these may not be considered to be equivalent to standards.

3.3 School Years and School Subjects
The compulsory years of schooling in each country surveyed for this study varies greatly. The age ranges in which students attend school also varies widely. The respondents for Belgium, the Czech Republic and Luxembourg commented that a compulsory "national curriculum" has been established for the pre-school years as well as for primary and secondary school. Some countries and individual States divide the school years into primary, middle and secondary years, for example Finland, France, Japan, Saskatchewan (Canada) and the USA.
The number of years of primary schooling fluctuates between four and ten years, with the exception being Iceland where the first ten years of "basic" education are equated with primary school. The number of years of secondary schooling ranges between two and seven years. The extreme positions are occupied by Scotland where seven years of primary schooling are followed by two years of secondary schooling, and New Zealand which has seven years of secondary schooling. Some countries have a number of types of secondary schooling offering specialist career options, and the compulsory years of schooling vary between these types of secondary education. Examples of countries where there are a number of types of secondary schooling are Argentina, Germany, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Sweden, Spain and France. Thus, it is very difficult to generalise about the number of years of secondary schooling.

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to list the subjects taught as part of the curriculum. A wide variety of subjects were listed by the respondents making any generalisation difficult. The majority of countries represented in this survey have curricula structured around subjects that stand as single entities. A smaller number of countries and individual States have grouped subjects within an overarching context, for example: Required Areas of Study (Saskatchewan), Areas of Learning (Hong Kong), Cultural Domains (Hungary), Essential Learning Areas (New Zealand), Areas of Study (Northern Ireland), Main Themes (Norway), Learning Areas (South Africa), Curriculum Areas and Modes (Scotland), Areas of Knowledge (Spain) and Groups of Subjects (Sweden). The approach taken by each country in organising curricula with respect to single subjects and groups of subjects is illustrated in the next table. The number and names of subjects included in curricula vary greatly, especially at the secondary level where students have a wide range of electives in addition to the compulsory subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Subject Groupings</th>
<th>Single Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Required Areas of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brazil                  | Arts Education                   | ✓
| Canada (Saskatchewan)  | Required Areas of Study          | ✓
| Czech Republic          |                                  | ✓
| Denmark                 |                                  | ✓
| England                 |                                  | ✓
| Finland                 |                                  | ✓
| France                  |                                  | ✓
| Germany                 |                                  | ✓
| Ghana                   |                                  | ✓
| Greece                  |                                  | ✓
| Hong Kong               | Areas of Learning                | ✓
| Hungary                 | Cultural Domains                 | ✓
| Iceland                 |                                  | ✓
| Ireland                 |                                  | ✓
| Italy                   |                                  | ✓
| Japan                   |                                  | ✓
| Luxembourg              |                                  | ✓
| Mexico                  |                                  | ✓
| The Netherlands         |                                  | ✓
| New Zealand             | Essential Learning Areas         | ✓
| Northern Ireland        | Areas of Study                   | ✓
| Norway                  | Main Themes                      | ✓
| Portugal                |                                  | ✓
| Scotland                | Curriculum Areas (Primary) and Modes (Secondary) | ✓
| South Africa            | Learning Areas                   | ✓
| Spain                   | Areas of Knowledge               | ✓
| Sweden                  | Groups of Subjects               | ✓
| Switzerland             |                                  | ✓
| Turkey                  |                                  | ✓
| United States of America| Arts Education                   | ✓
| Wales                   |                                  | ✓

In this table the "ticks" indicate that subjects in the respective countries are listed singly. If subjects are grouped together the name given to those subjects is listed. Note that in Brazil and the USA only the Arts subjects are grouped together, none of the other subjects in the curriculum are grouped.

3.4 Cross-Curricula Themes

An important feature in the curricula of some countries is the inclusion of cross-curricula themes or general education skills which are incorporated into all school subjects. Examples of countries and individual States where this arrangement takes place are England (Cross-Curricula Themes), Hong Kong (Elements of Learning), Hungary (Common Objectives), New Zealand (Groups of Essential Skills), Northern Ireland (Cross-Curricula Themes),
Saskatchewan (Common Essential Learnings), Scotland (Cross-Curricula Aspects) and Wales (Cross-Curricula Themes). The specific detail of the cross-curricula themes of these countries is listed in the table below.

Table 3.3: Summary of countries which include cross-curricula themes as part of a “national curriculum”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Education Skills</th>
<th>Types of Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Saskatchewan)</td>
<td>Common Essential Learnings</td>
<td>• Communication * Critical and Creative Thinking * Independent Learning * Numeracy * Personal and Social Values and Skills * Technological Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Themes</td>
<td>• Economic and Industrial Awareness * Careers Education * Health Education * Education for Citizenship * Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Elements of Learning</td>
<td>Outcomes of Learning: * Knowledge * Skills * Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Common Objectives</td>
<td>• Integration into Europe * Homeland * Communication and Culture * Learning * Career Orientation * Environmental Education * Physical and Mental Health * Integration into the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Themes</td>
<td>• Education for Mutual Understanding * Cultural Heritage * Information Technology * Health Education * Economic Awareness * Careers Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Aspects</td>
<td>• Equality * Enterprise Education * Environmental Education * Information Technology * Media Education * European Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under the heading “General Education Skills” the particular term used by each country is listed. Under the heading “Types of Skills” the specific skills stipulated by each country are listed.

3.5 Arts Learning Area

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to itemise the Arts subjects taught in their country and indicate if the Arts were grouped together in a “Learning Area”. The results from each country are collated in Table 3.4. The researcher made the decision to use the Arts forms that are included in the Victorian Arts CSF together with an “Other” category as the basis for the structure of this table. In keeping with a country's approach to either listing subjects as single entities or placing them together in a group, the Arts subjects are presented accordingly.

Table 3.4: Summary of Arts subjects offered in school curricula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Graphic Comm.</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Visual Art</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Sask'wan)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Wood/Metalwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Multi-Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Multi-Arts</td>
<td>Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nether-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where a “tick” is used the subject is included in the country’s Arts curriculum. Under the heading “Other” the specific Arts forms are listed; where this applies.

Single Arts subjects are included in the curricula of Argentina, Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Ghana, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Northern Ireland, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and Wales. With reference to England, Knight (1996) in his questionnaire response comments that the Arts subjects are included separately as this is the simplest way to ensure specific skills, knowledge and understanding is taught. This, he suggests, is also the most common way they are taught in schools. It should be noted that Hargreaves (1990), Francis (1992), Abbs (1993), D. Graham (1993), Robinson (1993), Redsell (1993), Kushner, (1994), B. Moon (1994) all criticise the decision to name the Arts
forms in the *English National Curriculum* as single entities rather than placing them in a group.

The remaining countries in the survey “group” their Arts subjects most commonly under the term, “The Arts”, but in some cases other names are used, for example in Brazil the translated title is Artistic Education; France, Aesthetic Education; Greece, Aesthetic Education; The Netherlands, Expressive Activities; Spain, Artistic and Visual Expression; Sweden, Practical and Aesthetic subjects; and Scotland, Expressive Arts. Belgium, Finland, Germany, Hong Kong, Hungary, New Zealand, Portugal, Saskatchewan, South Africa and the USA all opt for the term “The Arts”. Although a number of writers, including Abbs (1993), Hoffa (1994a) and Rush (1997), assert that there is no logical reason for collating individual Arts forms together into an Arts Learning Area, approximately half of the countries in this survey have grouped them in an Arts Learning Area.

The dominant Arts forms represented in the Arts curricula in all countries are Music and Visual Arts. Dance and Drama, either as stand-alone subjects or “disguised” as Physical Education and English respectively, are the second most common. Japan, Hungary, Norway, New Zealand and Sweden include Craft as a part of Visual Arts. Media is beginning to be recognised as an Arts form, in some cases being influenced by Technology, as is seen in particular in Hungary. The countries and individual States that include Media are Flanders (Belgium), Saskatchewan (Canada), Denmark, Hungary and New Zealand. In Scotland, Media Education is included in the cross-curricula aspects of the curriculum rather than as an Arts form. Textiles, as a separate subject, is included in Denmark, Hong Kong, The Netherlands and Portugal. Design, in conjunction with Visual Arts or Technology, is included in the curricula of Hong Kong, Hungary, New Zealand, Spain and the United Kingdom.

The focus on the provision of only Music and Visual Arts in school curricula is an issue addressed by R. Moon (1994) who reports that it is unusual for a school or an education
system to adequately provide for all the Arts. In an analysis of information from 19 OECD Member States, Brandt (1990) in R. Moon (1994:126) reports:

all countries traditionally perceived Visual Arts and Music as the most important for the purposes of schooling. These have received the most attention and resources. In most countries where there is training for teachers of the Arts, there has only ever been training in these two [Visual Arts and Music] Arts subjects. Dance has almost always been relegated to the margins of state education and tends to included within physical education. Drama has been almost equally marginalised (although) its value as a tool for learning is increasingly recognised in most countries and as a subject in its own right.

R. Moon comments that this emphasis on Visual Arts and Music illustrates a partial understanding of the Arts. He contends that Dance, Drama, Visual Arts and Music can be used to explore other subject areas, but it is equally important to provide a balance between different Arts modes to provide for teaching of the Arts in their own right and to allow for the learning of skills and concepts.

The Arts forms identified by respondents to the questionnaire which can be classified as exceptional include Architecture in Brazil and Hungary; Studies in Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage in Spain; Calligraphy in Japan; Textiles, Woodwork, Metalwork and Home Economics in Denmark; Computer Art in Hungary; Literature in Germany; Domestic Science, Literature and Physical Education in Sweden; Movement in Italy and Portugal; Gymnastics in The Netherlands; and Oratory in New Zealand.

3.6 Common Learning Processes and the Arts
A common learning process is a curriculum structure which is applied to a group of subjects that have common features. For example, in Australia each of the Arts forms that comprise the Arts Learning Area is expected to be taught according to the following common learning processes: Creating, Making and Presenting; Arts Criticism and Aesthetics; Past and Present Contexts. In overseas countries, common learning processes are included in the Arts curricula of Japan, Saskatchewan, Scotland, Spain, and the USA. Table 3.5 illustrates this information.
Table 3.5: Summary of countries responding to the questionnaire which structure the Arts forms in a “national curriculum” according to common learning processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description of Common Learning Processes across the Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Saskatchewan)</td>
<td>• Creative/Productive Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural/Historical Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical/Responsive Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>• Acquiring active knowledge of materials and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inquiring how to make and to appreciate Art works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Realising communication through images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>• “Using” materials, techniques, skills and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Expressing” feeling, ideas, thoughts and solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Evaluating” and “Appreciating”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>• Image made through classic or technological media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (a) Perception and representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Expression of feelings and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding different meanings and aesthetic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>• Creating and Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perceiving and Analysing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding Cultural and Historical Contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corresponding to each country are the common learning processes which structure the Arts Education curriculum. In each case three common learning processes are nominated.

Saskatchewan Education (1991, 1992, 1996) has published an Arts curriculum guide for each school year level (Kindergarten to Year 12), as well as for band and choir at the senior secondary levels: Years 10, 11 and 12. Four strands are included in the Arts curriculum: Dance, Drama, Music, and Visual Arts and for students to fully appreciate the Arts they need to study each of the four strands of the program. The three common learning processes (called components) accommodate the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes in the areas of perception, procedures; conceptual understanding and personal expression. The three components are intended to be interwoven throughout the teaching of each Arts form and are not to be segregated. The Creative/Productive Component includes the exploration, development and expression of ideas in the language of each Arts form. The Cultural/Historical Component deals with the role of the Arts in culture, the development of the Arts throughout history and the factors that influence the Arts and Artists. The
Critical/Responsive Component enables students to respond critically to images, sounds, performances and events in the Artistic environment, including the mass media. Unlike Australia, the descriptions of each component in the Saskatchewan curriculum do not include a reference to “presenting” or “performing” in any Arts form. The three components are complemented by Foundational Objectives which describe the content for each Arts form in more detail using language specific to each Arts form. The objectives are broad in scope and development can take the entire length of time a student spends in the primary school (five years) narrowing to just one year in the higher school levels. (Saskatchewan Education, 1991, 1992, 1996).

The Scottish Expressive Arts curriculum comprises the four subjects of Art and Design, Drama, Music, and Physical Education. Each Arts form is described according to three common attainment outcomes (common learning processes) in which students are expected to become competent. The attainment outcomes are described as Using materials, techniques, skills and media; Expressing feelings, ideas, thoughts and solutions; and Evaluating and Appreciating. Within each attainment outcome there is a series of strands that help identify the key aspects of each Arts form. Three strands are defined for Using materials, techniques, skills and media, and described using language specifically suitable for each Arts form. With minor exceptions, a common language is used to describe the remaining two attainment outcomes for each Arts form. Two strands are nominated for Expressing: Creating and Designing, and Communicating and Presenting. Presenting is not included for the Visual Arts but is used for the other Arts forms. Evaluating and Appreciating has one strand, recorded as Observing, Reflecting, Describing and Responding. Listening is added to this strand for Drama and Music (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

The Japanese curriculum contains three common learning processes for Arts Education. These common learning processes apply to the Arts forms taught in the Japanese curriculum: Music, Visual Arts, Calligraphy, and Craft. The Arts forms in the Spanish curriculum - Dance, Drama, Music, Visual Arts, and Design - are linked together by three common learning processes.
The USA *National Standards for the Arts* are listed as Dance, Music, Theatre, and Visual Arts as these are generally understood to constitute the Fine and Performing Arts. The *National Standards for the Arts* are organised around Content Standards, Achievement Standards and broad process categories. The number of Content Standards vary across the Arts forms: Dance has seven, Music has nine, Theatre has eight, and Visual Arts has six. A varying number of Achievement Standards are matched to each Content Standard. The Content Standards for each of the four Arts forms are grouped into common learning processes termed “broad process categories”. The categories which have been developed from the Discipline-Based Arts Education approach are Creating and Performing, Perceiving and Analysing, and Understanding Cultural and Historical Contexts. Neither the Content Standards nor their relevant broad process categories are assumed to be equal in importance.

Unlike the other Arts forms where a Content Standard refers to “performance”, Visual Arts does not include a Content Standard which refers to “presenting” as an equivalent activity.

### 3.7 Multi-Arts

As was seen from the discussion about Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts in the Literature Review, there is no common understanding or definition of the term Multi-Arts, nor is there a common explanation of how Multi-Arts teaching should proceed. Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to comment on the inclusion of Multi-Arts in their country's Arts curricula as a way of providing a background for the Australian experience.

The inclusion of Multi-Arts in the Arts curricula of the surveyed countries falls into different categories. Iceland and New Zealand have indicated that the idea is unacceptable. A longer list of countries do not include Multi-Arts. In some instances the respondent for the country was neither able to find a corresponding term or concept, nor able to delineate an equivalent activity. These countries include Argentina, Austria, Brazil, the Czech Republic, France, Ghana, Greece, Hong Kong, Mexico, Luxembourg and Switzerland. In Japan, Italy and Spain discussions about Multi-Arts have taken place but no firm decision has been made. Teachers in England and the USA have the freedom to use a Multi-Arts approach although no official direction is given in the curriculum. Knight (1996) in his response to the survey
questionnaire notes that schools in England are not prevented from developing an Integrated Arts program, but the syllabus for each Arts form stresses the skills and knowledge to be developed. Lehman (1997) in his response to the questionnaire comments that interdisciplinary teaching is recognised as important but because the USA National Standards for the Arts are expressed in terms of what students should know and be able to do, a narrower focus is more useful. The Saskatchewan Arts curriculum includes an interrelated unit exploring a common theme through the four Arts strands at each Year level. The common attainment structure of the Scottish Expressive Arts curriculum makes a Multi-Arts approach very possible. The Arts subject titled “Aesthetics” in Flanders may be considered a type of Multi-Arts. South Africa has acknowledged that an Integrated Arts approach for students in the primary school will give them a richer experience of the Arts. Denmark, Norway and Sweden include integrative projects between the Arts and other subjects. Germany has special groups and project days when the Arts are integrated under the heading of Performing and Interpretative Arts. Multi-Arts is recommended in Finland as part of integrative learning in all subjects and the flexible nature of the Arts curricula in Hungary encourages integration. All Arts forms in Portugal are taught using an integrative approach. Respondents to the questionnaire seemed to indicate a more integrative approach not only to the Arts but to all subjects in the curriculum in Ghana, Ireland and The Netherlands.

Where Multi-Arts is part of a country's Arts curricula the teaching approach used is in terms of integration. By contrast, the majority of the writers discussed in the Literature Review (Chapter Two) would seem to favour merely “making links or connections” in preference to overall integration per se. Such writers include Abbs (1993), Emery (1995), Stephens (1996), Wiggins and Wiggins (1997) and an article “Setting the Record Straight: Give and Take on the National Standards for Arts Education” (1996).

3.8 Assessment in Music

The respondents to the questionnaire were asked to detail the way in which teachers make a judgement about a student's standard in Music. In general, the criteria used are mostly according to what a student should know and be able to do. Some respondents gave specific
examples of attributes which are included in assessment. These include Singing, Listening, Playing Instruments, Music Theory, Music General Knowledge, Music Notation, and Music Composition. More specific examples of procedures are outlined by the respondents from Saskatchewan, Brandenburg and Hungary. In Saskatchewan (Canada), Music is assessed with a focus on the degree to which each student has achieved the Foundational Objectives and the Specific Learning Objectives of each program. In Brandenburg (Germany) four different tasks are used: analysing and interpretation; discussion of selected texts; describing methods, facts and terms used in Music compositions; and playing or singing from written notation. In Hungary curriculum objectives that are to be accomplished by students completing Years 4, 6, 8 and 10 are specified.

Respondents were also asked how teachers would report the standard achieved in Music. The range and types of grading used in the countries surveyed was so diverse that it would be futile to attempt to collate it into discrete categories.

As a general summary respondents indicated four approaches to assessment. First, many countries use a numerical or letter grade over a varying range. In some cases a one word descriptor accompanies the grade. Second, descriptive reporting is a feature of Music assessment in Denmark and Norway. A third way of describing a Music assessment is by the use of Level Descriptors which extend over the full range of schooling. England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales use this approach. South Africa is proposing to introduce Level Descriptors. Eight Level Descriptors are proposed to cover the 13 years of schooling in New Zealand, but, as Parsons (1997) reports, the New Zealand Arts curriculum is not expected to be completed until 2001. The fourth approach to assessment is the development of Performance Standards indicating achievement at progressive levels. The USA is the most advanced country using this approach and England is beginning to establish a similar method. Discussion has also taken place in Victoria (Australia) about proceeding with this type of assessment in all the Arts forms.
Brazil and Iceland reported that their methods of assessing Music are under revision. In Brazil, the different approaches used in each State make a generalisation difficult. Iceland plans to require every subject including Music to state outcomes in terms of standards in a revision of assessment expected to be completed by the summer of 1998.

Because Level Descriptors form part of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, together with a movement to introduce Performance Standards into the Arts curriculum in Victoria, it is appropriate to discuss more fully these approaches as they are used by other countries. A Level Descriptor describes the knowledge, skills and understanding that the majority of students should achieve, most often after a specified period of tuition. Each Level Descriptor increases in complexity.

Eight Level Descriptors are spread across Key Stages 1 to 3 in the Northern Ireland curriculum. Level Descriptors 1 to 4 relate to Key Stage 1. Level Descriptors 1 to 6 are included with Key Stage 2 (the end of primary school). The eight Level Descriptors are matched with Key Stage 3 and students are expected to working at Level Descriptor 5 or 6 by the end of Key Stage 3. This represents school years 8 to 10 and the end of *compulsory* teaching in the Arts. (Department for Education Northern Ireland, 1996, 1997).

In Scotland, five Level Descriptors labelled A to E are used. Each Level Descriptor is matched with the suggested level of attainment by students in primary and secondary school:

- Level A: first three years of primary school
- Level B: most students in Year 4 at primary school
- Level C: students between Year 4 and 6 in the primary school
- Level D: students in Year 7 of primary school, and
- Level E: students in their second year of secondary school.
  (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

End of the Key Stage descriptions in Music in the *English National Curriculum* define the standard that the majority of pupils should achieve by the ages of 7, 11 and 14 years. The first statutory requirement for assessment in Music occurred in 1997 for pupils at Key Stage 3. From 1997, assessment changes have been introduced for the Arts forms in the *English*
National Curriculum. Knight (1996), when addressing the Australian Association of Research in Music Education Conference, stated that Performance Standards, to be seen as benchmarks or expectations, would be established for each Arts form, including Music. Accompanying Key Stages 1 and 2, a Performance Standard in four levels of competency has been set, using the descriptors “working towards”, “achieving”, “working beyond” and “exceptional”. Knight was unable to identify an expected “pass” rate, and whether it would represent a minimum or majority standard. In Music, work samples of expected standards have been distributed to teachers in the six areas of:

- controlling sounds,
- performance ensemble,
- developing musical ideas,
- communication through music,
- knowledge and understanding in different times and places, and
- reflecting and evaluating.

The Music Educators National Conference (USA) has developed Performance Standards for Music in conjunction with the Content and Achievement Standards that are documented as part of the National Standards for the Arts. The Content and Achievement Standards are established at three cluster levels - Kindergarten to Year 4, Year 5 to 8, and Year 9 to 12. For Music only, Lehman (1998) and Webster (1998) both confirm that because of the special nature of the discipline of Music, Pre-Kindergarten Content, Achievement and Performance Standards have been written by the Music Educators National Conference. The Performance Standards for Music use the same grade cluster levels as the National Standards for the Arts. The Performance Standards for Music include an assessment strategy designed to “test” each of the Achievement Standards listed under the nine Content Standards. A basic, proficient and advanced level of response are described for each assessment strategy. In most cases, each level of response is described under a number of points giving clear details of the skills which could be expected from a student as an indication that they have achieved the set assessment task.
3.9 Chapter Summary

The responses to the questionnaires, together with additional material gathered from the literature, Arts curriculum documents, conference papers and correspondence with the researcher have been discussed in this chapter under seven headings. The issues discussed link with those introduced in the review of the literature. The survey responses expand on the ways in which countries interpret and implement a “national curriculum”, national standards, cross-curricula themes, an Arts Learning Area, Multi-Arts and assessment. An extension of the use of an Arts Learning Area is the development of common learning processes to describe the structure of each Arts form included in the Arts Learning Area. Only five countries of those surveyed have adopted this approach. The respondents were also asked to list the school years and school subjects which were covered by the country's “national curriculum”. A wide variation exists in the number of primary and secondary school years covered by the various “national curricula”. Belgium, the Czech Republic and Luxembourg include pre-school education in their “national curricula”. A wide variety of elective subjects are available to students, especially at secondary school. A series of tables illustrating the collated data complements the discussion.

Chapter Four focusses on the significant past Australian and Victorian reports into Education and the Arts and the past Victorian Arts/Music curriculum documents. These curriculum documents and reports have guided Arts and Music Education policy development in Australian schools and they have provided a context for the design and development of the Australian Statements and Profiles. The Australian documents consist solely of reports into Education and the Arts. The Victorian documents include one report which focusses on Education and the Arts and three Arts/Music curriculum documents implemented by Victorian schools prior to the Arts CSF. Some elements of the Arts curricula used in Victorian schools before the release of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF have been influential in the development of these Arts documents.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 PAST AUSTRALIAN AND VICTORIAN DOCUMENTS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter examines the significant past Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents and reports. The past Australian documents considered in this chapter consist of six reports into Education and the Arts. The past Victorian documents include one Arts Education report and three Arts curricula documents. The Australian and Victorian reports have guided Arts and Music Education policy development in schools and reference has been made to them in the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. Some elements of the past Victorian Arts curricula can be seen as having an influence in the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF.

4.2 Past Australian Documents
Since 1975 six significant reports concerning Education and the Arts in Australia have been written. These reports are often referenced in any discussion about Arts Education in Australia. The reports are:

- Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts (1977)
- Arts on Course (1980)
- Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980)

Although the Australian Statements and Profiles are the result of a unique collaborative process between all the States and Territories of the Australian Commonwealth, previous attempts in collaborative curriculum decision making in Australia have occurred. The former Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) in Canberra was responsible for some of this work. The CDC operated as a national body under the auspices of the Australian Government to
devise and develop school curriculum and undertake related research. In 1976 and 1977 the CDC formed a number of study groups including one with a focus on the Expressive Arts. The *Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts* (1977) questions the traditional subject-specific approach to Arts Education, especially at the secondary school level where the Arts curriculum was separated into set stages. The same report questions the continual rigid isolation of Arts forms from each other even when links are obvious, for example between Dance and Music. The report also explores the notion of treating the Arts in an integrated way, both within the Arts, where a commonality exists, and between non-Arts forms. The authors of the *Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts* (1977:29) caution against a perceived trend towards specialist Arts teaching creating a situation where “Arts become a rather special, rarified subject for special, rarified people”. They advocate a more integrated and less highly specialised approach.

The report acknowledges that “the Arts” in schools cannot be narrowly defined and that the area includes the traditional and established Artistic disciplines of Literature, Drama, Painting, Music and Dance which do not exist as self-contained entities. In addition, the report lists the many related Arts forms which also are available in schools. These are, in Visual Arts: Drawing, Lithography, Print-Making, Sculpture, Collage; in Crafts: Pottery, Plastics, Leatherwork, Weaving, Macrame; in Literature: Novels, Short Stories, Poetry, Journalism, Creative Writing, Language Skills, Drama; and in Music: Opera, Mime, Musicals, Vaudeville, Dance-Drama. The Arts forms of Photography, Film, Video and Audio-Visual Arts are listed as being available in some schools. The report identifies a bias towards Visual Arts and suggests that Music and Drama play an inferior role in the provision of Arts Education. It is also noted that Dance is very poorly treated and linked to the unrelated “sport-oriented” Physical Education. At the same time it is noted that the newer Arts forms such as Photography are even more neglected than Dance. Literature, it is suggested, suffers from a “functional” bias - being secure as part of English but lacking the opportunity for imagination. The authors of this report maintained a close liaison with the authors of another Australian Commonwealth Government report, *Education and the Arts*, also published in 1977.

A joint study in 1977 between the Australian Schools Commission (the then Australian Commonwealth Government's education arm) and the Australia Council (the Australian Commonwealth Government's Arts funding body) commissioned a report into Arts Education from each Australian State and Territory as well as a National Report. A national report and nine separate reports all with the common title *Education and the Arts* (followed by the name of the State or Territory) were produced. The *Education and the Arts: National Report* (1977) encompasses a wide variety of Artistic forms of expression and it groups Arts forms in the familiar categories of Visual Arts, Craft, Music, Drama, Dance, Film, Television and Radio, and Creative Writing. The National Report acknowledges the need to view all the Arts as being of equal value, even though some Arts forms have a longer history in education. The National Report identifies four important objectives for all students participating in an Arts Education. These are to provide opportunities for

- access to the Arts
- success in the Arts
- to build confidence in the Arts and display commitment to the Arts, and
- to achieve excellence in the Arts.

The authors of the National Report comment that amongst all the Arts forms, Music is the most "respectable" and the longest established Arts subject. This comment is in contrast to the reference in the *Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts* (1977) that a bias towards Visual Arts is evident in schools. The authors of *Education and the Arts: National Report* comment that Classroom Music content has consisted of Singing and Studying the Lives and Music of Famous Composers with a focus on the Western European tradition of the 18th and 19th centuries. The National Report acknowledges the debate regarding the merits of Music Education techniques which are "new" in schools, for example Kodály, Orff Schulwerk, Suzuki, Yamaha, and Dalcroze. Other areas of concern detailed in the Music section of the National Report are Instrumental Music teaching in primary and secondary schools, Music specialists attached to primary schools, and student access to Australian Music and Artists. In an historical account of Arts Education in Australia schools from the
1930s to the 1980s, Comte (1988), who chaired the Music Committee for the Victorian Report, makes special mention of three issues that are also highlighted in the National Report. These are the narrow focus on Visual Arts and Music as the only two Arts forms offered in schools; the inappropriate structure and timetabling provisions in secondary schools as contributing to the low status of the Arts in schools; and concern about the inadequate training in the Arts for teachers and the flow-on effect in schools.

*Education and the Arts: Victorian Report* is discussed with the Victorian documents in this chapter. Only limited action on the *Education and the Arts* reports followed at the State and Territory levels and even less was done nationally.

### 4.2.3 *Arts on Course (1980)*

In April 1980, a joint Conference focussing on Education and the Arts was organised by the Australian Schools Commission and the Australia Council. The Conference was entitled *Arts on Course*. Each State and Territory presented a progress report resulting from the 1977 *Education and the Arts* study and the process leading to the commissioning of the ten individual reports. The progress reports for each State and Territory were spread across a period of three to five years from 1975 to 1980. The various State reports highlighted the advances made in the areas of concern explored in the 1977 *Education and the Arts* study. In summary, the State reports at the *Arts on Course* Conference indicated that the Arts form known as Graphic Communication or Visual Communication was being placed under the Visual Arts umbrella; that the study of Film, Radio and Television was being incorporated into Media; that an increased focus was being given to Dance either within Physical Education or through the services of community groups; and that Theatre in Education and Drama in Education had been introduced.

### 4.2.4 *Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980)*

In 1980, the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) published a booklet entitled *Core Curriculum for Australian Schools*. Lokan (1997) says that this booklet appeared at a time when there was growing dissatisfaction with the suitability of Australian education to equip
students for a post-industrial economy. The education system was seen as not addressing this current need. This publication is the one Australian document up until this time that most closely resembles a “national curriculum” where a Core Curriculum of basic and essential learnings is promoted. The authors recommended that core learning experiences and core areas of knowledge form the basis of the structure of education in Australia. It is promoted in the publication Core Curriculum for Australian Schools that individual subjects should be replaced by core learning experiences which interweave with core areas of knowledge. The notion of cross-curricula themes is explored with the inclusion of core learning experiences. The Curriculum Development Centre (1980:14) acknowledges that to plan and construct a Core Curriculum the following points need to be taken into account:

- the general aims of education
- the aims, values, directions and needs of Australian society
- the aims for schooling produced by various authorities
- the characteristics and needs of students
- the present capacities and resources available to schools
- school experience and examples of successful core practice
- theory, research and practice relating to learning processes.

The Core Curriculum proposals promoted in the booklet describe education in terms of broad areas of knowledge, experience and processes. The traditional view, where knowledge was packaged into subjects, was now considered inappropriate. Seven core learning processes feeding into nine core areas of knowledge and experience were established. The goal was to find ways of incorporating processes and experiences which did not involve a unique dependence on particular subjects, but instead a focus on an interdisciplinary or non-disciplinary way of grouping subjects. The seven core learning processes are:

- Ways of Organising Knowledge
- Dispositions and Values
- Interpersonal and Group Relationships
- Learning and Thinking Technique
- Skills or Abilities
- Forms of Expression, and
- Practical Performances.
The nine areas of knowledge and experience are:

- Arts and Crafts
- Environmental Studies
- Mathematics
- Social, Cultural and Civic Studies
- Health Education
- Science and Technology
- Communication
- Moral Reasoning and Values, and
- Work, Leisure and Lifestyle.

In *Core Curriculum for Australian Schools* (1980:18) Arts and Crafts are defined as covering “a wide and diverse area including Literature, Music, Visual Arts, Drama, Wood, Metal and Plastic Crafts and many others”. The publication acknowledges that although it may not be entirely satisfactory to group the listed Arts forms together, in the school setting they have common features. Because particular Arts forms had been neglected in schools, the group contributing to the publication *Core Curriculum for Australian Schools* (1980:18) was divided in its opinion about the need for “general Aesthetic Education as distinct from expression through the Arts”. The group also identified an “uneven” approach to basic Craft teaching in schools. Craft as a separate subject has been a feature of all three reports discussed to this point. In a discussion about the historical significance of these reports Emery (1997a) comments that “Crafts” is an odd term in a description of Arts Education. As with the *Education and the Arts* National Report, the constitutional rights of the Australian States and Territories precluded the formal adoption Australia-wide of the Curriculum Development Centre's proposals.


The ten documents making up *Education and the Arts* (1977) were considered to represent a significant landmark in Australian Arts Education. These reports were expanded by *Action: Education and the Arts* (1984), a report prepared for the Minister for Education and Youth
Affairs. The *Education and the Arts* (1977) reports provided the terms of reference for the 1984 report, which resulted from a series of meetings by a taskforce. The taskforce agreed that the Arts should be broadly defined and adopted the categories of the 1977 report. It agreed that Dance should be interpreted as “Dance-Movement” and Design was accepted as both a distinct category and as a contribution to other Arts and Crafts. Agreement was reached that Architecture should be included. The *Action: Education and the Arts* report (1984:30) recognised the need to distinguish the Arts forms traditionally performed by women “such as Embroidery, Knitting, Craft, Garment-Making, Quilt-Making, Lace and Doyley-Making and Cake-Making” from the Arts forms taught in schools. The taskforce reported that the four objectives for Arts Education endorsed in the 1977 *Education and the Arts* study and the general impetus advanced by that study had encouraged all State and Territory Governments to develop policies for Arts Education. One issue highlighted for primary schools was the need to provide broad experiences in the Visual Arts, Crafts, Dance and Movement, Drama and Media Studies. Two issues identified for secondary schools included the need to strive for excellence in all Arts forms, the traditional and the contemporary, and a concern about the compartmentalisation of Arts subjects in Arts Education. The *Action: Education and the Arts* report (1984:33) states: “The common element of Design and the complementary elements of different Art forms . . . should be stressed where possible with the goal of providing an Integrated Arts education which values all Arts forms”.


The *National Arts in Australian Schools* project (NAAS) focusses on the Arts as a combined area. NAAS was formed in 1986 as a recommendation from the 1984 *Action: Education and the Arts* taskforce. The project was undertaken by the Curriculum Development Centre “to identify, examine, document and disseminate significant policy issues and effective promotion of Arts education in Australian schools” (McLeod, 1991:iii). Among a number of commissioned papers and policy documents, four booklets were published between 1989 and 1991 by the Curriculum Corporation of Australia, the Government body which replaced the CDC. McLeod (1991), the author of one of the booklets entitled *The Arts and the Year 2000*,
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comments that the challenge for an Arts curriculum is to be relevant and meaningful for students. He continues that with "meaning" placed at the centre of Arts experiences, activities such as Making and Appreciating, which contribute to "meaning", become secondary. McLeod (1991:9) suggests that the Arts provide a common way of knowing "in which the affective, cognitive and skill aspects are totally intertwined". In the area of curriculum planning, he supports the development of an Arts Learning Area. McLeod proposes that each Arts form has both sufficient distinguishing features and similar qualities to be seen as a "subset" of the Arts. With a focus on the Arts Learning Area rather than individual Arts disciplines, he remarks that an emphasis on consistency within diversity can be achieved.

4.3 Past Victorian Documents

The Victorian documents for discussion are:


Although the 1977 study *Education and the Arts* referred to earlier in this chapter was not acted upon, the Victorian Report which forms part of the 1977 National study, has a place in the historical development of Arts Education in Victoria. The Victorian Report focusses on the six Arts forms identified in the National Report. The Chairman of the Victorian Music Committee was Martin Comte and in this capacity he had primary responsibility for writing the Music section of the Victorian Report. The Music section refers to the shortage of general Classroom Music and specialist Instrumental Music teachers in Victorian Government secondary schools. The "out-dated" content and "haphazard" provision of Music teaching in both Government primary and secondary schools is also highlighted. It is noted that the emphasis in secondary schools is on Singing, and History and Literature of Music, with a focus on Musical developments that took place before the 20th century. There was little
evidence of creativity as part of Classroom Music and core Classroom Music is rarely available beyond the first two years of secondary school. The designation of five Government secondary schools as specialist Music schools, to cater for the needs of talented Musicians, is commented on favourably.

The preamble in *Education and the Arts: Victorian Report* (1977b:1) to the Art/Craft section comments that “Craft” has not been treated separately and that “in the minds of the writers there is a lack of certainty that Art and Craft can or should be separated”. The preamble in *Education and the Arts: Victorian Report* (1977b:35) to the Drama section offers another opinion that could be considered in the current debate about integrating Arts forms in the classroom. Drama is described as “the integrating medium for the Arts in education. . . . it partakes of Music, Dance, Writing, Vocal Art and Design, using them where they are most effective for the statement being made”.

The three curriculum documents used for the teaching of Music and the Arts in Victorian schools from 1981 follow appropriately from the *Education and the Arts: Victorian Report*. The recommendations of the Victorian Report are reflected in the curriculum documents designed for use in the classroom. The four objectives of Arts Education contained in the National Report and endorsed by the Victorian Report - access, participation, confidence and commitment, and excellence - are evident in the curriculum documents that followed.


The curriculum document *A Guide to Music in the Primary School* (1981) was written by the Music Branch Resource Centre staff in collaboration with classroom teachers and Music specialists for the Primary Schools Division, Education Department of Victoria. The Music Branch Resource Centre was part of the Special Services Division established by the Victorian Education Department in 1970. Special Services Division was responsible for the areas of the school curriculum that required special support such as Music, Physical Education, and Art and Craft. The Music Branch Resource Centre had existed previously in the Primary Division and was moved to the Special Services Division.
Ferris (1993) claims that *A Guide to Music in the Primary School* (1981) cannot be considered an innovative document as it represents a summary of a Music Branch inservice curriculum document entitled "A New Programme for Teaching Music" which was in use during the 1970s. *A Guide to Music in the Primary School* (1981:1) was prepared to assist teachers to devise a class or school Music program and consideration was given to:

- research concerning the Musical characteristics of children
- the cognitive developmental stages of children
- a variety of approaches to Music Education.

*A Guide to Music in the Primary School* establishes a sequential development of Musical skills and understandings which are illustrated in a scope and sequence chart from preliminary stage to stage six. The stages represent a developmental sequence through which children pass. The stages do not necessarily correlate with the year levels in the primary school and are not intended as prescriptions for achievement at particular school years. Six elements of Musical Knowledge (Rhythm, Melody, Expression, Tone Colour and Style, Harmony, and Form) and five Musical Experiences (Singing, Listening, Playing, Moving, Creating) are used to establish a scope and sequence chart depicting the stages of student development in Music.

4.3.3 **Curriculum Frameworks** (1988).

The overarching title *Curriculum Frameworks* (1988) consists of 12 books:

*Curriculum Frameworks: P-12 An Introduction* (1985) (no number)

*Getting Started with Frameworks* (1988) (no number)

1. **School Curriculum and Organisation Framework: P-12** (1988)
2. **Arts Framework: P-10** (1988)
4. **English Language Framework: P-10** (1988)
8. **Science Framework: P-10** (1988)


Numbers two to ten of this collection represent the Learning Areas which constituted the curriculum areas in Victorian schools. The focus is on curriculum activities for Preparatory Year to Year 10. By contrast, the reference to Preparatory Year to Year 12 in the titles of *Curriculum Frameworks: P-12 An Introduction* and *School Curriculum and Organisation Framework: P-12* covered all 13 years of schooling.

The *Curriculum Frameworks* project had its origins in 1985 when the Minister for Education published the Victorian *Ministerial Papers 1-6*. These papers provided the basis for the development of *Curriculum Frameworks* and the *Victorian Certificate of Education* (VCE). The content and purpose of the *Ministerial Papers* was to determine the current Government's Statewide Education policy. Two principles underpinned the Government's policy: participatory and collaborative decision making involving the school community, and the provision of opportunities for all students to achieve success in education. The titles of the papers are:


Ministerial Paper number 3  *The State Board of Education* (1983)

Ministerial Paper number 4  *School Councils* (1983)


The last of these, Ministerial Paper number 6, provided the impetus for *Curriculum Frameworks* (1988). The topics covered in Ministerial Paper number 6 are:

1. Access and Success
2. Individual Differences
3. Learning and Learning Styles
4. Teaching Strategies
5. Negotiating the Curriculum

6. Assessment and Reporting

The *School Curriculum and Organisation Framework: P-12* (1988) provides a very tight connection with the content of Ministerial Paper number 6. The Framework was published to help school communities plan, develop and implement a curriculum that was to meet the needs of all students and the needs of the society in which they live. The document provides general curriculum advice for all Learning Areas. Content areas include “An Overview of School Curriculum and Organisation”, “Developing a Comprehensive Curriculum”, “Improving Learning and Teaching”, “Assessment and Reporting”, “Curriculum Decision Making”, and “Curriculum Improvement”.

The *Arts Framework: P-10* (1988) is one of the Learning Areas of the *School Curriculum and Organisation Framework*. The Arts document proposes that learning in the Arts is essentially student-centred and is fundamentally an experimental and practical process. This approach values the differences in perception, insight, knowledge, needs, and capacities of each student. The *Arts Framework: P-10* has two main parts. Part A: The Arts Core Statement, and Part B: Individual Arts Statements. The Arts Core Statement includes a rationale for Arts Education, a perspective on learning and teaching in the Arts, advice and guidelines for program planning and evaluation, advice on assessment and reporting, a reference list, and the presentation of an Arts Learning Model. The Arts Learning Model (1988:13) illustrates the following interactive learning processes:

- *Perceiving* (sensing, receiving, experiencing)
- *Transforming* (thinking, feeling, imagining, intuiting, problem-solving)
- *Expressing* (making, communicating designing, producing, performing, representing)
- *Appreciating* (understanding, analysing, reflecting, sharing)

The context in which learning takes place envelopes the model.

The Individual Arts Statements in the *Arts Framework: P-10* for Art/Craft, Dance, Drama, Graphic Communication, Media Education, and Music are approached in a variety of ways.
The various structures chosen for the presentation of the material do not allow for integration between the Arts. The Music Statement gives scant attention to the Arts Learning Model and Drama makes a marginally better attempt. By contrast each of the other Arts Statements is very strong on developing a relationship between the particular Arts discipline and the generic Arts Learning Model. The writers of the Individual Arts Statements worked independently of each other (there was no collaboration between the writers of the six Arts Statements) and this mostly likely explains why some writers developed a stronger link with the Arts Learning Model than others.


*Designing an Instrumental Music Program* contains four booklets:


This series is a joint project between the Ministry of Education (Schools Division), Victoria, and the Department of Education, Queensland. The first three booklets in the series were prepared and published by the Ministry of Education, Victoria in 1988. The fourth booklet in the series was prepared and published by the Department of Education, Queensland, in 1990.

*Designing an Instrumental Music Program: Establishing the Program* provides practical advice on the administration of an Instrumental Music program. *Designing an Instrumental Music Program: An Overview of Areas of Learning and Skill Development* establishes a structure used by the more specific *Designing an Instrumental Music Program: String Instruments* and *Designing an Instrumental Music Program: Wind and Percussion Instruments*. The areas of learning and skill development as listed in the table of contents of the Overview booklet (1988: unpaged) are placed into five levels. Levels 1 to 5 follow sequentially. Each level describes what should be the achievement of an average secondary
student after a one-year cumulative course, with the acknowledgment that students in the primary school will probably progress at a slower rate. The areas are:

- The Instrument (parts of the instrument, maintenance)
- Playing Posture
- Tone and Vibrato
- Pitch Repertoire (range, scales and arpeggios, scale and arpeggio patterns, technical exercises)
- Tuning and Intonation
- Articulation
- Symbols and Terms
- Rhythmic and Melodic Perception
- Improvisation and Composition
- Sight Reading
- Performance (performing from memory, ensemble, solo)

These booklets were the first to be written with a specific focus on teaching Instrumental Music since the introduction of this specialist teaching approach in Victorian Government secondary schools in 1967. The booklets were distributed freely to all Government secondary schools in Victoria. Although a large gap in time exists between the commencement of Instrumental Music teaching and the publication of these booklets, the catalyst for their development was the growth of ensemble groups in schools, particularly concert bands, and the "grading" of music for school ensembles. Unfortunately, the booklets have had minimal usage and influence, with many Instrumental Music teachers being unaware of their availability. The booklets were not distributed directly to Instrumental Music teachers, instead they were sent to school principals and Classroom Music teachers.

4.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has brought together the significant reports and curriculum documents that have guided Arts and Music Education policy development in schools and been of influence in the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. The
six Australian documents consist of reports into Education and the Arts. The four Victorian documents include one report into Education and the Arts and three curriculum documents which have been implemented in Victorian schools before the development of the CSF.

Some of the issues raised in the Literature Review and the overview of overseas Arts curricula are also apparent in the past Australian and Victorian curriculum documents. The six Australian reports were either developed through a national collaborative effort or they constitute reports from each State and Territory. The sole Victorian report referred to in this chapter, although published separately, is also part of a larger National study. With the exception of the report entitled Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980) which has a general section as well as sections devoted to each area of knowledge, all the other reports specifically address Arts Education. The specific inclusion of Arts Education in all but one of these documents is indicative of a strong desire by Arts Educators to develop Arts policies which encompass each Australian State and Territory.

Underlying most of the Arts reports discussed in this chapter would seem to be an assumption that the Arts are part of a Learning Area. The exception is Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980) where the writers were concerned that because particular Arts forms had been neglected in schools, promotion of an Arts Learning Area would compound the problem.

Each of the reports list the Arts forms that should be part of an Arts Learning Area. Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts (1977), Education and the Arts: National and Victorian Reports (1977), and Action: Education and the Arts (1984) all refer to the narrow approach taken to Arts teaching in Australia where the focus is primarily on Visual Arts and Music at the expense of other Arts forms. The Arts forms listed in these reports are extensive, encouraging the inclusion of Arts forms not traditionally associated with schooling.

It is noted in both the National and Victorian Reports of Education and the Arts that the content of Music teaching in schools is not reflective of a more up-to-date focus and that the provision for teaching Music is inconsistent throughout primary and secondary schools.
The possibility of developing common learning processes as a linking mechanism between each of the Arts forms is addressed by McLeod (1991), author of *The Arts and the Year 2000*. McLeod comments on the commonalities between Arts forms as well identifying that each has differences. The *Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts* touches upon the idea of common learning processes with reference to integration within the Arts where commonalities exist between the Arts forms. The *Report of the Study Group into the Expressive Arts* and *Action: Education and the Arts* refer to the value of integrating the Arts forms.

The main strength of the Victorian curriculum document *A Guide to Music in the Primary School* (1981) is the listing of a variety of elements that make up the content of a Music curriculum and approaches to teaching these elements. The division of the content into stages provides teachers with a clear indication of assessment standards in the form of a scope and sequence chart, although no additional advice on this topic is given.

*Curriculum Frameworks* (1988) is a Victorian curriculum document which served to provide guidelines for teaching of content and advice for assessment and reporting. Although not a compulsory curriculum document for Victorian schools, the nine Learning Areas listed were adopted by schools as a way of structuring curriculum for Preparatory Year to Year 10. The *School Curriculum and Organisation Framework: P-12*, part of *Curriculum Frameworks*, includes general education principles which could be equated with cross-curricula themes.

The *Arts Framework: P-10* (1988) includes an Arts Learning Model and groups six Arts forms together into an Arts Learning Area. The Arts Learning Model contains four interactive learning processes which structure the learning experiences in the six Arts forms - a clear example of the use of common learning processes. The *Arts Framework: P-10* does not give advice about integrating the Arts forms.
Designing an Instrumental Music Program: An Overview of Areas of Learning and Skill Development (1988), part of the series Designing an Instrumental Music Program, includes the areas of learning and skill development that are considered integral in an Instrumental Music program. The list of learning experiences is extensive and these encourage teachers to pursue a more wholistic approach to teaching a Musical instrument as distinct from merely teaching students to reproduce Music of the past. The areas of learning and skill development are divided into five levels of achievement. This procedure provides teachers with a way of measuring the achievement of each student against set criteria.

Each of the documents included in this chapter have some elements that link to issues raised in Chapters Two and Three. The report Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980) most reflects a similarity to a “national curriculum”. All the Arts reports focus on an Arts Learning Area and include an extensive list of Arts forms that constitute an Arts Learning Area. The Victorian document Curriculum Frameworks (1988) incorporates many of the issues discussed although it is not a compulsory curriculum.

Chapter Five focusses on the current Australian and Victorian curriculum documents.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 CURRENT AUSTRALIAN AND VICTORIAN CURRICULUM DOCUMENTS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter focuses on the current Australian and Victorian curriculum documents. The chapter is in two parts, the Australian documents are presented first, followed by the Victorian documents. The Australian documents are the Arts Statement, and the Arts Profile and the drafts of each of these. The Victorian documents consist of the main curriculum document, the Arts CSF, and a number of support documents. In each section the development phases of the respective documents are highlighted. This is then followed by a discussion and analysis of the documents.

The chapter summary is in two sections. The first section summarises the current Australian and Victorian documents and refers to the same issues highlighted in the preceding chapters. The second part of the summary considers the influences on the current documents of the past reports and curriculum documents that are presented in Chapter Four.

The Australian Statements and Profiles were completed on 30 June 1993 and presented to the Australian Education Council (AEC) for ratification on 2 July 1993. As was explained in Chapter One, the Australian Constitution does not permit the adoption of a “national curriculum” on an Australia-wide basis. One major purpose for the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles was to establish a curriculum framework which could be implemented on a national level with the addition of local education initiatives. Unfortunately, this was not to be the case. The documents were returned to the States and Territories for local implementation without the collaborative dialogue that had characterised their development.

The main events leading to the completion of the Australian Statements and Profiles are summarised in the Table 5.1 (Lokan, 1997:4-5).
Table 5.1: Key Stages of Recent Curriculum and Assessment Reforms in Australia 1986 to 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Australian Education Council (AEC) resolved to 'support the concept of a national collaborative effort in curriculum development in Australia to utilise to maximum effort scarce curriculum resources and to ensure that unnecessary differences in curricula from State to State be minimised'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Commonwealth, States and Territories agreed to work on national collaborative curriculum projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1989   | Australian Education Council (AEC) ratified a formal declaration of 10 common and agreed national goals for schooling in Australia ('Hobart Declaration'). Out of this agreement the AEC identified eight broad areas of learning and commissioned the writing of *Statements and Profiles* in each. These areas are  
- The Arts  
- English  
- Health and Physical Education  
- Languages other than English (LOTE)  
- Mathematics  
- Science  
- Studies of Society and Environment  
- Technology. |
| 1988-1991 | Curriculum mapping occurred in the Learning Areas of Mathematics; English Literacy; Science; Technology; and Social Sciences and the Environment as a cross curriculum study to identify commonalities across state curricula. |
| 1988-1993 | Statements were written for the eight Key Learning Areas. The statements were written to define the Learning Areas of the curriculum identified in the agreed goals for schooling. |
| 1990   | Curriculum Corporation established to facilitate national collaborative curriculum development |
| 1991   | Establishment of Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CURASS). The role of this committee was to initiate and supervise national collaborative curriculum development. This committee replaced the Australasian Cooperative Assessment Program (managing *Profiles*) and AEC (managing *Statements*). |
| 1992   | CURASS developed national ESL scales and the 'Towards Level 1' section in the *Profiles*. |
| 1991-1993 | Consultation on the *Statements* occurred at State and national levels. Consultation on, trialing and empirical validation ('calibration') of the *Profiles* and ESL scales occurred at State and national levels. |
| 1992   | Work samples were collected from States and Territories for inclusion in the *Profiles*. |
| 1993   | *Statements and Profiles* were completed in their present form. AEC agreed that the publication of *Statements and Profiles* should be the responsibility of each State and Territory. |
5.2 Part One: The Australian Curriculum Documents

5.2.1 Australian Statements and Profiles

5.2.1.1 The Development of the Australian Statements and Profiles.

The paper *Strengthening Australia's Schools: A Consideration of the Focus and Content of Schooling* was the catalyst for the development of the *Statements and Profiles*. This paper was presented to the Australian Parliament in 1988 by the then Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training, John Dawkins. One major outcome of the Dawkin's paper was the development of the *Hobart Declaration on Schooling* (1989). Marsh (1994) notes that four elements from the *Hobart Declaration on Schooling* influenced the construction of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. These elements are the eight Key Learning Areas; English as a Second Language and Special Education; Cross-Curricula Themes; and Groups with Special Needs. The four elements are summarised in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Summary of elements from the *Hobart Declaration on Schooling* which influenced the construction of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements from the <em>Hobart Declaration on Schooling</em></th>
<th>Specific Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Eight Key Learning Areas | • English  
• Mathematics  
• Science  
• Technology  
• Languages other than English (LOTE)  
• Health and Physical Education  
• Studies of Society and the Environment (SOSE)  
• Arts |
| 2. English as a Second Language and Special Education | |
| 3. Cross-Curricula Themes | • Environment  
• Information Technology  
• Personal and Interpersonal Skills  
• Career and Work Education  
• Literacy and Numeracy |
| 4. Groups with Special Needs | • Girls  
• Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students  
• Geographically isolated students  
• Children in poverty  
• Students who leave school early |
Following the endorsement of the *Hobart Declaration on Schooling* in April 1989, the Australian Education Council (AEC) established the Curriculum Corporation of Australia. A curriculum mapping exercise was conducted to identify the common elements in school curriculum throughout Australia. The mapping exercise discovered that the frameworks and syllabi presently used in Australian schools had a great deal in common. The mapping exercise lead to the production of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* in eight agreed Key Learning Areas. For each Key Learning Area, a *Statement* was written first followed by a *Profile*.

A national secretariat of 10 staff was appointed by the Australian Education Council in May 1992 to ensure that the writing of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* was effectively monitored and supported, and completed by a deadline of 30 June 1993. The secretariat replaced the CURASS Key Learning Area steering committees. The work was presented to the State and Territory Ministers for Education on 2 July 1993.

The return of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* to the States and Territories for implementation encouraged writers including Francis (1993), Kennedy (1993a), Wilson (1993, 1994b), Boston (1994), Grundy (1994), Mann (1994a), and Malcolm (1995) to stress that the Australian *Statements and Profiles* did not constitute a "national curriculum". These writers held senior positions with the Curriculum Corporation of Australia and CURASS throughout the writing of the *Statements and Profiles*.

The writing of the Australian *Statement* on Mathematics in 1990 flags the beginning of the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. The conceptual framework developed by Boomer was used as the basis for the design of the *Profiles*. According to Marsh (1994:48) this conceptual framework comprised five areas:

- Bands of schooling (e.g. lower primary years, upper primary years)
- Subject elements (later termed "strands")
- Student outcomes in relation to each subject element
• Assignments which richly describe and illustrate the outcomes (later termed "pointers")
• Exemplifications (later termed "work samples")

Francis (1997), the Executive Director of the Curriculum Corporation of Australia during the time the Statements and Profiles were written, remarks that although the eight Key Learning Areas are considered to be "equal", some are still "more equal" than others. He makes this comment in the knowledge that CURASS never defined a core body of knowledge, learnings, skills and processes expected to be achieved by each student. The definition of such elements, he argued, would be associated with a compulsory "national curriculum", which the Statements and Profiles were never intended to represent. Therefore, at the level of implementation of the Australian Statements and Profiles, the States and Territories were free to make their own decisions about the resources to be allocated to each Key Learning Area as well as the expectations required of each student.

The national collaborative effort resulting in the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles is described by Marsh (1994:12) as being influenced by an "authority-innovation-decision" making model adapted from Rogers and Shoemaker (1971). Such a model consists of two distinct groups of decision making individuals: the "superordinate" group who initiate and direct curriculum development, and the "subordinate" group who implement the curriculum decisions. In this case the parties involved in the "superordinate" group are the Federal Minister and State Ministers for Education, the Australian Education Council, the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CURASS), the Federal Government Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET), the Curriculum Corporation of Australia (a private company owned jointly by the Federal and State Ministers for Education), the key and associate writers for the eight Key Learning Areas, Chief Executive Officers of the Government school systems and Directors of Accreditation Agencies. The "subordinate" group consists of professional associations, classroom teachers and principals.

The management model (Marsh, 1994:73) used for the writing of the Australian Statements and Profiles is illustrated in Figure 5.1.
The formation of national multidisciplinary professional subject associations occurred during the late 1980s on the offer of financial incentives to participate in the production of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. The National Affiliation of Arts Educators (NAAE), formed in 1989, is an example of such an association.

5.2.2 Australian *Statements*

The Australian *Statements* written between 1990 and 1993 provide a framework for curriculum development in each of the eight Key Learning Areas. Each *Statement* defines the Key Learning Area, outlines its essential elements, shows what is distinctive about it and describes a sequence for developing knowledge and skills for the first 10 years of schooling. Each Key Learning Area *Statement* consists of a “strand” and a “band”. Table 5.3 illustrates the parts of a strand and a band.
Table 5.3: The elements that make up a “strand” and a “band” within a Key Learning Area

Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Statement - Strand</th>
<th>Australian Statement - Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A strand is a group of “understandings of a Learning Area’s content, processes and concepts” (Arts Statement, 1994:1). e.g. Music in the Arts Learning Area</td>
<td>• A band describes the broad stages for developing the knowledge, understandings and skills in a Learning Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each strand includes the same interrelated strand organisers.</td>
<td>• The sequential learning experiences are described within each of the Bands A to D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strand organisers describe key areas and present varying approaches for studying the appropriate strand. e.g. Creating, Making and Presenting in the Music strand</td>
<td>• The bands are not intended to be age-related and students may progress through them at different rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strands are divided into the four bands of schooling common to all Key Learning Areas.</td>
<td>• The bands correspond to the following school Years and Profile Levels: Band A Lower primary - Levels 1 and 2 Band B Upper primary - Levels 3 and 4 Band C Lower secondary to Year 10 - Levels 5 and 6 Band D Upper secondary and post-compulsory years - Levels 7 and 8. (Arts Statement, 1994:26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marsh (1994) remarks that the major issue that haunted all eight writing teams involved with the Australian Statements was the nature of the strands or concepts: the segments that make up each Key Learning Area. In some Learning Areas writers were attracted to the use of generic strands - e.g. Transforming - because they provided the flexibility to cover a range of traditional subject areas. In other cases, individual subjects or disciplines were identified as strands, e.g. Music. A further concern related to whether the strands should be content-oriented, process-oriented or a combination of both. Marsh reports that ultimately many of the decisions taken in the writing of the Australian Statements were managerial and organisational ones. Wilson (1997) agrees with Marsh that there was never a consistent theoretical underpinning and different decisions were made for each Key Learning Area. Wilson continues that in the case of the Arts, the strands were structured around content. In other cases, the decision was to have a process strand or a number of process strands and some content strands, and in other cases, the two were integrated. Wilson comments that in
developing materials for the Arts, Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE), and Health and Physical Education, it was quite difficult to work out a structure that would reflect both a unified conception and the special knowledge of the particular disciplines that were part of each Key Learning Area.

The inclusion of cross-curricula themes and groups with special needs as identified in the Hobart Declaration on Schooling were also a matter of concern for all Key Learning Area writers. With the exception of the incorporation of an understanding of the cultural background of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, and gender equity interests, writers of the Australian Statements found it difficult to include cross-curricula themes. Wilson (1997) acknowledges that it was towards the end of the writing of the Statements and Profiles that discussions considered linking the eight Key Learning Areas together in some way. He comments that consistent guidelines were developed so that Learning Areas would be recognisable as being part of the same intellectual structure. He recalls that the debate focussed on the place of some cross-curricula subjects, and this forced the Learning Area managers to articulate issues about the relationship between Learning Areas, subjects and disciplines. It was only then that problem areas of overlap and inconsistencies of strands and components were addressed.

5.2.2.1 Combination Key Learning Areas.

The last four Key Learning Areas to be developed - Studies of Society and Environment, the Arts, Health and Physical Education, and Languages other than English - are the most complex as each Key Learning Area consists of a combination of subjects. Prior to the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles the subjects included in the combination Key Learning Areas existed in school curricula as single entities. The choice of subjects included in each combination Key Learning Area is described as being pragmatic, as little opportunity for discussion was available before the final decision was made. Little detailed explanation or rationale was provided for the combination areas. Wilson (1997), the current Executive Director of the Curriculum Corporation of Australia, in conversation with the researcher, expressed the view that there was a strong commitment to the idea of “Key
Learning Areas” and perhaps the rationale for the combination Key Learning Areas was less comprehensively considered than it might have been. Further, he comments, that at the Australian level there was no detailed analysis of the combined Learning Areas and that the construction of the combined Learning Areas resulted in compromise; Studies of Society and Environment is an example. In the case of the Arts, virtual exclusion of Craft from the Learning Area caused major problems for the Arts steering committee.

The production of a Statement Brief preceded the development of the Australian Statement in the case of the four combination Key Learning Areas. A Statement Brief was not required for the non-combination Key Learning Areas. The Statement Briefs for the combination Key Learning Areas were concluded early in 1992. A Statement was then written for each combination Key Learning Area, as had been the case for the other four Key Learning Areas. On reflection it was discovered by CURASS that the Statement Briefs were sufficiently detailed to have taken the place of the Australian Statements.

Hannan (1992) comments that during the construction of the four combination Key Learning Areas that represented collections of studies or new studies, the focus of the argument was over whether the Key Learning Areas should be described from the point of view of their diverse content and approaches, or whether they should somehow be pulled together into a single coherent subject. The “disciplines” approach allowed the traditional subject empires to reign, whereas the alternative “conceptual” approach was considered by the sceptics as diverting the curriculum into something less tangible. Marsh (1994) confirms that concern was expressed about the grouping of subjects within each Key Learning Area, and about the emphasis given to particular strands and how they might be taught.

5.2.3 Australian Profiles

The Australian Profiles in each of the eight Key Learning Areas provide a description of the progression of learning typically achieved by students during the compulsory years of Australian schooling (Years 1 to 10). The major purpose of the Australian Profiles is to
provide support for improved teaching and learning in the classroom and provide a framework for reporting student achievement.

- Each Australian Profile is divided into strands, e.g. Music.
- Each strand is accompanied by strand organisers as defined in the relevant Key Learning Area Statement, e.g. Creating, Making and Presenting.
- Each strands is further divided into eight levels of achievement representing the progression of learning of students from Years 1 to 10.

In 1992 CURASS undertook a supplementary project for students with disabilities; a “Towards Level 1” section was added to each of the Australian Profiles to ensure that these students had access to the Profiles. Wilson (1997) comments that the section was included not to define a disability but to indicate that students with any type of disability may take a longer time to achieve Level 1.

Wilson (1993, 1994a, 1994b, 1994d), and Boston (1995) reflect on a number of important characteristics of the Australian Profiles. These are that:

- the Profiles assume that every student is learning and making individual progress
- the Profiles describe the progressive and sequential order in which students learn in each area of the curriculum as they progress though the compulsory years of schooling
- the Profiles focus on what students are learning rather than on what is being taught and provide a mechanism for reporting and charting the Learning Outcomes achieved by a student, and
- the Profiles can be used as a framework to monitor standards at classroom, school and system levels.

Ingham, a writer of the Science Profile, in Francis (1993:6), describes the value of the Australian Profiles thus: “Profiles will assist teachers to map growth in understanding of students as they develop from the beginning of school to Year 10, building up a connected
picture of each student's basic learning which can be passed on between teachers from year to
year”. Beazley (1992) considers that the Australian Profiles will allow teachers to assess the
level of achievement of students within a common framework and report that level in terms of
a nationally agreed set of attainment levels. Boomer (1992:63) describes the then yet to be
completed Profiles, “as detailed descriptions of what children will progressively be able to
say, do and understand as they move through the guaranteed curriculum”. He considers the
Australian Profiles to be neither norm-referenced nor criterion-referenced, but a “new
creature” which he terms “standards-referenced”.

Hannan and Ashenden (1996:9) describe the argument about the nature of the strands as being
“continual, fierce and inconclusive”. They report that the argument has not been settled at the
Australian level or elsewhere, and the Australian Profiles reflect a mixture of both process
strands and content strands, the emphasis being different in each Key Learning Area. Hannan
and Ashenden describe the two choices in the following terms: conceptual or process strands
show student progress in skills and understanding but these types of strands do not fit in with
courses; whereas content strands fit neatly with courses but progression is an arbitrary
development of subject matter. During the development of the Australian Profiles, Hannan
and Ashenden (1996:10) report that the number of strand levels proposed by key writers
“commenced at six, moved to eight and resisted efforts to have more”. Francis (1997)
comments that the Australian Statements and Profiles needed to have consistency and
agreement in the number of achievement levels chosen. The crucial point was to break the
nexus between school years and Profile Levels and therefore five or ten achievement levels
were not satisfactory. Six, seven, eight or multiples there of were more suitable. Wilson
(1997) remarks that during 1992 and 1993 there was a move to double the number of levels to
16 on the grounds that it takes 21 months for a student to progress from one level to another.
This approach for reporting purposes would not have been adequate as a student would be
progressing to the next level before the completion of a school year. Wilson comments that
the initial view was that more than six levels was needed to describe the full range of student
achievement in the compulsory years of schooling.
The division of content of each of the eight Key Learning Areas into eight levels of achievement causes a number of writers to raise concerns. Collins (1994a, 1994b) comments on the unsuitability of a developmental set of curriculum outcomes which have validity for all Australian children in all schools: and the division of knowledge into “areas of knowledge”, with a further division into “strands”. She also questions the use of the term “levels” to describe the arrangement of outcomes, set out in developmental or growth terms, with eight levels being use to indicate the standard in all strands and all Learning Areas. Wilson (1994c) responds to Collins (1994a) commenting that the Australian Profiles represent a continuous development of knowledge across an eight level sequence, and he states that the division of knowledge into artificial boundaries is for practical reasons.

Reid (1995) highlights the same issues as Collins (1994a) and he asserts that during the implementation phase of the Statements and Profiles throughout Australia the opportunity should be taken to examine these central theoretical issues which were used as a basis for the collaborative effort. Kennelly (1994) also points to the uncertainty of the assumption that all learning occurs sequentially, which can be mapped according to levels, and he suggests that other theories of learning be considered. Hannan (1992) questions whether there is such a thing as typical progress in learning in all aspects of the curriculum, and if there is, how can it be described accurately. Brady (1996b) remarks that to make the assumption that the acquisition and understanding of all knowledge occurs in a linear step-wise pattern is questionable. Brown (1994:57) comments that the Profiles reflect average performance ability and while age is not intended to be “synonymous” with the eight levels of performance, they are both clearly intended to be closely correlated. Morris (1992) considers that the Australian Profiles could be used to narrow and constrain the curriculum experience of students. Masters (1991) suggests that standard assessment tasks be developed with each Key Learning Area Profile as a support for teachers who, he argues, will find it difficult settling on criteria and judging the “achievement” level of students in terms of the Australian Profiles.
Knight (1995) comments that the Australian Profile places the emphasis on content (the specific order of topics placed in a course) whereas the English National Curriculum focusses on knowledge (the understanding of all elements of a subject) and he makes the claim that the important aspect is to be clear about what knowledge is needed to take students forward in their learning. Francis (1997) finds Knight's opinion remarkable as it means that the English National Curriculum is a document that enables knowledge to be taught without content. Francis says that the Australian and English documents both focus on knowledge, skills and processes as indicated in the "Forward" of the Australian Arts Statement and Arts Profile. Knight reports that establishing the content and appropriate teaching context are the biggest challenges for teachers. Some believe that experiences alone will invite students to find the content and others suggest that they must be given the knowledge initially. Secondary teachers especially need to acknowledge the level of understanding that students bring from primary school so that planning for new experiences accommodates past learning.

5.2.3.1 Benchmarking the Profiles.

The use of the Australian Profiles changed between September 1992 and May 1993. At the CURASS meeting in September 1992, it was decided to set a standard for Level 8 based on the likely attainment by the upper 30 or 40 percent of students by the end of Year twelve.

In each Profile strand there are eight levels of achievement. The levels do not equate with either year levels in school or the chronological age of students. The Australian Education Council has determined that the student outcomes described for Level 6 should be achieved by 70 percent to 80 percent of students by the end of Year ten. The student outcomes described for Level 8 should be achievable by 30 percent to 40 percent of students at or before the end of Year twelve (Arts Profile, 1993:4).

In May 1993, CURASS submitted a revised statement to the AEC regarding the use of the Australian Profiles when it was clear that there were concerns and some negative media comments about tying Profile Levels to the post-compulsory years of schooling. Marsh (1994:125) reports this as
CURASS affirms that the major purpose of the Profiles is to inform teaching and learning and to act as a framework for reporting student achievement during Years 1-10. The curriculum of the compulsory years will continue to be the responsibility of States and Territories using the national Statements as an agreed framework. The curriculum of Years 11 and 12, which is related to Band D of the Statements, will continue to take the form of more specific syllabuses and frameworks designed to meet the needs of students as they prepare for university studies, training programs and employment. . . . Profiles are not in a form which would enable them to be used as reporting frameworks in Years 11 and 12. National agreement on student outcomes for Years 11 and 12 has not been reached. . . . The Profiles will help to ensure that the relationship between compulsory and post-compulsory curriculum will be clear.

Willmott (1994b:54) comments that when it was determined not to follow the initial plans of benchmarking Level 8 of the Australian Profiles as the standard of achievement for Year 12 students, the change was seen as a "weakening of a grand design", a "flaw in the Statements and Profiles", and a demonstration that the "model lacked robustness necessary for a national framework". Gough (1995), on the other hand, remarks that with the change in plan to benchmark Level 6 to Year 10, the remaining two Profile Levels - Levels 7 and 8 - could be used to indicate advanced performance for Year 10 students.

5.2.4 Australian Arts Statement

The Arts Learning Area was one of the later Key Learning Areas to be developed. The steering committee was established in August 1991, the successful tenderers being two academics at The University of Melbourne. The two writers, Dr. Lee Emery and Dr. Geoff Hammond, both Visual Arts Educators, were selected because of their academic expertise in Arts Education and because of their strong network links to Arts groups. The selection of two Visual Arts Educators as key writers did not provide the most appropriate balance when the Arts Key Learning Area was ultimately to include subjects representing the Performing Arts.

The Arts Key Learning Area was one of the few Learning Areas to benefit from a consistent writing team throughout the whole process of the Statement Brief, followed by the Statement and then the Profile. The team also included Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and gender equity consultants. Emery (1997a) remarks that between 1978 and 1990 all Australian States
and Territories had grouped their Arts forms together in one Learning Area. Therefore the
notion of an Arts Key Learning Area, as adopted in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile,
had already been established and was in use.

Emery (1991), in her review of Arts literature collated before the writing of the Australian
Arts Statement had commenced, refers to influences from Britain, the United States of
America, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea. Emery (1991: 5-8) has listed three documents
that were considered representative models for the development of the Australian Arts
Statement:

* Curriculum 11-16 (1977) a publication from a group of Her Majesty's Inspectors
* The Arts in Schools; Principles, Practice and Provision (1982), a report of the
  Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, and
* The Arts 5-16 series (1990) published by the English National Curriculum
  Council.

She also lists a number of publications from the USA referring to the teaching of the Arts
centred around the term “Discipline-Based Arts Education”. Although she makes no further
reference to this aspect, Wilks (1996), a doctoral student of hers, confirmed that Emery and
Hammond were influenced by the DBAE approach when designing the Australian Arts
Statement and Profile.

Emery (1991) notes further that two countries much closer to Australia, namely, New Zealand
and Papua New Guinea, had recently prepared broad curriculum statements outlining the role
of Arts in Education. A New Zealand Position Statement on Education in the Arts (1991)
defines four objectives - access, achievement, involvement and cultural heritage - and the Arts
forms of Art, Craft, Dance, Drama, Film, Television, Video, Literature, Language, and Music.
A community-based thematic approach to Arts experiences in Papua New Guinean schools is
the focus adopted by that country's 1988 Resource Book for Expressive Arts. The Arts forms
include Storytelling, Drama, Music, Art/Craft, Dance/Movement, and Creative Writing.
In the design stages of the *Arts Statement Brief* the matter of subject strands (e.g. Music and Visual Arts) versus generic (process) strands was discussed. Support for the use of generic process strands (e.g. Transforming) came from primary schools. As the move to process strands was not supported across all bands (levels of schooling), it was suggested that process strands may be included in the yet to be written *Arts Profile*. A further concern was expressed about the areas of Craft and Multi-Arts not being sufficiently included in the design *Brief*. The Crafts Council of Australia, the Visual Arts/Craft Board of the Australia Council, and the Australian Academy of Design proposed that Craft should be identified as a discrete strand and presented the following written submission:

We are not advocating separate strands for Art, Craft, and Design as is being done for the various components of the Performing Arts. Rather it is our fundamental view that because Craft is a major and distinctive area of contemporary Arts practice, any Visual Arts strand should identify and describe Craft as an integral but discrete component. . . . Craft practice should be seen as part of a visual arts continuum, comprising Art, Craft, and Design (Marsh, 1994:99-100).

As a result of intensive lobbying over the inclusion of Craft and Multi-Arts in the design *Brief*, Marsh (1994) reports that the June 1992 CURASS meeting required the *Brief* to be revised to incorporate relevant aspects of Craft and Multi-Arts.

Table 5.4. is a summary of the first draft of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, completed by the end of April 1992, entitled *Brief for the Arts National Curriculum Statement and Profile* (1992:14). It provides a summary table of the two components called *Making* and *Appraising*. The two components were each broken into three subcomponents. The subcomponents are called *Perceive, Transform, Express* (the components of *Making*) and *History and Culture, Criticism, Aesthetics* (the components of *Appraising*). For the first draft, a decision was made to use subject areas as strands.
Table 5.4: Summary table of the first draft of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* (April 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Making</th>
<th>Appraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceive</td>
<td>Transform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Kinesthetic awareness</td>
<td>Improvise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Awareness through observing and listening</td>
<td>Explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Awareness through observing and listening</td>
<td>Identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Aural awareness through listening</td>
<td>Compose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts and Design</td>
<td>Awareness through seeing and touching</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4.1 *Arts Statement* (First Draft).

In the first draft (April 1992), the Australian Arts writers Dr. Lee Emery and Dr. Geoff Hammond discuss reasons for the selection of the Arts subjects, the choice of the components and the relationship of the Arts to the other Key Learning Areas. These issues identified by the writers are complemented by the discussions of Marsh (1994) regarding the general and specific issues which affected all the Key Learning Areas. The writers of the first draft of the Australian *Arts Statement* (1994:3) indicate that the “five key symbol systems” of Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts and Design are recognised and clearly identified in Australian society and schools. They acknowledge that the chosen Arts forms do not represent the total number of Arts forms that could have been considered for inclusion. With respect to the chosen five Arts forms they state that the expression of meaning in each of them
is unique to each respective Arts form and is not transferable. Visual Arts and Design focus on visual and tactile sensory systems; Music is predominantly an aural system; Dance is a kinaesthetic Arts form; and Media and Drama use combinations of aural, kinaesthetic, tactile, verbal, and visual systems. Each Arts form has its own body of knowledge, skills, processes, and traditions and collectively they define what is experienced in “the Arts”.

The writers of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* acknowledge that in some cultures the Arts are identified as a whole, but the experience for Australian students should be as separate Arts forms. This is further emphasised in a comparison with other Key Learning Areas. Whereas the strands in other Key Learning Areas describe sections of one subject, the Arts strands describe five different curriculum areas, and experiences in one cannot substitute for another. Emery (1995) writes at a later time that learning in the Arts is similar to learning a number of different languages, where achievement in one language does not imply achievement in another. The Australian writers comment that although Design has a role in each Arts form, it is closely related to Visual Arts. The writers indicate that aspects of Arts forms are included in other Learning Areas. Drama is covered in the non-Literary area of English, Design has a link with the Arts and Technology, and Media is associated with English, Technology and the Arts. Despite other connections, the writers stress that Drama, Design and Media are properly located in the Arts Learning Area. The Arts form, Literature, is seen as a difficulty because, by convention, it has been included with English. The Australian writers did not include Literature as an Arts form in the *Arts Statement* on the understanding that it was included in the English Key Learning Area.

The first draft of the Australian *Arts Statement* defines the learning process in the Arts strands according to two broad components: *Making* (with the subcomponents being Perceiving, Transforming, Expressing), and *Appraising* (with the subcomponents being History and Culture, Criticism, Aesthetics). The subcomponents are designed to work as interrelated elements of *Making* and *Appraising*. The Arts Learning Model designed for the *Arts Framework: P-10* (1988:13) influenced the components at this stage. The model depicts the interrelated processes involved in Arts learning experiences: *Perceiving, Transforming,
Expressing and Appreciating. The model also represents a “generic” set of processes to encompass all the Arts forms. The structure of Music in the English National Curriculum is an obvious influence here and the work of Pascoe (1992) is also considered to be of influence. Pascoe suggests a structure consisting of two organising principles: Expressing and Appreciating, within each of which are key suborganising elements. Expressing contains Creative Expression, Arts Languages, Skills and Media, and Process. Arts Heritage, and Valuing are included in Appreciating. In the model suggested by Pascoe, the specific Arts disciplines of Dance, Drama/Theatre, Music, Visual Arts and Design support the organising principles and suborganising elements.

5.2.4.2 Arts Statement (Second Draft).

The second draft of the Australian Arts Statement, entitled National Curriculum Statement in the Arts (1992), was presented to the CURASS meeting in June 1992. It included Art and Design (formerly Visual Arts and Design), Dance, Drama, Media, and Music. A minor change had been made to the name of Art and Design. The term “learning processes” instead of “components” was now being used and these had been increased to four, with the six subcomponents removed. The learning processes are named as Transforming in the Arts, Presenting, Developing an Understanding of Arts Criticism and Aesthetics, and Developing an Understanding of Past and Present Contexts. The four learning processes are explained and it is stated that they are interrelated and constantly utilise each other’s characteristics.

Marsh (1994) reports that although there was broad support for the second draft of the Australian Arts Statement (June 1992) some concerns were expressed about the use of Arts forms as strands and the names given to the components, especially Transforming and Aesthetics and Criticism. It was decided that these matters should be addressed when the Australian Arts Profile was completed. A focus on the interconnectedness of the strands was suggested as an area to receive attention as it was generally agreed that the current Arts forms should remain the basis for the strands. The decision to change the name of Art and Design to Visual Arts and incorporate three elements - Art, Craft and Design - helped allay the concerns expressed about Craft. Marsh states that The Australian Institute of Art Education protested
quite late about the number of strands in the Australian *Arts Statement* arguing that the Performing Arts were given too much prominence and a fairer balance would be two strands, namely Visual Arts and Performing Arts. There was limited support for this proposal. The Australian Senate Inquiry entitled *Arts Education (1995)* notes that no clear reason is provided as to why five Arts forms were selected for the *Arts Statement* and subsequently the *Arts Profile*. The Senate Inquiry also acknowledges the strength of argument put by the Visual Artists and the Craft/Design advocates that they were now in competition with more Arts forms.

Marsh (1994:102) remarks that it was noted that the four components of the second draft of the Australian *Arts Statement (June 1992)* - Transforming, Presenting, Criticism and Aesthetics, Past and Present Contexts - “did not necessarily have equal significance in Arts Education at different levels of schooling”. Marsh (1994) comments that concern was also expressed about the out-dated approach to Music and this resulted in the Australian Society for Music Education, the nationally recognised Music Education body in Australia, being consulted to remedy this problem.

Another area in the draft Australian *Arts Statement* which attracted attention was the possible overlap between the English and Technology Learning Areas with regard to Media and Design. Marsh (1994:127) notes that “There was also a problem of whether 'Media' should be located within the English Learning Area or the Arts Learning Area”. Francis (1997) says that one reason for the indecision about the place of Media was that it had no secure place in the curriculum of each Australian State and Territory. Gillies (1997) remarks that he does not think Media, as it is presented in the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, sits comfortably with the other Arts disciplines. He argues that the skills necessary for Drama and Media are learnt outside the Arts Learning Area as opposed to other Arts skills.

5.2.4.3 *Arts Statement (Final Draft).*

The final draft of the Australian *Arts Statement (June 1993)*, entitled *A National Statement on the Arts for Australian Schools - Music (1993)*, saw a further change in the name of Art and
Design to Visual Arts, incorporating Arts, Craft and Design. The learning processes were reduced to three: *Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics, Past and Present Contexts*. There were two major changes in the learning processes between the second and final draft. Transformation in the Arts was renamed *Creating, Making*. The learning process *Presenting* was added to this resulting in the final name of *Creating, Making and Presenting*.

Marsh (1994:100) has summarised a comparison between the successive drafts of the Australian *Arts Statement*, 1992-1993. Part of it is reproduced below as Table 5.5.

Table 5.5: Comparison of drafts of the Australian *Arts Statement* (1992-1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>Bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strands:</td>
<td>Strands:</td>
<td>Strands:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dance</td>
<td>• Dance</td>
<td>• Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drama</td>
<td>• Drama</td>
<td>• Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Media</td>
<td>• Media</td>
<td>• Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Music</td>
<td>• Music</td>
<td>• Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual Arts and Design</td>
<td>• Art and Design</td>
<td>• Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components and subcomponents:</td>
<td>Components:</td>
<td>Strand Organisers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making (Perceive, Transform, Express)</td>
<td>• Transforming in the Arts</td>
<td>• Creating, Making and Presenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appraising (History and Culture, Criticism, Aesthetics)</td>
<td>• Presenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing Understanding of Criticism and Aesthetics</td>
<td>• Arts Criticism and Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing Understanding of Past and Present Contexts</td>
<td>• Past and Present Contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.5 *Arts Statement* (Published Document)

The published version of the Australian *Arts Statement*, entitled *A Statement on the Arts for Australian Schools* (1994), is presented in three parts. Part One considers the Arts as an area of learning and covers four subheadings: (1) Five key Arts forms, (2) Defining and analysing the Arts, (3) Approaches to learning in the Arts, and (4) Cross-curriculum perspectives. Part
Two of the *Arts Statement* focusses on the five Arts strands - Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts. Part Three of the *Arts Statement* is a description of the Arts strands as they are divided amongst the four bands of schooling.

5.2.5.1 *Arts Statement* Part One.

The Australian *Arts Statement* identifies five key Arts forms or strands that are accepted as the major forms of Arts activity in Australian schools and the wider community. A note is made in the *Arts Statement* that the Arts forms selected do not represent a complete listing of recognised Arts forms. The Arts strands are Dance, Drama, Media, Music, and Visual Arts (incorporating Art, Craft and Design). The *Arts Statement* discusses three ways of defining and analysing the Arts as a basis for curriculum development. These are the Arts as symbol systems, Aesthetics and the Arts, and Social and Cultural perspectives. The different approaches to learning in the Arts are discussed under the headings of Aesthetic, Conceptual, Physical, Sensorial, and Social Understandings. It is recognised that a student participating in one Arts activity can develop all the understandings listed.

A short paragraph is presented under each of the following 13 headings acknowledging the place of Cross-Curricula perspectives: the Arts and other areas of the curriculum; the Arts and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander societies; Cultural diversity in Australia; Gender equity; Equality of opportunities; Literacy; Environment and development; Technology; Economic awareness and understanding; Health and safety; Self-esteem and wellbeing; Ethics; and Knowledge and social context.

5.2.5.2 *Arts Statement* Part Two.

This section of the *Arts Statement* acknowledges that each Arts strand has its own distinct areas of knowledge and tradition with identifiable skills and processes. Although the content of each Arts strand is separated for the purposes of education, it is recognised that in non-school contexts the Arts work in close collaborative relationships.
The three strand organisers of *Creating, Making and Presenting; Arts Criticism and Aesthetics*; and *Past and Present Contexts* describe the content and structure of the five Arts strands that make up the Arts Key Learning Area. The strand organisers are designed to work together and not as isolated processes. In generic terms, the strand organisers are described in the Australian *Arts Statement* (1994:13) as follows: *Creating, Making and Presenting* “refers to the full range of ways in which people experiment with ideas, generate ideas, bring a new product into existence, rework and transform existing works or ideas, rehearse and present their work to others”. This organising involves experimentation, risk-taking, selecting, refining and making decisions, and development of skills and techniques. *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* encourages reflection and response to Arts works “Through listening, talking, reading and writing about the Arts . . . social and cultural values and meanings are constructed, challenged and reconstructed”. *Past and Present Contexts* enable the consideration of “social, cultural and historical contexts in which the Arts are produced” and knowledge recorded. This strand organising involves “analysis, research, comparison and interpretation”. The strand organisers are further expanded by an explanation in terms specific to each Arts strand. For the purposes of this study, the Music Statement is presented as an example.

The Music Statement (1994:21) discusses the characteristics of Music generally, and as taught in schools, with consideration of the following areas: Music as an aural Arts form which exists in time, Music as an Arts form that evolves continually, Music with respect to both its aesthetic and functional purposes, and Music in education which should reflect the ways Music is used in society.

5.2.5.3 *Arts Statement Part Three.*

Part three of the *Arts Statement* explains how learning in the Arts is divided between the bands (or levels) of schooling. The Arts learning which occurs throughout each of the Bands is classified as Band A: early Arts experiences, Band B: extended learning experiences (the end of primary/elementary school), Band C: more specialised Arts experiences, and Band D: specific specialised study to meet the needs of Years 11 and 12 (the end of secondary school).

A general overview is provided of what could be expected in Arts Education at each band
level as well as a more specific view according to each Arts strand. In this section of the document reference is made to the different learning rates of students and their attraction to certain activities and Arts forms where they show preference and strengths. It is argued that the school program should consider skills developed by students outside of the school.

Specific examples of learning experiences are listed for each Arts strand and grouped according to the strand organisers and bands. In the primary school (Bands A and B) the Arts Statement refers to the generalist nature of teaching and it is emphasised that the Arts strands do have discrete learning content and that each strand needs a separate focus from the beginning. Because secondary schools (Bands C and D) have traditionally employed specialist Arts teachers to deliver the curriculum, the discussion focusses on the more specialised approach to Arts teaching at this level. For Bands C and D the Arts Statement merely acknowledges the value of Integrated Arts experiences. It is suggested that learning experiences in the Arts at all levels of schooling should make links across the Arts forms and to other curriculum areas.

Gillies (1997) refers to the Australian Arts Statement where it is acknowledged that although each Arts form has a distinct area of knowledge, it is recommended that primary and secondary students participate in Multi-Arts experiences. He identifies this comment as a weakness in the document, as no evidence is presented on how to overcome the “distinctiveness” of each discipline.

5.2.6 Australian Arts Profile

When writing commenced for the Australian Arts Profile the issue of whether Arts forms or components (learning processes) should be used as Profile strands had not been resolved, nor had concerns about the omission of Craft and Multi-Arts. Wilson (1997) comments that although the Arts is an integrated Learning Area there was never any decision to produced an integrated curriculum. He remarks that some Arts Educators considered that a document based on components was more forward looking and more desirable for use. At the design level. Wilson offers insights into the development of the Australian Arts Statement and
Profile. He comments that in the Arts, the strand names were not changed to process names; instead the strands are named according to the discipline areas. Because of the intellectual structure that was formulated during the development of the Arts Key Learning Area the outcomes of the different strands are very similar and Wilson remarks it is possible to argue that the structure is a Multi-Arts one. The development of generic Learning Outcomes which are used to describe each of the Arts forms makes it possible to develop a Multi-Arts approach to teaching. Wilson says that the Arts steering committee was concerned about the debate surrounding the nature of the Arts strands or subjects. Questions raised included: “Should the parts be called subjects or should they be called learning processes? And then, what kind of learning processes; and which ones?” Wilson comments that a more integrated structure in the Arts would have resulted in significant difficulties for Arts Educators who focus their teaching on single Arts forms. He continues that the solution in the Arts was quite a clever one in that the overall outcome was consistent with the generic approach as well as providing a structure within which teachers could teach single Arts forms in a way in which they had been accustomed.

Gillies (1997:7) remarks that the varied approaches which could be taken to teach the Arts using a combination structure of generic Learning Outcomes and Arts forms contributes to the instability of the Arts Key Learning Area. He is particularly concerned that the two strand organisers - Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts - are more related to “talking, writing and thinking about”, whereas Music most importantly is about “making”. The fundamental differences in each of the Arts forms are not considered to be solved by common Learning Outcomes.

Francis (1997) remarks that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile had to accommodate the Arts Educators who supported Arts forms taught as single Arts disciplines and those who supported a Multi-Arts approach. As the debate is still not resolved, even after the publication of the documents, the decision to use generic Learning Outcomes satisfied both ideals. The generic Learning Outcomes could be interpreted by those Arts Educators who preferred to focus on teaching single Arts forms and by those who favoured teaching by
making connections between the Arts forms. Francis comments that the Multi-Arts advocates see the Arts as being taught through a focus on processes. They may select one Arts form or a couple of Arts forms. He continues that strict single discipline advocates focus on skills and knowledge and see each Arts form as unique, having its own body of knowledge. Francis says that the main reason for these issues not being resolved is that the Arts Education community is not a united body. He remarks that the lobby groups involved in the consultation process - professional associations, research bodies, and universities departments - maintain a focus on single Arts disciplines.

5.2.6.1 *Arts Profile (First Draft)*

The first draft (April 1992) of the Australian *Arts Profile*, entitled *Brief for Arts National Curriculum Statement and Profile* (1992), is quite short. At this stage the *Arts Profile* described learning in the Arts for Years 1 to 12 arranged across eight levels and four bands of schooling. Four elements made up each level: a General Description, Learning Outcomes, Pointers, and Exemplars. A Learning Outcome was described as providing a key curriculum focus for a level. The combined group of Learning Outcomes across the eight levels of achievement were to describe the total spectrum from beginning to advanced understanding. The Learning Outcomes were to provide a common framework and language for reporting to parents. These two attributes would be invaluable should a student move between schools and especially between States and Territories within Australia.

The Australian *Arts Profile* writing team produced an options paper addressing the design of the *Arts Profile*. The options paper set the groundwork for the second draft of the *Arts Profile*. Four options were presented:

1. Five Arts forms (Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts)
2. Two Arts forms (Visual and Performing)
3. Four components (*Transforming, Presenting, Context, Criticism and Aesthetics*), and
4. Combinations of the three options listed.
5.2.6.2 *Arts Profile* (Second Draft).

The second draft (February 1993) of the Australian *Arts Profile*, entitled *National Profile for the Arts* (1993), is quite substantial. The document uses the four learning processes (components) and five strands which were defined for the second draft (June 1992) of the Australian *Arts Statement* (1992), but the conceptual model is reversed in the *Arts Profile* design. In the second draft of the *Arts Statement*, the Arts forms represent the strands. In the second draft of the *Arts Profile* the learning processes (components) are used as strands. Figure 5.2 illustrates the differences in the conceptual model between the second draft of the *Arts Statement* and second draft of the *Arts Profile*.

Figure 5.2: Differences in the Conceptual Model used in the *Arts Statement* (Second Draft) and *Arts Profile* (Second Draft).

The second draft of the *Arts Profile* (1993: 7-10) is arranged according to eight levels of achievement. A Level Statement describes an overall summation of student achievement at each level. The four learning processes are accompanied by a general description. The Outcome Statements specific to each learning process at each of the eight levels are listed. Written examples of students' work in each of the five Arts forms are presented under the Outcome Statements for each level. Illustrations of students' work which are representative of some of the written expectations are included as Work Samples. Table 5.6 illustrates the Outcome Statements for each level of the second draft of the *Arts Profile*. 
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transforming</th>
<th>Presenting</th>
<th>Arts Criticism and Aesthetics</th>
<th>Past and Present Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making Arts works by working with ideas and achieving technical control.</td>
<td>Preparing and presenting Arts works for others.</td>
<td>Engaging in Arts discourse and making personal responses to Arts works.</td>
<td>Knowledge of Arts history, study of the Arts from different cultural contexts and awareness of issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses some elements of the Arts and experiment with them to make Arts works freely drawing upon play and imagination.</td>
<td>Share their Arts works with others in the class.</td>
<td>Describe Arts works in their own words and talk about their preferences.</td>
<td>Identify ways in which Arts are encountered in everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make choices about Arts elements and organise them in expressive ways, using experience and imagination as a basis for their expression.</td>
<td>Prepare and present their Arts works to a familiar audience.</td>
<td>Use some Arts terms to describe Arts works and gives reasons for their preferences.</td>
<td>Identify some distinguishing features of Arts works which locate them in time, place or culture and recognise that the Arts are used for a range of purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment with several approaches and refine ideas to make Arts works, exploring a variety of mediums and comparing their different qualities.</td>
<td>Prepare and present Arts works for a particular audience or purpose.</td>
<td>Use appropriate language to describe Arts works, analyse the ways Arts works are organised and talk and write informally about their personal observations.</td>
<td>Identify characteristics of some contemporary Arts works from their own and other cultures focussing on artistic traditions and comparing the way Arts elements are used to express ideas and feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment with ideas to find satisfactory solutions to given tasks by selecting, combining and manipulating Arts elements and using a range of techniques.</td>
<td>Draw upon a range of skills to plan and present works for a variety of audiences or purposes.</td>
<td>Describe the organisation of elements in Arts work, interpret the content and ideas involved and discuss personal responses.</td>
<td>Show an understanding of the Arts of different social and cultural groups in Australia demonstrating a sense of history and tradition in relation to the Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use several different starting points to express ideas and feelings, control and manipulate a range of elements, styles or genres, and identify the processes involved in the generation of ideas and in the forming their Arts works.</td>
<td>Select and modify presentations for particular occasions taking into account purpose, space, materials and equipment.</td>
<td>Use a process of description and analysis to support interpretations of Arts works and discuss their personal value judgments and preference.</td>
<td>Write about the nature, purposes and presentation of Arts works of past and present societies and explore typical themes, forms, styles and genres of specific periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Arts works which are based on independent ideas, involve the selection and development of specific elements and demonstrate an understanding of form, style and genre.</td>
<td>Draw upon imaginative and conventional ways of presenting for different audiences or purposes using specific skills and techniques appropriate to the presentation.</td>
<td>Describe, analyse and interpret the qualities of Arts works and show an awareness of how Arts works are used to communicate ideas, challenge and reinforce values.</td>
<td>Discuss Arts works in terms of their historical, cultural and political contexts and show an understanding of the ways in which knowledge of the Arts has been recorded and transmitted in different cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Arts works and document the processes involved, drawing upon a personal set of aesthetic criteria, an awareness of contemporary practice and demonstrating an ability to control the medium/s.</td>
<td>Use technical equipment, display techniques and appropriate presentational and promotional devices to present their works for special occasions and situations.</td>
<td>Uses critical processes of description, analysis and interpretation to make judgments which take account of social and cultural factors.</td>
<td>Discuss Arts works from the perspective of contemporary social and cultural issues including the ways in which Arts challenge and shape prevailing values and are themselves influenced by societal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>Level 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate technical and aesthetic elements in an imaginative and skilful manner to make Arts works which reflect sensitivity and commitment in the exploration of themes and ideas which extend the potential of the mediums used.</td>
<td>Use imaginative approaches which reflect a wide knowledge of the conventions of promotion and presentation of Arts works for specific situations and audiences.</td>
<td>Engage in critical discourse to explore the nature of personal and shared aesthetic values and make informed judgments which reflect an understanding of contemporary issues.</td>
<td>Compare and contrast the complexity of characteristics such as style, themes and content, display historical knowledge and an ability to explore contemporary Arts issues and pursue independent research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.6.3 *Arts Profile (Final Draft).*

At the end of April 1993, the consultation, trialing and validation phase was complete. The issue of whether components or Arts forms should be used as *Profile* strands remained a matter of dispute. To allow for the development of both generic and Arts form specific outcomes in the *Arts Profile*, it was recommended that the following be maintained:

- The four components of *Transforming, Presenting, Context, Criticism and Aesthetics*
- The five Arts forms of Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts, and
- There was to be no restriction on the number of outcomes per strand per *Profile* Level.

Considerable disagreement abounded about the preferred number and weighting of components and the complexity of the outcomes. Various titles were suggested for the
process strands and it was recommended that the existing components be retained but with a clear explanation of meaning at the beginning of the Profile. Some changes to the titles of the components and a reduction from four to three were approved in May 1993 and rapid rewriting took place to accommodate the changes.

The final draft of the Australian Arts Profile (June 1993), entitled National Arts Profile (1993), reverses the layout of the second draft of the Arts Profile (February 1993). The Arts forms are used as strands. The learning processes are renamed strand organisers and reduced to three. The strand organiser Creating, Making and Presenting has three subcomponents: Exploring and Developing Ideas, Using Skills, Techniques and Processes; and Presenting. The other two strand organisers are Arts Criticism and Aesthetics, and Past and Present Contexts. The Outcome Statements for each strand organiser per Profile Level are generic and are repeated for each of the five Arts forms. In most cases one Outcome Statement is provided for each strand organiser at each Profile Level. The two exceptions are at Levels 7 and 8 where two Outcome Statements are included for Exploring and Developing Ideas and Past and Present Contexts. In this draft, examples of student achievement are also given under a heading “Expanded Level 1” for each strand organiser. These are not included in the published edition of the Arts Profile (1994). Wilson (1997) comments that during the writing stage a variety of ideas were put forward and such an example would be have been the inclusion of an “Expanded Level 1”. Wilson suggests that the writers may have found the jump between the levels too substantial and may have experienced some confusion in keeping the school levels detached from the Profile Levels. The structure of the final draft of Arts Profile which is applicable to each of the five Arts forms is illustrated in Table 5.7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating, Exploring and Developing Ideas</th>
<th>Making and Using Skills, Techniques and Processes</th>
<th>Presenting Presenting</th>
<th>Arts Criticism and Aesthetics</th>
<th>Past and Present Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draws upon play and imagination in making Arts works.</td>
<td>Level 1 • Uses basic elements of the Arts and explores them in making Arts works.</td>
<td>Level 1 • Shares Arts works with others</td>
<td>Level 1 • Responds to Arts works in his or her own way.</td>
<td>Level 1 • Shows an awareness of the Arts in everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 2 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 2 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 1 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 1 • written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanded Level 1</strong></td>
<td>Level 1 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 1 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses experience and imagination to make Arts works.</td>
<td>Level 2 • Makes choices about Arts elements and organises them in expressive ways.</td>
<td>Level 2 • Plans and presents Arts works for a familiar audience.</td>
<td>Level 2 • Responds to Arts works giving reasons and preferences.</td>
<td>Level 2 • Discusses the ways Arts are made and used for a range of purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 2 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 2 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 2 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 2 • written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explores ideas and feelings through Arts works.</td>
<td>Level 3 • Explores and uses several Arts elements and uses specific skills, techniques and processes appropriate to the Arts form.</td>
<td>Level 3 • Plans and presents Arts works for a particular audience or purpose.</td>
<td>Level 3 • Responds to key feature of Arts works.</td>
<td>Level 3 • Discusses Arts works from several cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 3 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 3 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 3 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 3 • written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experiments with ideas and explores feelings to find satisfactory solutions to given tasks.</td>
<td>Level 4 • Selects, combines and manipulates Arts elements using a range of skills, techniques and processes.</td>
<td>Level 4 • Draws upon a range of skills to present Arts works for a variety of audiences and purposes.</td>
<td>Level 4 • Talks and writes informally about personal observations and features of Arts works.</td>
<td>Level 4 • Identifies distinguishing features of Arts works which locate them in a particular time, place or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 4 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 4 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 4 • written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Level 4 • written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses different starting points such as observation, experiences and research to express ideas and feelings.</td>
<td>Structures Arts works by organising Arts elements and applying appropriate skills, techniques and processes.</td>
<td>Plans, selects and modifies presentations for particular occasions taking into account factors such as purpose, space, materials and equipment.</td>
<td>Uses appropriate language to describe the ways Arts works are organised to express ideas and feelings.</td>
<td>Shows and understanding of the ways Arts works are made within particular cultural and historical contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explores the Arts of various cultures to generate and develop ideas for Arts works.</td>
<td>Uses Arts elements, skills, techniques and processes to structure Arts works appropriate to chosen styles and/or forms.</td>
<td>Rehearses, presents and/or promotes Arts works in ways appropriate for specific audiences.</td>
<td>Identifies, analyses and interprets Arts works and discusses responses to these works.</td>
<td>Shows and understanding of the Arts of different social and cultural groups demonstrating a sense of histories and traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes Arts works using ideas informed by an awareness of contemporary Arts practice.</td>
<td>Structures Arts works using selected elements, styles and forms and demonstrates ability to control the medium using skills, techniques and processes.</td>
<td>Rehearses, presents and/or promotes Arts works using available technical equipment to evoke specific audience responses.</td>
<td>Uses processes of critical analysis to support personal judgments of Arts works.</td>
<td>Displays cultural and historical knowledge by comparing and contrasting characteristics such as styles, themes, purposes and content in the Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects an awareness of aesthetic considerations in Making Arts works.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Explores contemporary Arts issues and relates to his or her own creating, making and presenting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 8</th>
<th>Level 8</th>
<th>Level 8</th>
<th>Level 8</th>
<th>Level 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiates and makes Arts works which explore issues, concepts and themes.</td>
<td>Integrates technical and structural elements in an imaginative, skilful and coherent manner to make Arts works.</td>
<td>Uses imaginative approaches which reflect a wide knowledge of the conventions of rehearsing, presenting and/or promoting Arts works.</td>
<td>Uses critical discourse to reflect on meanings and values associated with particular Arts works.</td>
<td>Researches Arts works from a variety of past and present social and cultural perspectives and shows an awareness of how histories are constructed in the Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Arts works which reflect sensitivity, commitment and an understanding of aesthetic considerations.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>Examines with reference to his or her own works and the works of others, the ways the Arts challenge, shape and are influenced by prevailing values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
<td>written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.7 Arts Profile (Published Document)

The published version of the Australian Arts Profile, entitled The Arts - a Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools (1994), is similar to the final draft, except that a Towards Level 1 category replaces the Expanded Level 1. Examples of student work supplement the Level 1 examples and indicate progress towards Level 1 for students with disabilities. The Level 1 Outcome Statements apply to Towards Level 1. Annotated work samples for each Arts strand except Media at Level 1 are included. The work samples present a task completed by students together with the school year, relevant Outcome Statements and samples of student work in response to the task, including photographs.

The document notes that Presenting is not included for Visual Arts as it is considered to have less significance than for Dance, Drama, Media and Music. Some observations are made about assessment in the Arts Profile and it is suggested that student outcomes may be displayed through work diaries or journals recording the development of ideas, notated scores, videos and audio recordings, folios of works in preparation, student commentaries, and research projects. Table 5.8 illustrates the structure of the Arts Profile in published form.

Table 5.8: Structure of the Arts Profile (Published Document).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating, Exploring and Developing Ideas</th>
<th>Making and Using Skills, Techniques and Processes</th>
<th>Presenting Presenting</th>
<th>Arts Criticism and Aesthetics Towards Level 1</th>
<th>Past and Present Contexts Towards Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Towards Level 1</td>
<td>Towards Level 1</td>
<td>Towards Level 1</td>
<td>Towards Level 1</td>
<td>Towards Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draws upon play and imagination in making Arts works.</td>
<td>• Uses basic elements of the Arts and explores them in making Arts works.</td>
<td>• Shares Arts works with others.</td>
<td>• Responds to Arts works in a personal way.</td>
<td>• Shows an awareness of the Arts in everyday life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
<td>• written examples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Uses experience and imagination to make Arts works.  
• written examples of student work. | • Makes choices about Arts elements and organises them in expressive ways.  
• written examples of student work. | • Plans and presents Arts works for a familiar audience.  
• written examples of student work. | • Responds to Arts works, giving reasons for preferences.  
• written examples of student work. | • Discusses the ways Arts are made and used for a range of purposes.  
• written examples of student work. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Explores ideas and feelings through Arts works.  
• written examples of student work. | • Explores and uses several Arts elements and uses specific skills, techniques and processes appropriate to the Arts form.  
• written examples of student work. | • Plans and presents Arts works for a particular audience or purpose.  
• written examples of student work. | • Responds to key feature of Arts works.  
• written examples of student work. | • Discusses Arts works from several cultures.  
• written examples of student work. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Experiments with ideas and explores feelings to find satisfactory solutions to tasks.  
• written examples of student work. | • Selects, combines and manipulates Arts elements using a range of skills, techniques and processes.  
• written examples of student work. | • Draws upon a range of skills to present Arts works for a variety of audiences and purposes.  
• written examples of student work. | • Talks and writes informally about personal observations of Arts works.  
• written examples of student work. | • Identifies distinguishing features of Arts works that locate them in a particular time, place or culture.  
• written examples of student work. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Uses starting points such as observation, experiences and research to express ideas and feelings.  
• written examples of student work. | • Structures Arts works by organising Arts elements and applying appropriate skills, techniques and processes.  
• written examples of student work. | • Plans, selects and modifies presentations for particular occasions taking into account factors such as purpose, space, materials and equipment.  
• written examples of student work. | • Uses appropriate language to describe the ways Arts works are made within particular cultural and historical contexts.  
• written examples of student work. | • Shows and understanding of the ways Arts works are made within particular cultural and historical contexts.  
• written examples of student work. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Explores the Arts of various cultures to generate and develop ideas for Arts works.  
• written examples of student work. | • Uses Arts elements, skills, techniques and processes to structure Arts works appropriate to chosen styles and forms.  
• written examples of student work. | • Rehearses, presents and promotes Arts works in ways appropriate for particular audiences.  
• written examples of student work. | • Identifies, analyses and interprets Arts works and discusses responses to them.  
• written examples of student work. | • Shows and understanding of the Arts of different social and cultural groups, demonstrating a sense of histories and traditions.  
• written examples of student work. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Makes Arts works using ideas informed by an awareness of contemporary Arts practice.  
  • Reflects an awareness of aesthetic considerations in Making Arts works.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Structures Arts works using selected elements, styles and forms and demonstrates ability to control the medium using skills, techniques and processes.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Rehearses, presents and promotes Arts works using available technical equipment to evoke specific audience responses.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Uses processes of critical analysis to support personal judgements of Arts works.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Displays cultural and historical knowledge by comparing and contrasting characteristics such as styles, themes, purposes and content in the Arts.  
  • Explores contemporary Arts issues and relates these to personal creating, making and presenting.  
  • written examples of student work. |
| Level 8 | Level 8 | Level 8 | Level 8 | Level 8 |
| • Initiates and makes Arts works that explore issues, concepts and themes.  
  • Makes Arts works that reflect sensitivity, commitment and an understanding of aesthetic considerations.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Integrates technical and structural elements in an imaginative, skilful and coherent manner to make Arts works.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Uses imaginative approaches that reflect a wide knowledge of the conventions of rehearsing, presenting and promoting of Arts works.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Reflects critically on meanings and values associated with particular Arts works.  
  • written examples of student work. | • Researches Arts works from a variety of past and present social and cultural perspectives and shows an awareness of how histories are constructed in the Arts.  
  • Examines with reference to own works and the works of others, the way the Arts challenge, shape and are influenced by prevailing values.  
  • written examples of student work. |

Evidence presented at the Australian Senate Inquiry, *Arts Education* (1995), reflected anxiety from Arts Educators with regard to the number of Arts forms included in the Australian *Arts Profile*. During the Inquiry, Visual Artists and Musicians promoted the value of their Arts forms at the expense of the newer, less dominant Arts forms. The Australian Senate Inquiry, *Arts Education* (1995:100), notes that “Clearly there are factions amongst Arts Educators”. The summary comment on this matter from the Australian Senate Inquiry, indicates an isolationist approach to Arts teaching taken by many of those who presented submissions to the Inquiry. The report *Arts Education* (1995:103) expresses concern about this issue:
But in the submissions of many particular Arts form advocates the Committee detected a note of evangelism about the special merits of 'their' Arts form, which we regard as regrettable. The separate Arts forms should not be put into boxes, just as the Arts as a whole should not be put in a box. There is a higher level learning - the habit of creative and innovative thinking - which is not the sole property of any one Arts form, nor indeed is it the sole property of the Arts generally. All Arts advocates need to recognise this. They need to recognise that their colleagues in other Arts forms (and, ideally, other disciplines) are travelling to the same place by slightly different paths. They need to help each other.

The Australian Senate Inquiry, accepts the five Arts forms listed in the Australian Arts Profile as those relevant to Australia, but a note is also made that no clear reason is given as to why they were selected. It is acknowledged in Arts Education (1995:4-5) that this list ignores Creative Writing, Craft, Film, Hybrid Arts, Indigenous Art, Computer Art, Multi-Media, Television, and links between Art and folklife, Industrial Design, and Architecture and Urban Design.

There appears to be some disagreement between the two key writers of the Arts Learning Area regarding the way in which teachers could approach teaching when using an Arts Learning Area. Emery (1995) comments that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile does not suggest that all the Arts strands need be offered continuously, so that in a primary school setting, a school can decide when to offer the five Arts experiences over the seven years of primary schooling. In contrast, Hammond (1996) considers that students should be provided with continuous experiences in some Arts forms throughout primary and secondary education.

Although the Profile Levels and school years are not connected, an analysis of the annotated work samples in the Australian Arts Profile (Table 5.9) below indicates an emerging pattern, where at the Profile Levels 2, 3, 4, and 5 the samples for Drama and Music show a two year gap between each level.
Table 5.9: Comparison between Australian *Arts Profile* Levels and Arts Work Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian <em>Arts Profile</em> Level</th>
<th>School Year and Arts Strand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>Year 12 Drama, Music, Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>Year 11 Music, Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Year 10 Music, Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Year 9 Drama; Year 7 Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Year 8 Drama; Year 5 Music; Year 9 Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Year 6 Drama; Year 4 Music; Year 2 Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Years 1&amp;2 Dance; Year 4 Drama; Year 2 Music, Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Year 1 Music, Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.8 Commentary

Although Marsh (1994), Francis (1997), Gillies (1997) and Wilson (1997) have comprehensively addressed the concerns and dilemmas encountered by the writers of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* on a general level and with regard to the *Arts*, four issues can be pursued further. These are the Performing Arts - Visual Arts debate, the exclusion of Literature from the Arts Learning Area, the interpretation of *Presenting*, and the use of generic Outcome Statements as the structural basis of the Arts Key Learning Area.

5.2.8.1 The Performing Arts - Visual Arts Debate.

Supporters of a two-way division into Visual Arts and Performing Arts were concerned that by naming the individual Arts forms that constitute the Performing Arts more emphasis would be placed on this part of the Arts, as opposed to the Visual Arts. Even though Arts supporters of a two-way split recognised the differences in the segments of Art, Craft, and Design, they did not want the area of Visual Arts broken into discrete discipline names (e.g. Sculpture, Painting, Textiles) as is often the case with the Performing Arts subjects. The creation of a Performing Arts category would not accommodate the needs of Media (a more visual medium), and it would lessen the focus on individual Performing Arts disciplines. For the
disciplines that are traditionally classified as part of the Performing Arts, the use of an umbrella name implies a loss of identity. At the same time the teachers of Performing Arts are aware of the dominance and competition from Visual Arts in terms of school displays and timetable allocation. The discipline of Visual Arts is often split into specialised skills of Drawing, Painting, Ceramics, Sculpture, Print Making, Textiles, and Photography, all receiving equal attention and timetabling allocation. A comment in *Arts Education* (1995) regarding the possible dominance of Visual Arts in a school Arts curriculum suggests otherwise. In the Australian Senate Inquiry report it is argued that Visual Arts is now competing with more Arts forms for a place in the school curriculum. The complex nature of Media has placed it in a hybrid category, with the capacity to link the two dominant Arts areas together. Perhaps the term “Expressive Arts” may be more appropriate than Performing Arts and Visual Arts, in that specific Arts forms would not be named and an equitable balance restored.

5.2.8.2 The exclusion of Literature from the Arts Learning Area.

The decision to exclude Literature from the Arts Learning Area in the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* restricted the opportunity for expansion of the Arts Learning Area beyond the most commonly included Arts forms. The Arts Learning Area has adopted the Arts subjects that have traditionally been considered as “Art” in Australian education, although taught under different umbrellas in schools. For all Australian States and Territories the position of Dance, Drama, and Media as Arts forms has now been substantiated, whereas in the past, in some Australian States and Territories, the first of these was taught as part of Physical Education and the other two as part of English. The admission of Literature would act as a support for the traditional Literary part of Media, whilst Media develops its new “visual” image. Emery (1997a); when addressing a group at the Cross Arts Victoria Conference, expressed a strong desire to include Literature in the Arts Learning Area, but she remarked that such a move would have left little content for the English Learning Area. Hammond (1997) comments on the attempts made to include Literature and Poetry in the Arts. In support of the Arts writers (Emery and Hammond), Wilson (1997) recalls that they argued vigorously that Literature belonged in the Arts. Francis (1997) comments that English
wanted Literature. Gillies (1997) revisits the common goals of Australian schooling (1989) which included reference to student participation in the “Creative Arts”, and he comments that the word “creative” has become lost along the way. If the Arts Learning Area had proceeded with a Creative Arts focus, according to Gillies it would have opened-up the Arts area to include Visual and Plastic Arts, Electronic Arts, Multi-Media and also could include Creative Writing, Media studies, Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Design.

5.2.8.3 The interpretation of Presenting.

Throughout the drafts of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, the subcomponent Presenting was given equal place in all the Arts forms (including Visual Arts) with an explanation detailing the meaning of Presenting for each Arts form. The published Australian Arts Profile (1994:3) notes that “No presenting role is outlined for the Visual Arts, where it has less significance than for Dance, Drama, Media and Music”. The strand organisers, as they are termed in the published document, are viewed as outlining “the roles students play or undertake in the Arts as makers, presenters, critics and theorists”. This represents a shift of direction from the second draft (June 1992) of the Australian Arts Statement where it suggests that Visual Arts students accomplish Presenting through the preparation of exhibitions for viewers or an audience with accompanying written or verbal review commentaries. The change in definition of the term Presenting not only indicates that the activity is considered more significant for the Performing Arts, including Media, but it lessens the strength of Presenting in the generic Learning Outcomes approach. The notion of a generic Learning Outcomes approach is one in which every Learning Outcome can be applied to all the subjects grouped together in a Learning Area. In the case of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, the Visual Arts does not include Presenting.

5.2.8.4 The use of generic Outcome Statements.

The creation of an Arts Key Learning Area with a common structural focus using generic Outcome Statements does not satisfy those Arts Educators with a strong belief that each Arts form represents a distinct body of knowledge, skills, and processes. Although Emery (1997b) refers to the importance of teaching the distinct body of knowledge that accompanies each
Arts form as being the main reason for not agreeing to a Multi-Arts approach, the use of generic Learning Outcomes is a structure which does allow for the development of a Multi-Arts approach. It is noted in the report of the Australian Senate Inquiry, *Arts Education* (1995), that the generic Learning Outcomes approach can lead to the discrediting of practices of particular Arts forms and the deskilling and de-emphasising of specialist skills in each Arts form. Alternatively, as was indicated by Wilson (1997) earlier in this chapter, the use of both subjects and generic processes solved an impasse - the generic Learning Outcomes approach was supported as was a structure for teaching single Arts forms. A further point about the adoption of an Arts Key Learning Area is made by the Australian Senate Inquiry. The submission of Brown and McKeon, referenced in the *Arts Education* report (1995:112), suggests that the Arts Key Learning Area structure has “marginalised” the Arts into a box which reflects a restricted focus on “creative, expressive and aesthetics interests”. They suggest that a more indepth consideration of the Arts may have formed a link to the humanities and social sciences, but the Key Learning Area structure has placed limitations on expansion.

5.2.9 Key Competencies

At the same time as the Australian *Statements and Profiles* were being developed another project known popularly by Australian Educators as the *Key Competencies Project* took place. In December 1990, the Australian Education Council (AEC) established a committee under the chairmanship of Brian Finn (The Finn Review) to inquire into the roles and responsibilities of schooling, particularly the *post-compulsory* sector. It was proposed that a “national curriculum” at the *post-compulsory* level be vocationally oriented. The Finn Review produced a list of desired areas of competence and in late 1991, the AEC appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Eric Mayer (The Mayer Committee) to do further work on the “competencies” section of the Finn Review. In 1992, the Mayer Committee expanded on the work of the Finn Review and developed seven *Key Competencies*, the underlying knowledge component of each matched to a Key Learning Area and formulated in generic terms. Wilson (1997) recalls that much work was done to determine to what extent the *Key Competencies* could have been integrated with the *Profiles*. He suggests that the procedure
could not take place because the sequences in both structures were different and both projects were not driven from the same intellectual source.

Table 5.10 illustrates a chronological summary of the Australian curriculum documents and events that are relevant to the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. The education reports were presented in Chapter Four.

Table 5.10: Chronological Summary of Australian Curriculum Documents and Events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td><em>Expressive Arts Study Group</em></td>
<td>Curriculum Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td><em>Education and the Arts</em></td>
<td>ASC - Australia Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td><em>Core Curriculum for Australian Schools</em></td>
<td>Curriculum Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td><em>Arts on Course</em></td>
<td>ASC - Australia Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><em>Action: Education and the Arts</em></td>
<td>Minister for Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>National Arts in Australian Schools project</em></td>
<td>Curriculum Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td><em>Strengthening Australia's Schools</em></td>
<td>John Dawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td><em>Hobart Declaration on Schooling</em></td>
<td>AEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td><em>Key Competencies</em></td>
<td>AEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1993</td>
<td><em>Statements and Profiles</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 April</td>
<td><em>First Draft Arts Statement</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 June</td>
<td><em>Second Draft Arts Statement</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 June</td>
<td><em>Final Draft Arts Statement</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 April</td>
<td><em>First Draft Arts Profile</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 February</td>
<td><em>Second Draft Arts Profile</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 June</td>
<td><em>Final Draft Arts Profile</em></td>
<td>CURASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Statements and Profiles Published</em></td>
<td>Curriculum Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Part Two: The Victorian Curriculum Documents

5.3.1 Curriculum and Standards Framework

5.3.1.1 The Development of the Curriculum and Standards Framework.

The Victorian CSF was developed from the Australian Statements and Profiles. Kimber (1995b:72) remarks that when the Australian Statements and Profiles were returned to the States and Territories in July 1993, advisory committees were established to determine the suitability of implementing each Key Learning Area Statement and Profile in the State of Victoria. The collective advice indicated that there had been “insufficient consultation with the profession” throughout the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles, and that the documents “were not of sufficiently high quality to be implemented in Victoria”. The Minister for Education requested the Board of Studies to conduct an extensive review during September and October 1993. Kimber (1995b:72) writes that the response from the Board of Studies was that the Australian Statements and Profiles in their present form were “inadequate” for implementation. In structural terms they were seen to be “too complex and unwieldy for school use in reporting to parents and collecting system-wide data on student achievement”. According to Kimber (1995b:72) the Board of Studies stated that the corresponding document to be developed, the Victorian CSF, would provide a “comprehensive curriculum framework with intended Learning Outcomes around which schools could develop their own detailed programs” and use as a focus for assessment and reporting. Kimber (1995b:73) comments that the combining of the eight Key Learning Areas into one framework was seen to be a “positive advance” on the Australian Statements and Profiles. The CSF was specifically designed as an integrated curriculum to benefit the teaching style used in primary schools in particular. In addition, the CSF would provide consistency of format and a specified relationship between Victorian CSF Levels and years of schooling.

Arts Course Advice Kit (1996, Module 2: 3) describes the Victorian CSF as a common framework “to meet the needs of individual students as well as establish a common standard that students are expected to attain at different stages of their schooling”. This statement can
be interpreted as contradictory. If the framework is aiming to meet the needs of individuals, it
should recognise that those individuals will be carving out their own learning Profile and not
aiming to meet common set targets tied to years of schooling.

The Victorian CSF was distributed in draft consultation form to Victorian Government
schools in August 1994. At the release of the draft consultation document in August 1994
Painter (1994:4) quotes Howard Kelly, Chairman of the Victorian Board of Studies:

The CSF will put a fence around what is being taught and enable teachers and
parents to talk more coherently and clearly to each other. It will assist us to
increase standards in Victorian schools. It is a framework that is derived from the
Australian Statements and Profiles but superior to them. It will make it clear to
parents and teachers the types of expectations that are appropriate for children
from Year preparatory to Year 10 based on the eight Key Learning Areas.

The Board of Studies hoped that the Catholic and non-Government school sectors, which
account for between 20 and 25 percent of students, would also adopt the Victorian CSF.
Victorian Government schools carried out a curriculum audit in 1995 to ascertain how much
of the CSF was already being taught in each school, with a view to commence
implementation of the CSF in 1996. By the end of the 1997 school year, all Victorian
Government schools were to report student progress in terms of the relevant Curriculum
Focus and Learning Outcomes in the eight Key Learning Areas. This procedure was not
completely successful, especially in the secondary school sector. The “Parents' Edition”
(1994) of the Victorian School Education News assures its readers that whilst the Victorian
CSF describes the content and processes of learning in eight Key Learning Areas across seven
levels of achievement for Preparatory Year to Year 10, schools and teachers have flexibility
in choosing how to reach these goals. A school's program is not limited to the content of the
framework's suggested curriculum materials, and may be freely complemented by a wide
range of extra curricula activities.

Kimberley (1994) and Kimber (1995a) both refer to the “framework” nature of the Victorian
CSF in addresses presented to educators as part of the implementation process. Kimberley
(1994), speaking at a Department of Education conference explains that the term "framework" in describing the Victorian CSF implies that schools are expected to do the major planning. He comments that the understanding associated with the Victorian CSF is that the "framework" is not prescriptive, but places teaching in context, providing a common basis for reporting and weekly planning. The Victorian CSF has three parts - the Curriculum Focus, Learning Outcomes, and Examples - and Kimberley defined each for the audience. The Curriculum Focus provides an overview of how and what students learn. It outlines in broad terms the experiences, skills and understandings that students would be expected to develop to satisfy the standards specified in the Learning Outcomes. The Learning Outcomes relate specifically to each Curriculum Focus and identify expected student achievements for each strand at each Victorian CSF Level (the Standard). The Learning Outcomes are worded in terms of what each student should know, understand and be able to do. It is expected that by the end of a CSF Level the majority of students will have achieved the standards specified in all the outcomes for a strand, following successful teaching and learning of that material. The Examples provide an indication of activities which students can do to demonstrate the Learning Outcomes presented with each Curriculum Focus.

Kimber (1995a) informed the audience at a JCSAV Invitational Seminar that he considers the policy framework of the Victorian CSF to be a creative document, incorporating the skills of teachers and the aspirations of the community. He states that it is not a course of study. In addressing his audience, Kimber reminded them that the Victorian Minister for Education, The Honourable Don Hayward, prefers to use the phrase "Improving Student Learning" rather than the term "outcomes" when referring to the attributes of the Victorian CSF. In describing the Victorian CSF, Kimber said that the document specifies Learning Outcomes to assist in the process of improving student learning. The focus of the Victorian CSF is on content and the essential learning that students need to develop.

A number of writers discuss what they determine to be critical aspects of the Victorian CSF. Graham (1994a) suggests that in some of the Key Learning Areas the progression from level to level seems to be linked with content development. He describes such an approach as
emphasising content driven by a syllabus, rather than being linked to any definable skill development. He then asserts that in tying the content to school grades, the Victorian CSF represents a curriculum influenced by bureaucracy and accountability, rather than any real understanding of the teaching and learning process. Graham (1994b) focusses on the ambiguous nature of the standards and Learning Outcomes in the Victorian CSF and he claims that it is unclear whether the standards are intended to be lists of skills and competencies, or an order of content. He also considers that the Learning Outcomes are a confusing combination of both skills and content, resulting in uncertainty about the meaning and intention of the standards and the actual meaning of “progression” from one level to the next. Graham (1996c) highlights the “denseness” of the Victorian CSF in general, and remarks that it does not translate easily into classroom practice and school programs. Malcolm (1997:19-20) also refers to the varying interpretations which could be made from the Victorian CSF. He comments that in its simplest form it is a “grid of outcomes”, but it could be considered a rigid “scope and sequence chart” or a “profile map”. He points out that the Victorian CSF was released with known inadequacies and it is for teachers to work with the idea that it represents.

Graham (1995, 1996a, 1996b) considers that the requirement for teachers to assess and report student achievement in every Key Learning Area in the language of the Victorian CSF by the end of 1997 to be unrealistic. His concern has been borne out considering that secondary schools in particular have been tardy in implementing the CSF. The mechanism in which teachers are to operate is described by Graham (1996b:7) as “a top-down centrally-imposed standards framework accompanied by the outlines of a P to 10 sequenced curriculum”. Graham (1996a:16) highlights a general concern expressed with the mandating of achievement levels which “require teachers to fit every student into one or more levels in each strand in each Key Learning Area and justify their decision”. Graham (1996b:7) continues that the standards as they are currently listed can be described as “experimental” at this stage.

Taylor (1996:2) comments that the linking of Victorian CSF Levels to school years “ignores individual differences in children, narrows the scope of classroom activities and makes it
difficult to implement integrated curriculum”. Davies (1996) reports that the Victorian CSF Levels have not been validated, although they are attached to school years. She comments that teachers have no guarantee that the outcomes assigned to each school year are an accurate measure of student ability. Malcolm (1997:17) reports that despite the publication of support material, “the underlying rationale for the Victorian CSF is not very clearly laid out, and the implied bases seem to vary from one CSF to another”. He explains the predicament with an assessment example where teachers and schools are given no guidance regarding the interpretation of Victorian CSF Levels and the place of grades.

As the writer of the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand and secondary Course Advice for Music, Morrisroe (1995a) offers comments which are in contrast to Victorian Government policy about linking a student's school year to a Victorian CSF Level. Morrisroe (1995a) says that although there are plans to assess the Arts under the Learning Assessment Project in 1999, teachers should not feel compelled to push their students to the stated CSF Level for that testing program in the primary years. Further, she suggests that secondary students who have not had the benefit of a sequential program in the primary years may have difficulty in reaching the standard of CSF Level 5 over two years by the end of Year eight and teachers should not be overly concerned about this situation. Jeanes (1996) also offers a comment in contrast to DoE policy regarding assessment. He remarks that it would be 1998 before teachers would be able or confident to make common assessments with regard to CSF Levels and Learning Outcomes. Howes (1997) reports that the DoE was aware that schools required considerable assistance to implement an outcomes-based curriculum, together with an assessment and reporting program, and few examples of a similar project were available anywhere in the world.

Further conflict is evident in comments made by representatives of the Board of Studies. The Board of Studies considers the Victorian CSF to be a curriculum planning tool whereas the DoE considers the Victorian CSF to be an assessment and reporting tool. Graham (1995) refers to the thoughts of Kelly (Chairperson of the Board of Studies) where he suggests four to five years as the implementation time and he dismisses the notion that there is a pre-set
Board of Studies timeline for the introduction of all or specific parts of the CSF. Hirsh (1996), speaking at a Cross Arts Victoria Conference, confirmed this information.

Malcolm (1994) draws a clear distinction between the “openness” of the Australian Statements and Profiles and the “closed” nature of the Victorian CSF. As examples of this difference he refers to the specific explanation of content in the CSF and the requirement that student achievement in the Victorian CSF is locked into school year levels. Graham (1994b) addresses the restrictive nature of the CSF. He comments that the Victorian CSF restricts the potential displayed in the Australian Profiles for flexible and open learning pathways. He maintains that the intentions of the Victorian Government to combine standards and Learning Outcomes does not encourage an integrated approach to learning, as is suggested by the Learning Areas that comprise the combination subjects.

Wilson (1997) remarks that the work done in Victoria in the construction of the Victorian CSF has largely undone the use of generic process strands. The process strands included in the Science CSF and Mathematics CSF have been removed and major alterations made to the SOSE CSF. In the Arts CSF the names of the Arts forms have been slotted into each strand description.

The Curriculum and Standards Framework (1995) published by the Victorian Board of Studies consists of a set of booklets, one for each of the eight Key Learning Areas. The Victorian CSF functions as one framework, despite being published in separate booklets. The Victorian CSF has a structural coherence to enable each of the eight Key Learning Areas to be combined, compared and contrasted, whilst maintaining their own internal integrity. Each Key Learning Area has a rationale for its strand structure and the relationship among strands. The CSF has been designed to include recognition of gender equity and equal opportunity for all students with disabilities, impairments and from all ethnic, socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds.
There are a number of major differences between the Australian and Victorian documents. Victoria produced one a *Curriculum and Standards Framework* booklet per Key Learning Area, whereas the Australian document contains two: a *Statement* and a *Profile*. The substance of each *CSF* is a reworking of the respective Australian *Profile*. The number of alterations made varies between the Key Learning Areas, with the Arts being the one that was changed the least. The relevant Australian *Statement* for each Key Learning Area was considered to be of minor influence in the development of the *CSF* booklets. The eight Australian levels were reduced to seven in the *CSF* and the levels tied to school grades. Name changes were made for the Australian strand organisers and a Curriculum Focus was added to give meaning to the Learning Outcomes. Outcome Statements were renamed Learning Outcomes. No Work Samples are included in any *CSF* booklet. Table 5.11 illustrates a general comparison between an Australian *Statements and Profiles* and Victorian *CSF*.

Table 5.11: Comparison between the Australian *Statements and Profiles* and the Victorian *CSF*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One <em>Statement</em> and one <em>Profile</em> for each of the 8 Key Learning Areas: the Arts, English, Health and Physical Education, Languages other than English, Mathematics, Science, Studies of Society and Environment, Technology</td>
<td>One <em>CSF</em> for each of the 8 Key Learning Areas: the Arts, English, Health and Physical Education, Languages other than English, Mathematics, Science, Studies of Society and Environment, Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each <em>Profile</em> is laid out according to Levels</td>
<td>Each <em>CSF</em> is laid out according to strands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each <em>Profile</em> has 8 Levels of achievement. The <em>Profile</em> Levels are not associated with years of schooling</td>
<td>Each <em>CSF</em> has 7 Levels of achievement and each Level is associated with years of schooling: Level 1: End of Preparatory Year Level 2: End of Year 2 Level 3: End of Year 4 Level 4: End of Year 6 (end of primary school) Level 5: End of Year 8 Level 6: End of Year 10 Level 7: Enrichment of those exceeding Level 6 Languages other than English and English as a Second Language <em>CSF</em> are exempted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each Profile is divided into strands, reflecting the major content areas and processes. The subdivision of strands are referred to as strand organisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Each Profile is divided into strands, reflecting the major content areas and processes. The subdivision of strands are referred to as strand organisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Curriculum Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each strand organiser has at least one Outcome Statement and in some cases two Outcome Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Outcome Statement is worded as “At Level X a student:”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Outcome Statement is accompanied by a number of Pointers or Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Work samples of some of the Pointers are included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each CSF is divided into strands, reflecting the major content areas and processes. The subdivision of strands use various names: substrands, modes, phases, strand organisers, and enquiry organisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Each CSF is divided into strands, reflecting the major content areas and processes. The subdivision of strands use various names: substrands, modes, phases, strand organisers, and enquiry organisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each subdivision of a strand has a Curriculum Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Curriculum Focus has only one Learning Outcome. The term Learning Outcomes is used, when more correctly it should be the singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Learning Outcome is worded as “At the completion of Level X a student will be able to:”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Learning Outcome is accompanied by a number of Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Work Samples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Askew (1997), a member of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee Music Working Party, remarks that the variety of language used in the Victorian CSF makes implementation in the primary school particularly difficult. He continues that to accommodate the number of Learning Areas, primary schools generally offer an integrated subject called general studies. Because of the limited number of specialist teachers in the primary school setting, one generalist teacher is responsible for learning programs in a number of Key Learning Areas.

5.3.2 Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework

The Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework (1995) is the Victorian curriculum document for the Arts Key Learning Area and is one of the booklets that constitutes the Victorian CSF.

The Victorian Arts CSF is governed by four main goals:

- To develop the intellectual and expressive potential of students through aural, spatial, kinaesthetic, interpersonal and visual experiences.
- To equip students to use and understand the Arts forms as symbolic languages by:
  - developing skills, techniques and processes that form the structure for exploration and development of ideas as a basis for their personal expression.
  - developing abilities to perform or present Arts works.
  - exploring how different social and cultural groups engage in, and convey meaning through the Arts.
• To develop skills in Arts criticism and aesthetics through describing, analysing, interpreting and evaluating their own and others' Arts works.
• To develop students' understanding that the Arts evolve within particular social and cultural contexts by:
  - developing understanding of how the Arts reflect, construct, reinforce and challenge values in different cultures.
  - studying the Arts from both historical and contemporary perspectives ("Teaching and Learning in the Arts", 1996:9).

According to Howes (1997), the Australian Arts Statement and Profile was well received by Victorian authorities. The major concern was a focus on the development of technical skills and completed products at the expense of creative work. It was perceived that an emphasis should be placed on the contribution of the Arts to the development and cultivation of creativity, and to the cognitive domain. Following the common introductory material placed in all the Victorian CSF booklets which explains the nature and purpose of the Victorian CSF, a description of each Arts strand is provided. Information is provided about the various parts of the Key Learning Area: the Curriculum Focus, Learning Outcomes, and Examples as they apply to the Arts. Issues concerning the use of terminology in the Arts, approaches to teaching the Arts from Preparatory Year to Year 10, and the importance of health and safety in the Arts are included.

The general purpose of the Victorian CSF and the specific advice about the teaching of the Arts as provided by the Board of Studies exposes an element of conflict. The Victorian CSF was designed as a generic document, allowing for the integration of Key Learning Areas as illustrated by the following quotations from the Victorian Arts CSF (1995):

The CSF as a whole has a structural coherence which allows its components to be combined, compared and contrasted, while each Key Learning Area maintains its internal integrity (p. 2).
Primary schools have typically delivered the curriculum in ways which integrate learning across the Key Learning Areas (p. 8).
Secondary schools have typically delivered the curriculum in ways that are strongly subject-based. The CSF is clearly amenable to such an approach: it is also amenable to a more integrated approach (p. 8).
The specific advice from the Board of Studies regarding the teaching of the Arts is as follows:

It is essential that the students experience each of the Arts strands as a discrete learning experience so that the understandings and skills central to each strand are developed sequentially. Using these skills and understandings students can then work effectively across the Arts strands. This will assist them to explore linking concepts and to enrich their understanding of the complementary relationships between the Arts strands. Learning in the Arts may also involve integration with any of the other Key Learning Areas of the curriculum. School curriculum organisation may consider the scheduling of sequential Art experiences, linked Arts programs and integrated curriculum experiences. Each Arts strand - Dance, Drama, Graphic Communication, Media, Music and Visual Arts - represents a distinctive way of learning. In this context learning in The Arts should be based on the systematic provision of strands to allow for the sequential learning of skills and concepts in specific Arts strands (Victorian Arts CSF, 1995:12-13).

The Victorian Arts CSF has six strands, the same five as in the Arts Profile - Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts - with Graphic Communication added commencing at Level 5 (the beginning of secondary school). At CSF Levels 1 to 4 Graphic Communication is incorporated into Visual Arts. The Victorian Arts CSF adopts the same strand organisers, strand suborganisers and Outcome Statements as the Australian Arts Profile. Unlike the Australian document, the strand suborganiser of Presenting is added for Visual Arts and Graphic Communication. The Examples illustrating student achievement of the Learning Outcomes have been changed to reflect more specific requirements. The Arts CSF Learning Outcomes are the same as the Outcome Statements in the Australian Arts Profile, listed in Table 5.8. The name of each Arts strand replaces the word “Arts” as used in the Australian Profile. This process removes the generic nature of the Outcome Statements. To enable the Victorian Arts CSF to include the same Outcome Statements as the Australian Arts Profile some adjustments have been made. The Victorian Arts CSF does not use the Outcome Statements provided for Level 8 of the Australian Arts Profile. It only uses one of the two Outcome Statements from Level 7 of the Australian Arts Profile for the sub-substrand Exploring and Developing Ideas, and one for the substrand Past and Present Contexts.
The three subcomponents of *Creating, Making and Presenting* in both the Australian and Victorian documents have not been given an official label. For convenience of this study, the subcomponents in the Australian *Arts Profile* are called strand suborganisers and in the Victorian *Arts CSF* they are called sub-substrands.

Table 5.12, adapted from A. Watson (1995:10-11), illustrates a comparison of the Australian *Arts Profile* and the Victorian *Arts CSF*. This table should be read in conjunction with Table 5.11 which presents a general overview of the Australian and Victorian Documents.

Table 5.12: Comparison between the Australian *Arts Profile* and the Victorian *Arts CSF*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian <em>Arts Profile</em></th>
<th>Victorian <em>Arts CSF</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strands:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strands:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dance</td>
<td>• Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drama</td>
<td>• Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Media</td>
<td>• Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Music</td>
<td>• Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual Arts</td>
<td>• Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graphic Communication (Level 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strand Organisers:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Substrands:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating, Making and Presenting suborganisers:</td>
<td>• Creating, Making and Presenting sub-substrands:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exploring and Developing Ideas</td>
<td>- Exploring and Developing Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using Skills, Techniques and Processes</td>
<td>- Using Skills, Techniques and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presenting (not for Visual Arts)</td>
<td>- Presenting (added for Visual Arts &amp; Graphic Communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arts Criticism and Aesthetics</td>
<td>• Arts Criticism and Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Past and Present Contexts</td>
<td>• Past and Present Contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels:</strong> 1-8</td>
<td><strong>Levels:</strong> 1-7 (linked to school years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profiles laid out according to Levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>Profiles laid out according to strands</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Curriculum Focus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curriculum Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Statements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pointers, Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Samples</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Work Samples</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.3 Music Strand of the Arts CSF

5.3.3.1 Terminology in the Music Strand of the Arts CSF.

It is important to analyse the approach taken to defining Music terminology within the Music strand of the Arts CSF, especially when the document has been written to accommodate General Classroom Music and Specialist Music programs. Sometimes Music terminology is included (with or without a definition) in the Curriculum Focus of a substrand or sub-substrand. Music terms that illustrate a gradual change in quality, e.g. “dynamics” are only defined in terms of extreme opposites, using common usage English words, namely loud and soft. This approach does not accommodate the correct and total meaning of such Music terminology. The decision to match specific Musical terminology with a particular Curriculum Focus illustrates an arbitrary division of Musical language and suggests that certain Musical language is only relevant to the accompanying Curriculum Focus.

At other times Music terminology is placed within the list of Examples of a substrand or sub-substrand. On these occasions some of the terminology has been already been defined in the Curriculum Focus and some is “new” and has not been defined at all. By including definitions of Music terminology in the Examples section, the lists of Examples of student achievement have become quite long and complicated. Some of the Examples listed contain many different Musical attributes grouped under one heading and would be more clearly explained if broken down into shorter Examples.

5.3.3.2 Specialist programs in the Music Strand of the Arts CSF.

References to specialist Instrumental or Vocal programs begin to appear in Level 3 of the Music strand. These programs are taught by specialist visiting teachers to schools. The reference to Instrumental or Vocal programs is only found in two sub-substrands: Using Skills, Techniques and Processes, and Presenting. The relevant information is included in the Curriculum Focus section of these sub-substrands. Table 5.13 lists the references in the Music strand of the Arts CSF to Instrumental or Vocal programs.
Table 5.13: References to Instrumental or Vocal programs in the Music strand of the *Arts CSF* (Arts CSF 1995: 91-104).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts CSF Level</th>
<th>Arts CSF Sub-substrand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Instrumental or Vocal programs</td>
<td>Using Skills, Techniques and Processes: &quot;develop greater technical control&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Instrumental or Vocal programs</td>
<td>Presenting: &quot;develop a higher level of performance&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5: Instrumental or Vocal programs</td>
<td>Presenting: &quot;develop increased performance techniques and technical skills&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6: Performance or Composition programs</td>
<td>Presenting: &quot;develop increased technical skills&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7: Performance or Composition programs</td>
<td>Presenting: &quot;strengthen their musical concepts and perceptions&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.4 Support Materials

To assist the process of implementation of the *Arts CSF* a number of other documents have been published. The three major documents are:

1. *Arts Course Advice* (1996) published by the Department of Education, Victoria. This provides sample units of work.

2. *Assessment and Reporting Support Materials* (1997) published by the Department of Education. This provides sample report forms and advice about judging a CSF Level.

3. *Using the CSF* (1995-1997) published by the Victorian Board of Studies. This is a series of booklets providing general and specific advice.

Other minor support materials produced by the Board of Studies and the Department of Education are included later in this chapter.

5.3.5 *Arts Course Advice* (1996)

Throughout 1994, 1995 and 1996 the Department of Education (DoE) was engaged in writing *Course Advice* for the eight Key Learning Areas. *Course Advice* is divided into two sections, Levels 1 to 4, for primary schools and Levels 5 to 7 for secondary schools for each Key Learning Area. *Course Advice* provides assistance with translating the CSF into practice by
offering a range of teaching and learning activities, additional resources, and assessment strategies. The units of work reflect a variety of teaching approaches including disciplined-based, integration between disciplines, and suggested links between Key Learning Areas. *Course Advice* as a total document has been described by Dennett (1994) “as the meat on the bones to implement the skeleton CSF”. A number of advisory groups were established to assist the writing process in each Key Learning Area. *Arts Course Advice* was outsourced to a number of Arts professional associations with an Arts writer editing the completed edition. The consortium *Cross Arts Victoria* played a major role in the development of the *Arts Course Advice*. A draft of the document was circulated to teachers in 1995.

*Arts Course Advice* (1996) was written for the Arts Key Learning Area. It includes common introductory material placed in all Key Learning Area *Course Advice* publications, followed by material specific to *Arts Course Advice*. General information provided about the integration of curriculum acknowledges that the *Arts Course Advice* has followed the same structure as the Victorian *Arts CSF*, working within a Key Learning Area boundary, even though courses in schools do not reflect this model. This structure was adopted to reflect the Board of Studies' policy that each Arts discipline is to be taught separately.

Throughout Levels 1 to 4 of *Arts Course Advice* (1996:14) an outcomes-based approach is promoted as being the most suitable for learning in the Arts, as such an approach “allows diversity in programs and caters for individual differences”. The writers of *Arts Course Advice* further comment that the five Learning Outcomes for each strand reflect the complexity of learning in the Arts, and that “At any one time, individual students may well achieve different levels in the different substrands”.

Each unit of work throughout *Arts Course Advice* presents a content topic or a theme. The topics are unrelated and encourage the teaching of a discipline in terms of a collection of disjointed activities that reflect a specific Learning Outcome rather than a continuous program. The structure used by the *Arts Course Advice* does not reflect the implementation of the Victorian *Arts CSF* as a continuous curriculum for Preparatory Year to Year 10, where skills, knowledge and understandings are presented to students in a sequential order. The
variety of units of work may indicate the scope that a program could adopt. It was hoped that work samples would be included in Arts Course Advice because they were left out of the Victorian Arts CSF. Samples of work are only found with the Graphic Communication units of work and are not included for the other Arts disciplines. This means that the ideas for assessment provided under a heading “Students should be able to demonstrate” are expressed solely in words. Teachers do not see any examples of the appropriate CSF Level. As the “Introduction” to the Arts CSF (1995:10) states that “Music is essentially an aural Art form”, it can be suggested that aural work samples are also necessary. A selection of units from across the Arts forms include ESL annotations to assist teachers of students with English as a second language (ESL).

5.3.5.1 Music Strand of Arts Course Advice.

The Course Advice units of work were devised to make the CSF standard more explicit in each of the Key Learning Areas. In Music three units of work have been devised for Levels 1 to 4 (primary school). The titles of these units are generally thematic-based. Four units of work have been written for Music Course Advice Levels 5 and 6, and three units have been devised for Level 7 (secondary school). The titles of these units focus on some of the technical aspects specific to Music. Each unit of work has a number of sections:

- A Title
- A Unit Focus
- The relevant Curriculum Foci for the unit of work, and
- The relevant Learning Outcomes for the unit of work.

The substrand Creating, Making and Presenting is included in every unit of work of Music Course Advice at the primary and secondary levels. The sub strands Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts are included for all units of work in secondary Music Course Advice. These two sub strands are not always used at the primary level.

A three column format is used to detail the units of work:

- Suggested Learning Activities (contain descriptions of units of work which achieve the desired Learning Outcomes)
• Suggestions (provide materials, resources, teaching strategies), and
• Assessment ideas (contain information about what students should know or be able to do in relation to the Learning Outcome).

Under the heading "vocabulary", the terms appropriate for the content of the unit of work are listed. The document states that students should become familiar with these terms as they complete the unit of work. This process strongly suggests that only those terms are relevant to the content and theme of the unit of work and have no "generic" meaning as applied to the discipline as a whole. This idea is sending a false message to generalist primary teachers, who, not being familiar with Musical terminology and definitions of Musical terms, may equate the Music "vocabulary" specifically to the unit of work in which the terms are presented. Although the fundamental terms are defined in the primary Music Course Advice, the failure to supply definitions for quite complicated terms in the secondary Music Course Advice does not assist the teacher to provide the correct definitions for students. The Music Course Advice for primary schools includes a glossary of basic Music theory to accommodate the needs of the non-specialist Music teacher who has the responsibility of teaching Music at the primary school level. The non-inclusion of a glossary in secondary Music Course Advice assumes that teachers will be specialists in the subject.

The inclusion of original songs in primary Music Course Advice provides unique content, but the difficulty of some of the songs, which form an integral part of the unit of work, require the skills of a Music specialist to teach them to the students. At each of Levels 5, 6 and 7 one unit of work has a special focus on Instrumental Music or the preparation of composed works.

In a series of articles, Stefanakis (1995), the primary Music Course Advice writer, specifically addresses the concept of integration between the Music substrands and the remaining Arts strands. With the exception of Graphic Communication, Arts Course Advice work samples have not been included, something that is considered to be a weakness in the Victorian Arts CSF. Morrisroe (1994c), the Victorian Arts CSF and secondary Music Course Advice writer, hoped that work samples would be included.
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5.3.5.2 *Professional Development Support Kit: Arts Course Advice* (1996).

*Arts Course Advice Kit* (1996) is a generic *Course Advice* support document consisting of a videotape titled *Introducing the Course Advice* and four modules:

- Introduction to the Arts Key Learning Area
- Developing programs using Arts Course Advice
- Assessment and Reporting, and
- Students with disabilities and impairments (distributed separately).

The videotape provides a very general overview of *Course Advice*. The fourth module has been distributed separately for each Key Learning Area *Course Advice* Kit. The first three modules are the same for all the Key Learning Areas. The name of the Key Learning Area (the Arts) and examples of material from the Victorian *Arts CSF* are used as appropriate. The Kit is designed for use by a facilitator to conduct professional development activities. All detail is provided including resources needed, times for each segment, overhead projection transparencies and answers to commonly asked questions. One of the example questions (1996, Module 1:15) reads: “Many of the Learning Outcomes at Levels 6 and 7 are dealt with in the *Victorian Certificate of Education*. If the Learning Outcomes are taught in Year 10 won't the students end up doing the same thing twice?” The answer advises that subject matter, teaching and learning strategies and resources used for the Victorian *Arts CSF* Levels 6 and 7 should be coordinated with the corresponding *Victorian Certificate of Education* (VCE) course. The inclusion of this question is quite fascinating in that it contradicts the original advice given about the relationship between the Victorian *CSF* and the *VCE*. The Learning Outcomes contained in Level 6 are tied to Years 9 and 10. The section from the *Arts CSF* (1995:4) explains the situation thus: “Level 7 is intended to provide extension material for students who have demonstrated achievement at Level 6. It does not duplicate material covered in the *VCE* Units 1 and 2. It is intended to enhance further learning”.

5.3.6 *Assessment and Reporting Support Materials* (1997)

In 1996 the Department of Education began to release a series of articles entitled *Assessment and Reporting Support Material*. These were initially published in *Victorian School News*, the official communication arm of the Department of Education. The first material included a
general overview and advice on reporting for English and Mathematics, together with sample report forms. Material published specifically for the Arts entitled “Assessment and Reporting in the Arts” (1997:15) addresses the Arts Key Learning Area. It includes the issues of:

- the nature of assessment in the Arts
- making on-balance judgements about student achievement in strands
- assessment strategies that can be used in the Arts
- making reliable judgements about student achievement of learning outcomes
- record keeping, and
- reporting to parents.

It is worthy of note that the same article draws attention to the requirements of making a judgement about student achievement in the Arts. “It is a fundamental understanding of the Arts CSF that separate judgements are made for each strand. A judgement made about student learning in Music is separate to a judgement about Media. . . . It is not appropriate to make a judgement for 'the Arts' as a whole” (Assessment and Reporting in the Arts, 1997:15). The article does not provide guidance about translating the CSF Level achieved in each Learning Outcome into an overall Victorian CSF Level for each strand. Although it is possible for a student to achieve a different CSF Level in each of the five Learning Outcomes, reporting using the CSF requires the statement of one overall level. The different levels of achievement, accompanied by different qualifiers, make it impossible and inappropriate to total the levels. The absence of information about this matter is a major weakness in the documentation and thus fails to support one of the aims of the Victorian CSF, namely as a framework to meet the needs of individuals.


The series of articles referred to above, along with material about other Key Learning Areas, has been republished in booklet form. The material is expanded to include sample report forms, strategies for assessment, criteria for assessment, and for making links with Learning Outcomes. It is suggested that a three-point scale (“established”, “consolidated”, “beginning”) may be more appropriate for the Arts, excluding the descriptor “not apparent”. If a student does not register a standard at a particular level, the booklet suggests that a teacher may refer back to a student's previous work and make a judgement based on a lower
Victorian CSF Level. The way in which a teacher is to use this information is unclear. The teacher could either record the achievement in a strand at a lower Victorian CSF Level or use a form of "equalisation" to make a judgement at the correct Victorian CSF Level. The booklet acknowledges that students will progress at different rates in each of the substrands within an Arts form. It also comments that not all students will fully achieve each of the five Learning Outcomes in any one Arts form. These observations suggest a recognition that it is not possible to total Learning Outcomes to equal a single Victorian CSF Level, but none of the sample report forms include provision for a different level to be indicated for each Learning Outcome.

One example of linking assessment tasks to Learning Outcomes illustrates the Victorian Certificate of Education method of allocating a "points score" for each criteria to equal a predetermined maximum. The collated numerical gradings (which are also converted into a letter grade) are used to make a judgement about achievement of a Learning Outcome. Some report forms indicate an overall letter grading as well as a position on the three-point scale of "established", "consolidated" or "beginning" within a single Victorian CSF Level. Making an "on-balance" judgement is illustrated in the sample report forms by adding together the most common "grading" achieved by a student for assessment tasks. The total of the common "gradings" is then transferred to the terms "established", "consolidated" or "beginning". Examples of "gradings" are: consistently, usually, sometimes, satisfactory, not satisfactory. Numerical gradings are also suggested.

5.3.7 Arts Matters (1997)

Arts Matters is a support program for the Victorian Arts CSF broadcast at regular intervals on SOFNet, the Victorian Department of Education Satellite Network. It provides segments on each Arts form in the Victorian CSF. Arts Matters is designed to inform teachers of the latest resources relevant to schools, including concerts, exhibitions and productions scheduled to take place in Victoria over the following weeks. The programs include teacher interviews, selections of students' work, specific Arts technologies, best practice demonstrations and
examples of Learning Outcomes. Each program is also available as a videotape and teacher notes can be downloaded from SOFWeb, the Victorian Department of Education Website.

5.3.8 Switched On Curriculum (1997)

Switched On Curriculum is a fully searchable CD ROM produced by the Victorian Department of Education. It is designed to encourage teachers to plan integrated units of work in line with CSF Learning Outcomes. It contains all the Course Advice for every Key Learning Area, Course Advice Professional Development Support Kits, the Assessment and Reporting Support Materials that have been prepared to date, selected material from Science and Technology Education in Primary Schools (a primary school science program that is delivered by SOFWeb) and some KIDMAP training modules (the recommended computer assessment and reporting package). The CD ROM can be linked to KIDMAP to assist with assessment and reporting.

5.3.9 Using the CSF Series (1995-1997)

The series Using the CSF, written and published by the Board of Studies, falls into two categories: general advice and specific Key Learning Area advice. This project was funded through the National Professional Development Program, a source of funding from 1994 to 1996 offered by the Commonwealth Government to assist with the implementation of the Australian Statements and Profiles in each State and Territory. The general advice contains four booklets:

2. Using the CSF - Integrating the Curriculum (1995)
3. Using the CSF - Assessment and Reporting (1996)
4. Using the CSF - The Transition Years (in press).

Using the CSF: “Key Learning Area advice” forms the specific advice. It has eight parts, one for each Key Learning Area. The relevant part for this study being Using the CSF: the Arts (1995).
5.3.9.1 *Using the CSF: An Introduction.*

*Using the CSF: An Introduction* (1995) focusses on a Curriculum Review and Planning process as the suggested approach for each school's preparation in implementing the Victorian CSF. The booklet outlines steps for schools to follow in the review process and provides a sample of the experiences and procedures used in a primary school and a secondary school. The school curriculum audit was considered to be a priority for 1995. The booklet includes initial advice in the areas of assessment and reporting, integrating the curriculum and the transition years. It details the Board of Studies' plans for each of the Key Learning Areas for 1995.

5.3.9.2 *Using the CSF: Integrating the Curriculum.*

*Using the CSF: Integrating the Curriculum* (1995) focusses on integrating the curriculum in primary schools. Sample integrated units of work are presented showing how Key Learning Areas can be combined through strands and Learning Outcomes. The 13 units of work are prepared in a variety of ways: as a detailed unit, a unit outline, and a whole school focus. The Victorian CSF Level 3 is used in all examples except one for Level 4 and one for a combined Level 1 and 2. Three different starting points are used as illustrations of integrated units: commencing with a topic, with a strand within a Key Learning Area, and with a Curriculum Focus and Learning Outcome within a Key Learning Area.

When the Arts is not chosen as a Key Learning Area focus in the sample integrated units, but is added as a secondary consideration, a generic statement regarding the Arts is repeated: “Students' progress towards achieving Learning Outcomes in the four strands of the Arts may be assessed throughout this unit. Select the Arts Learning Outcomes relevant to your program and assessment needs during program planning” (1995:15). Although this booklet is designed for the primary school, a major error is the reference to only four Arts strands, with Media and Graphic Communication omitted. Only the Arts form Graphic Communication is introduced at Level 5 (secondary school) and Media is included in the primary school Arts curriculum. Therefore there are five Arts strands in the CSF for the primary school.
5.3.9.3 *Using the CSF: the Arts.*

*Using the CSF: the Arts* (1995) is designed to help implement the Victorian *Arts CSF* and offers assistance with understanding the structure and content of the Victorian *Arts CSF*. The booklet covers the areas of curriculum audit and review, curriculum planning and development, and assessment and reporting within the Arts.

One small section in *Using the CSF: the Arts* lists and defines the terminology used in each strand of the *Arts CSF*. Most of the terms presented and defined in the Music strand of the Victorian *Arts CSF* are included once again. In addition, other undefined terms used in the Music strand of the *Arts CSF* are accorded an explanation. To account for the differing definitions of Music terms used in the Victorian *Arts CSF*, *Using the CSF: the Arts* explains that the elements of Music are referred to in a variety of ways throughout the Victorian *Arts CSF* to accommodate the different levels of understanding as the Victorian *CSF* Levels increase.

Other topics covered are guidance for the implementation of the substrands *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts* within each of the six Arts strands, and comprehensive information on the scope and sequence of knowledge, concepts, understanding and skills for the substrands in each of the six Arts strands.

*Using the CSF: the Arts* (1995:18) suggests that school Arts curricula may involve students in programs offering:

- a progressive provision of the Arts strands through each of the levels
- linked Arts programs where skills and understandings in the Arts are provided across the strands, and
- integrated curriculum experiences, where specific Arts strand(s) would be included within the activities or units

In providing advice about combining the individual Arts forms, and integrating the Arts forms with other areas of the curriculum, *Using the CSF: the Arts* (1995:21) adopts the term “linking”. The term is used to suggest “that the various Arts forms can be taught in one
activity while still retaining a notion of the discrete qualities and developmental notions of growth in each”. It is acknowledged that the Arts often depend on each other. The booklet refers to the disadvantages of “linking” when the experiences offered lose sight of discrete ways of learning in each strand such that students may not advance sequentially in the particular skills of each strand and its substrands. Similarly, the Arts Profile suggests a focus on students studying Arts forms as separate disciplines. The Arts strand, Graphic Communication, is not included in this advice about combining Arts forms.

Specific examples are suggested as ways of linking the Arts forms. These are interpreting one Arts form using another, focussing on the Arts elements, exploring themes, and using Literature as a starting point. A further example matches the five Arts strands used in the primary school with complementary Key Learning Areas as a way of integrating the Arts forms with other areas of the curriculum. The school production is suggested as one way of offering Integrated Arts teaching in the secondary school.

Sample report forms are provided, specifically designed for reporting one Arts strand. The report forms make it clear that students are to be working at the same CSF Level for each aspect of the relevant Arts strand. This expectation assumes that each student has had sufficient past experience to be able to do so. In assessing the achievement outcomes for each substrand, Using the CSF: the Arts booklet (1995:76) suggests the following numerical scale to indicate a level of achievement:

- 3 = Established
- 2 = Consolidating
- 1 = Emerging
- 0 = Not apparent

The inclusion of the achievement mark - “not apparent” - in this and other reporting advice raises the validity of the information supplied on the report form. If students are assessed with this grading, they are obviously not totally working at the required Victorian CSF Level. No indication is provided, therefore, about the relevant Victorian CSF Level for that particular Learning Outcome. The process also throws into doubt the validity of totalling
Learning Outcomes to equal one CSF Level. Although the Victorian Arts CSF (1995:11) states that when an Arts form is offered in a school all Learning Outcomes will be taught, the sample report forms in Using the CSF: the Arts suggests that a “tick” be placed next to those Learning Outcomes studied. In this case the reporting advice does not support the expectations of the Victorian Arts CSF.

5.3.9.4 Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting.

Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting (1996) is designed to help teachers and schools develop assessment and reporting procedures to implement the Victorian CSF. The substance of the booklet is divided into the three areas of assessment, recording, and reporting with an extended appendix featuring samples of these areas.

The crucial role of Learning Outcomes is emphasised as they are seen as central to assessment and reporting in the Victorian CSF. Learning Outcomes underpin teaching and learning programs, and teachers are expected to gather information on student achievement related to the Learning Outcomes. Students are expected to be assessed on key knowledge and skills which can be exhibited in units of work based on the Curriculum Focus statements and Learning Outcomes in each Victorian CSF Level and strand. Schools are expected to continue to use the variety of assessment practices already available. Assessment suggestions are to be found in the appropriate Course Advice.

Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting lists specific information that should be included in reports to parents and addresses the issue of judging achievement using the Victorian CSF Levels. The sample report forms take the Key Learning Area as their basis and assume that a student is working within one Victorian CSF Level. In the case of the Arts a single Key Learning Area report form will require teachers to interpret their observations of a student's achievements in different Arts forms taught within one overall CSF Arts Level. This approach implies that teachers can equate the learning between each Arts form and total all the Learning Outcomes taught.
Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting encourages teachers to collect work samples. Although work samples are included in the Australian Profiles, they are not included in the Victorian CSF. In the actual reporting process the booklet states that the Learning Outcome statements are to be used as a basis for reporting, but the actual language of the Learning Outcomes is not recommended for use. This section suggests the use of a four point rating scale to assess the achievement of a Learning Outcome. It also indicates that teachers might wish to added a qualifier, for example, “under direction” to the rating. The four point scale is the opposite to that used in Using the CSF: the Arts and the same as that suggested by the Department of Education, in an article entitled “KIDMAP Helpline Support for Schools” (1995:6). This time, the definitions in Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting (1996:44) have been expanded slightly:

- 1 = Established the level
- 2 = Consolidating the level
- 3 = Beginning to work in the level
- 4 = Not yet apparent

Individual schools may adopt the rating scale to their own needs, defeating the concept of continuity of learning between schools.

5.3.10 KIDMAP

KIDMAP (1993) is a computer assisted assessment and reporting package distributed to all Victorian Government schools and Catholic primary schools. It was developed by a private company in Western Australia. The program has been updated to accommodate changes in computer systems and specific requirements of the CSF. The latest version is KIDMAP 98. It is the preferred format for Victorian Government schools to record assessment data and for reporting to parents. The suggested headings and numbering system for reporting are slightly different from those in other support material. In the article entitled “KIDMAP Helpline Support for Schools” (1995:6) the headings and numbering system read:

- 1 = Established
- 2 = Consolidating
- 3 = Beginning
In another article entitled “Introducing KIDMAP to Schools” (1995:9) a fifth achievement level titled “cause for concern” is added.

5.3.11 Exemplary Assessment Materials

Exemplary Assessment Materials (EAMs) have been developed in some Key Learning Areas at the request of the Board of Studies. The areas are Visual Arts (being only one strand of the Arts), Science, English, Mathematics and Studies of Society and Environment. Assessment items in these Key Learning Areas have been developed to identify the standard represented by the Learning Outcomes at each Victorian CSF Level. This Visual Arts resource authored by Emery and Hammond (in press), provides a selection of assessment tasks for CSF Levels 1 to 6. Three types of assessment tasks are included: short, moderate and extended assessment items. Short assessment items focus on a “right” or “wrong” answer and they aim to test the specific knowledge of students. The assessment items are presented in print and require a written answer. The test questions include multiple-choice questions, matching an answer from a defined list, labelling parts of an object, and short answer questions. A scoring guide accompanies the questions. Moderate and extended assessment items take a practical approach with students producing a folio of examples. Appropriate work samples in the two categories of “working towards” and “achieving” are provided for each Victorian CSF Level. The written assessment criteria, which represents the scoring guide, is developed from the Learning Outcomes of each sub strand at each Victorian CSF Level.

5.3.12 Summary of Victorian Support Materials

A major section of this chapter has been devoted to the support documents accompanying the Victorian CSF. Some of the documents form part of a series, where information of both a general nature and that specific to each Key Learning Area is provided. Other support documents have been designed to encompass the whole CSF, for example KIDMAP, or to provide information just for the Arts, for example, Arts Matters. Course Advice is the main support document for the CSF. Arts Course Advice represents the specific information for the
Arts Key Learning Area. A supplementary package entitled Professional Development Support Kit: Arts Course Advice was produced for Professional Development providers. Using the CSF series includes four booklets which focus on general topics and another eight booklets that specifically refer to each Key Learning Area. Assessment and Reporting Materials contain both general information and a booklet specific to each Key Learning Area. Exemplary Assessment Materials are being developed in some of the eight Key Learning Areas, including the Arts, where the focus is on Visual Arts. Switched On Curriculum is a compilation of documents already mentioned and presented on CD ROM.

Table 5.14 illustrates a chronological summary of curriculum documents and events that are relevant to the development of the Victorian CSF. The education report and curriculum documents were presented in Chapter Four.

Table 5.14: Chronological Summary of Victorian Curriculum Documents and Events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Education and the Arts</td>
<td>ASC - Australia Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Ministerial Papers 1-6</td>
<td>Ministry of Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>School Curriculum and Organisation Framework</td>
<td>Ministry of Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Introduction of the VCE</td>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CSF (Draft)</td>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Arts Course Advice (Draft)</td>
<td>Department of Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1997</td>
<td>Using the CSF Series</td>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Arts Course Advice</td>
<td>Department of Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Assessment and Reporting Support Material</td>
<td>Department of Education (Victoria)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Summary One: The current Australian and Victorian curriculum documents

The focus of this chapter has been on the current Australian and Victorian curriculum documents. The Australian documents are called the *Statements and Profiles*. The Victorian document is the *Curriculum and Standards Framework (CSF)*. A number of support documents to assist with the implementation of the *CSF* have been produced. The support documents have been itemised and analysed. Much of the discussion in the chapter can be aligned to the similar headings in Chapters Two and Three.

5.4.1 Australia

Although it has been emphasised by a number of writers that the Australian *Statements and Profiles* do not constitute a “national curriculum” for Australia, the term is still used by some writers. The collaborative approach taken to the development of *Statements and Profiles* and the usefulness of the documents for the classroom teacher are emphasised.

The selection of Key Learning Areas which make up the Australian *Statements and Profiles* were listed as part of the *Hobart Declaration of Schooling*. The influence for the choice of these Key Learning Areas came from the work of the Curriculum Development Centre (Canberra) in 1980 when the decision was made to establish nine core areas of knowledge and experience. The aim of this work was to place subjects into interdisciplinary groups rather than as traditional stand-alone subjects. Cross-curricula themes and groups with special needs are identified in the *Hobart Declaration of Schooling* and form part of the development of the *Statements and Profiles* in each Key Learning Area. The key writers for each Learning Area were to include reference to these elements, a process that occurred with mixed results. The establishment of seven core learning processes as part of the work of the Curriculum Development Centre (1980) provided an influence for development of the cross-curricula themes in the *Statements and Profiles*.

The major area of debate in the development of the Australian *Statements and Profiles* was the structure of the four combination Key Learning Areas both in terms of the subjects to be included therein and the way in which the subjects would be described. In deciding on how
subjects would be described considerations were given to the choice between subjects or processes or both, the selection of learning processes, and the use of generic language.

Australia adopted an Arts Learning Area, in a similar way to a number of other countries listed in Chapter Three. By the time the writing process commenced for the *Arts Statement and Profile* all Australian States and Territories were using an Arts Learning Area, and the grouping of the Arts had been generally accepted for curriculum development. The problems that were encountered by the key writers of the Arts Learning Area have been a focus of this chapter. Resolutions were required to be reached to satisfy a balance between Visual Arts and Performing Arts, and for those Arts Educators who advocated benefits of Multi-Arts teaching. Within Visual Arts, the Craft, and Design *specialists* argued for a stronger focus. Some Visual Arts Educators considered the inclusion of Performing Arts in the Arts Learning Area, tipped the balance towards the performance side. The debate to include Literature took place and was lost, as was the desire of some Arts Educators to include Multi-Arts.

Suggestions made about developing Multi-Arts programs using the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* as a basis all refer to making links or connections between the Arts forms. This approach is in common with the majority of writers referenced in the Literature Review of this study. It is recommended in the *Arts Statement and Profile* that students take part in Multi-Arts experiences, but no advice is given about overcoming the “distinctiveness” element of each Arts form.

The decision to use generic common learning processes as the structural element for the Arts Key Learning Area acted as a means of accommodating the wishes of all parties contributing to the debate. The common learning processes also bonded the individual Arts forms into an Arts Learning Area. During the planning stages proposals were put that both outcomes specific to each Arts form and generic outcomes be written. Disagreement about the weighting, number and complexity of Outcome Statements resulted in the non-inclusion of any outcomes specific to each Arts form. Despite this, Arts Educators who are particularly
concerned that individual Arts forms will loose their uniqueness and strength in the school timetable, consider that the use of generic learning processes will encourage this to happen.

5.4.2 Victoria.

The development of the Victorian CSF reversed a number of elements of the Australian Statements and Profiles. The CSF is a mandated curriculum document, establishing both a compulsory curriculum and a set of standards. It is to be implemented in all Government schools and used for reporting student progress. The CSF Levels have been tied to school years and teachers are expected to teach and report according to the Learning Outcomes and CSF Levels. Although developed from non-compulsory curriculum guidelines, the Victorian CSF is a document that has taken on “national curriculum” status, setting standards within one State of Australia.

The CSF adopted the same Key Learning Areas in totality as the Australian Statements and Profiles. The Profile was used as a basis for each CSF document. The Statement was of only minor influence, and it has been recommended that teachers read the relevant Statement to understand the philosophical reasons for the approach taken in the Key Learning Areas. The Victorian CSF also accommodates student groups with special needs in the same way as the Australian Statements and Profiles.

The Arts Profile remained intact when it was developed as the Arts CSF. The major changes are one Learning Outcome for each substrand, rather than two as found in the Arts Profile, more specific Examples of student achievement, the addition of Graphic Communication for secondary students (Level 5) and the sub-substrand Presenting for Visual Arts. Although the Learning Outcomes are the same in the Arts Profile and Arts CSF, the names of the Arts strands are included in the Victorian document, a factor that removes the generic approach taken to Learning Outcomes in the Arts Profile. Other changes made were common to all CSF documents, such as the inclusion of a Curriculum Focus and tying CSF Levels to school years.
The connection between the many support documents associated with the *Arts CSF*, both of a general type and those specific to Arts and Music have been discussed in this chapter. One major issue is the approach to the use of Music terminology in the *Arts CSF* and in the support documents of *Course Advice* and *Using the CSF: the Arts*. The approach to including and describing Musical terms in the Victorian *Arts CSF* Music strand and in the support documents *Using the CSF: the Arts* and *Arts Course Advice* is inconsistent and particularly confusing for the *non-specialist* Music teacher. Not all terms are defined and the definitions used change according to the expected level of achievement throughout the Victorian *Arts CSF*. A vocabulary section is included with each unit of work in *Arts Course Advice*, but the terms relate specifically to that unit. The issue of learning the terms associated with Music and the relevant definitions is made difficult for the *non-specialist* teacher with the information spread across three publications.

In the opening pages of the *Arts CSF*, the Board of Studies provides details about the overall approach to teaching the Victorian *CSF* as well as the specific requirements for teaching the Arts. When compared, these statements are contradictory and make it difficult to ascertain if Multi-Arts teaching has a place. In a general sense, the *CSF* is written as an integrated document where Key Learning Areas can be interrelated. Yet, for the teaching of the Arts, it is strongly recommended that each Arts form be taught individually. In an attempt to cater for these two requirements the writers of the Arts support documents have had the difficult task of providing information which is “seen to be implementing” the Victorian *Arts CSF* but at the same time supporting a policy of integration. The units of work in *Arts Course Advice* do not include Integrated Arts or Multi-Arts activities. Reference is made to “links” which can be made between the appropriate units of work and other Key Learning Areas. The inconsistencies in the positioning of material in *Arts Course Advice* may not assist teachers planning for Multi-Arts experiences. *Using the CSF: the Arts* (1995) offers teaching suggestions for the Arts. These include linking the Arts across the strands and integrating curriculum experiences where specific Arts strands are included within the activities or units. The school production is acknowledged as a means of Integrated Arts teaching. If the school production serves as the only Arts experience available to students for the year, or if the
school program offered is an Integrated Arts approach, the question remains: Are students able to achieve knowledge and skills in one or more Arts strands when they have not experienced learning through the discrete Arts forms, as recommended by the Board of Studies? *Using the CSF: the Arts* views the Arts as a Key Learning Area and provides sample program layouts to assist teachers in program planning across the Arts strands. The very existence of this material brings into doubt the seriousness of the Board of Studies’ comment on delivering the Arts strands as discrete areas. On the same matter, *Using the CSF: Integrating the Curriculum* does not encourage the teaching of the Arts CSF according to discrete strands.

Assessment in the Arts and Music is a topic which is very relevant to Victoria with the development of a curriculum framework which includes standards. Teachers are required to report student progress according to CSF Levels and Learning Outcomes. The support documents provide the information for teachers on this topic and an analysis reveals inconsistencies. The Board of Studies has produced sample reports for each Key Learning Areas and the individual strands of a Key Learning Area. The coding systems on these forms are reversed and the inclusion of the “traditional” grade as well as the Victorian CSF Level does not clearly indicate the achievement level of a student. The report forms in *Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting* imply that Learning Outcomes in all Arts forms can be totalled and represented by a single Victorian CSF Level. The report forms in *Using the CSF: the Arts* suggest that the Learning Outcomes in one Arts form can be totalled and represented by a single Victorian CSF Level. The *Arts Assessment and Reporting Support Material* stresses the fundamental premise of keeping judgements in each Arts strand separate and the inappropriateness of judging the Arts as a whole. The advice also indicates that should a multidisciplinary Arts program be offered it is important to maintain the integrity of each strand to assist with reporting of separate Arts strands. The advice does not explain how to transfer this to a single Victorian CSF Level on a report form. The absence of proposed work samples in *Course Advice* (with the exception of Graphic Communication) does not give teachers any indication of an appropriate achievement level for each Arts discipline at each Arts CSF Level. Hannan and Ashenden (1996:10) advise that “condensing different levels of
achievement in each strand into a single level is fraught with problems”. They comment that a student working at one level will also display skills at higher and lower levels. Hannan and Ashenden categorically state “Levels are not meant to correspond to age or year levels”. Rowe (1994:6) provides a differentiation between objectives and outcomes which illustrates that outcomes, in contrast to objectives, cannot be attributed number grading, percentages, or proportions. He states: “Outcomes are not a grade, score or number”. This opinion questions the use of a rating scale on the sample report forms for the Victorian CSF.

5.5 Summary Two: The influence of past Australian and Victorian documents on the Arts Statement and Profile and Arts CSF

This summary is based on the findings of the present chapter and the previous chapter (Chapter Four).

5.5.1 Australia.

The report entitled Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980), with its focus on learning processes and areas of knowledge, represents a strong influence on the current Australian curriculum developments. The authors of the report stressed the need to move away from the traditional structure of individual subjects into Learning Areas which contain subjects that interrelate. Francis (1997) the Executive Director of the Australian Curriculum Corporation during the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles, in conversation with the researcher, commented that the work of the Curriculum Development Centre in 1980 on the document Core Curriculum for Australian Schools influenced the development of the Australian Statements and Profiles.

The significant past Arts Education reports all address the Arts in schools as part of an Arts Learning Area. The actual lists of Arts forms are an indication that the authors of the reports recognise that many different Arts forms could be considered as components of an Arts Learning Area. The references to supporting Dance, Drama, and Media as deserving of teaching and timetable space rather than the exclusive traditional focus on Music and Visual Arts are the most influential aspect of the list of Arts forms. The position of importance given to Craft and Design in the past documents is of influence in the debate regarding their
inclusion in the *Arts Statement and Profile*. The authors of *Education and the Arts: National Report* (1977) comment on the limited content taught as part of Classroom Music and suggest that the then “newer” Music Education approaches should be encouraged.

Emery (1997a), speaking at the Cross Arts Victoria Conference, considers the *Education and the Arts* reports (1977) to be “quite significant” as a forerunner to the Australian *Statements and Profiles*, especially as it is suggested that all the Arts be viewed as being of equal value, even though some Arts forms have a longer history in education.

### 5.5.2 Victoria

Although there was input from Victoria into all the Australian Arts Education reports, *Education and the Arts: Victorian Report* is specific to this State. It is noted in the Music section of this report that Creativity is excluded from the school Classroom Music syllabus. Even though Creativity was included in the *Arts Framework* (1988), its place has been substantiated in the *Arts Statement and Profile* and *Arts CSF*.

The curriculum documents used in Victoria since 1981 display some similarities and influence over the current Australian and Victorian curriculum documents. The seven stages used to structure *A Guide to Music in the Primary School* (1981) represent a developmental sequence of music skills, and the five sequential levels used to structure *Designing an Instrumental Music Program* (1988) represent areas of learning and skill development. It could be argued that these two approaches have influenced the development of the level structure of the *CSF*, where levels are associated with school years. The structure of the learning theory in the *Arts Framework: P-10* (1988) is depicted in the Arts Learning Model and this has a strong similarity to the learning processes proposed in the first draft (April 1992) of the Australian *Arts Statement*. The four major headings of the 1988 Arts Learning Model are *Perceiving, Transforming, Appreciating and Expressing*. This language is representative of a Visual Arts Model. Similar subheadings can be found in the first draft of the *Arts Statement* following the two main divisions of *Making and Appraising*. The Music strand statement in the second and final drafts of the Australian *Arts Statement*
(June 1992 and June 1993) and the published version of the document (1994) use the same headings as the Music Statement rationale in the *Arts Framework: P-10* (1988:202). In both the *Arts Framework: P-10* and the *Arts Statement*, Music is discussed as being a form of communication, as a medium to evoke individual responses, as having aesthetic and functional purposes, as reflecting aspects of society, and as an Arts form which is constantly evolving. The disciplines which make up the Victorian *Arts CSF* are the same as those included in the *Arts Framework: P-10*. In the Victorian *Arts CSF*, Graphic Communication is only relevant to the secondary school, whereas in the *Arts Framework: P-10*, it is represented as an Arts form for all school years.

A statement regarding a suggested approach to assessment in the *Arts Framework* (1988:26), “Age or year level expectations are an unsuitable basis for assessment because they do not take account of individual development and progress - an important tenet of Arts learning”, has not influenced the current assessment policy for the *Arts CSF*. The new blanket Victorian Government policy which ties school years to Victorian CSF Levels represents a complete turn-around in assessment policy for the Arts from that found in the *Arts Framework* document that has influenced the structure of the *Arts CSF*.

*Designing an Instrumental Music Program* (1988) is recommended as a support document in conjunction with the Music strand of the Victorian *Arts CSF* for Instrumental Music teachers. Morriseroe (1995b), the writer of the CSF Music strand, has suggested that *Designing an Instrumental Music Program* (1988) is a useful resource for Instrumental Music teachers grappling with Instrumental Music teaching and the Victorian *Arts CSF*. In support of this document she suggests that for too long the Instrumental Music program has concentrated on teaching skills and techniques to enable students to play an instrument and that planning for students' total musical development is now more important. Morriseroe (1995b:21) states that “a skills development based program should no longer be considered appropriate for our students”. Ironically, *Designing an Instrumental Music Program* focusses on sequential skill development and the approach fits neatly with advice provided on teaching the different Arts forms in the Victorian *Arts CSF* (1995:12-13). It is interesting that Morriseroe has
recommended Instrumental Music teachers refer to this previous publication to bolster up the scant references to *specialist* programs (of which Instrumental Music is one) in the Music strand of the Victorian *Arts CSF*. Although there is little information in the Music strand for the Instrumental Music teacher, the discrepancy occurs between what is recorded in the *Arts CSF* and the comments of Morrisroe (1995b). If Morrisroe believes that a skills-based program for Instrumental Music students is no longer applicable, the opportunity to rectify this matter was not utilised during the writing the Music strand. The Music strand reinforces the "outdated" focus of Making and Performing for this section of Music Education.

Chapter Six presents data collated from interviews conducted with the key Arts writers, associate writers and contributing Music writers for the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, and key Music writers and members of the Music working parties involved in the development of the Victorian *Arts CSF*. 
CHAPTER SIX
6.0 INTERVIEW DATA

6.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results of the interviews conducted with the writers and members of the associated groups involved with the writing of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. The questions asked of the interviewees are included in appendix six of this study. The interview data is collated under three main headings. First, the development of the Arts CSF with particular reference to the Music strand; second, the construction of an Arts Key Learning Area; and third, the varying types of standards used in the Arts. These three main headings are subdivided into more specific headings. The interview data specifically relates to the design and development of the Arts CSF in Victoria in the context of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile.

The interviewees in this study represent the following positions:

- Key writers for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile (2)
- Associate Drama writer for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile (1)
- Associate Music writers for the Arts Statement and Profile (2)
- Contributing Music writers for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile (2)
- Music writer for the Victorian Arts CSF (1)
- Arts Key Learning Area personnel (2)
- Convenors of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee (2)
- Members of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee Music Working Party (4)
- Music writers of Arts Course Advice (2)
- Music representative on the Course Advice Expert Panel (1)
- Music personnel on the Course Advice Reference Group (2)

In addition, an expert in the history of Music in the Victorian Government school curriculum was included to provide a link between the previous and current Music curriculum.
The writing team for the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* included two key writers and ten associate writers. The associate writers group consisted of two *specialist* writers for each of the five Arts forms. Throughout the project, other people were invited to contribute to the writing process, and in this category, there were two Music contributing writers.

It is important to reiterate the existence of the *Code of Conduct for the Victorian Public Sector* and its effect on the identification of a number of the interviewees who are key participants in this study. The relevant sections of the *Code of Conduct for the Victorian Public Sector* are included in appendix eight of this study. Reference will be made to those people affected by this code as “Person A”, “Person B”, “Person C”, “Person D”, “Person E”, “Person F” and “Person G”. All of them were members of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee (KLAC) convened under the auspices of the Victorian Board of Studies. Other respondents will be identified by name and the position they held on the various groups that existed during the development of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* and the Victorian *Arts CSF*. The opinions expressed by the interviewees in this chapter are personal opinions and not opinions held by everyone, although these people were all key personnel involved in the design and development of the Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents.

The chapter is structured as follows:

The development of the *Arts CSF*: specifically the Music strand

Complexity of the *CSF*

*Arts Language*

*Learning Outcomes and the Arts*

*Arts CSF Structure*

*Arts Course Advice*

Instrumental Music and the Music strand

*Alternative Level Structures for the Arts*

Influence of the *Victorian Certificate of Education*

Government support for implementation

The construction of an Australian Arts Key Learning Area
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6.2. The development of the Arts CSF: specifically the Music strand

The Victorian CSF was written after dramatic cuts to staffing and resources in the Victorian Government primary and secondary school sectors. An eight percent cut in 1992 followed by a six percent cut in 1993 resulted in the loss of over 8000 teaching positions, the closure of 300 schools and the loss of curriculum support staff (Lierse, 1997:178-179). Further school closures and reduction in teaching staff have continued into 1998. In addition to the education cuts outlined, Marginson (1997:216) reports that since the election of the (conservative) Liberal and National Party Government in October 1992, special needs staffing has been halved. Marginson (1997:208) continues that spending on Victorian Government schools has been cut by $300 million, since 1992, with funding to private schools increasing by $33 million. The immediate impact on primary schools was to move all specialist subject teachers back into generalist teaching positions, and in the secondary school sector to reduce the amount of teaching time available to “non-core” subjects. Class sizes also rose sharply. The additional effects on the Victorian Government school curriculum with the specific timetabling requirements for Languages other than English, and Sport and Physical Education, have been discussed in Chapter One. The circumstances surrounding the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF have been documented in Chapter Five.

The first part of the interview data collates the responses to a question that asked the personnel involved in the writing of the documents what modifications they would make to the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and/or the Victorian Arts CSF, if the opportunity were available. The data resulting from the responses to this question has been subdivided into nine sections.
6.2.1 Complexity of the CSF
The topic of complexity of the Victorian CSF can be tackled on three fronts. First, as a collection of eight booklets describing the Key Learning Areas, the CSF is especially complex for primary teachers. Second, accompanying the CSF is Course Advice for each Key Learning Area and support material from the Board of Studies. A third perspective is the complexity of the Arts Learning Area considered separately, with its relevant support documents.

Askew (1997), a member of the Arts KLAC Music Working Party, and Person F (1997) comment on the complexity of the Victorian CSF and the difficulties experienced in mastering the document by the primary school teacher and the primary school as a community. The segments of the Key Learning Areas are known by different names: “substrands” for the Arts and Science, “strands” for Mathematics and Health and Physical Education, “modes” for English, “phases” for Technology, “inquiry activities” for Studies of Society and Environment and “strand organisers” for Languages other than English.

Askew and Person E (1997) explain that the integrated teaching approach of primary schools makes the understanding of the Key Learning Areas and the equation of knowledge from each Learning Area very difficult to comprehend. Person F (1997) is concerned for the primary teacher trainee and says “the complexity is horrendous”. The different and seemingly contradictory language found in the respective Victorian CSF booklets makes it difficult for the trainee to master the content and structure of each Key Learning Area and the overall goal of the Victorian CSF.

Person B (1997), Person F (1997), and Yeung (1997), the Arts Course Advice Reference Group (CARG) secondary Music representative, all discuss the issue of transferring the Victorian CSF into a written curriculum suitable for classroom use at both the primary and secondary levels. Person F detects a big gap between the CSF, the Course Advice, and developing a curriculum, noting that “the CSF and a working curriculum are two very different pieces of writing”. Person B stresses that the Victorian CSF is a framework and that
teachers do not have the expertise nor the skills to write a curriculum from the CSF. Person B says “it is a quantum leap to writing courses”, emphasising that the CSF is presented as a framework and not as a series of ready-made lesson plans for classroom use. Person B recalls the demands from the Board of Studies to create a “simple” framework, suitable for the integrated programs run by primary schools, amid the calls of “I don’t understand” from primary teachers. After the consultation period, during August 1994, Person B remarks that nearly half of the Arts CSF was rewritten to satisfy the generalist primary teacher. Person B recounts the fierce editing demands of the Board of Studies: explanatory material had to be cut, sections of the document had to be a “certain length and could not extend over the page”. The draft Arts CSF was much larger than other Key Learning Area drafts and strict editing made it a similar size to the other drafts.

Person G (1997) comments that the Victorian CSF is a curriculum framework combined with a Learning Outcome standard: “It had to be like that simply because you're looking at a variety of programs, different kids' needs and cultural differences”. Person G justifies the framework concept by saying that “The Curriculum Focus does not give precise information, detailed theoretical knowledge or identify the actual skills required of students. The Curriculum Focus only hints at those things and provides teachers with some idea of what kids ought to be doing or ought to be learning”.

Yeung (1997) comments that “This State document [the Victorian Arts CSF] is becoming cumbersome, it's becoming complex and certainly for teachers at the primary school level very difficult to comprehend”. Person F (1997) views the Arts structure as the cause of complexity, with the problem compounded by words chosen to describe the parts of the structure. Ferris (1997), an expert in the history of Music in the Victorian Government school curriculum, comments that Music teachers who completed their teacher training prior to the development of the Victorian CSF find the construction of the document “puzzling”. She says that the jargon used to construct the document and the conceptual basis of it, contribute to the document's complexity. Ferris comments that Music teachers working in country
environments try hard to fit their content based curriculum, often using the commercial package Upbeat, into a process structured document.

Person A (1997) views the complexity of the Arts CSF in terms of the quantity of documents. “Teachers place the Arts CSF next to the Arts Course Advice, which is placed next to the Kit that explains how to implement the Course Advice which tells teachers how to implement the CSF. It all looks very nice”. Person A's opinion is that this collection of documents is not supporting the implementation of the Victorian CSF. In contrast, Friend (1997), a member of the Arts KLAC Music Working Party, comments that the Music Working Party was aware of the problems associated with primary teaching when the Music strand was constructed. She remarks that the Victorian CSF forms the basis of a user-friendly curriculum which allows for diversity. She says that the CSF challenges people to integrate the Key Learning Areas.

6.2.1.1 Commentary.
The issue of complexity was generally only addressed by those interviewees involved with teaching primary school students or primary teacher trainees. These people have had to study all the CSF booklets and accompanying documentation in order to carry out their professional responsibilities. Some of the interview respondents were from interstate and could not be expected to be aware of the complexity issue of the CSF. On the other hand some of the Victorian interviewees did not raise this issue, asserting that it was too early to comment.

Making sense of the language used in the CSF booklets and Course Advice, as well as the structure used for both documents is confusing. The complexity is exacerbated with the addition of support material from the Department of Education and the Board of Studies. Further to this, some support material is of a general nature and applies to all Key Learning Areas, and some is of a specific nature, written for one Key Learning Area. Teachers need to read both sets of information and make the appropriate links. The involvement of two Victorian Government departments (the Department of Education and the Board of Studies) and the need to analyse who is responsible for which aspect of implementation is an additional element of confusion.
The complexity issue becomes perplexing as a teacher attempts to convert the documents into a curriculum and understand the place of assessment. Teaching now involves a focus on Learning Outcomes, which in turn determines what standard a student has reached. Teachers are also required to understand the language of KIDMAP (referred to in Chapter Five), the recommended computer assessment and reporting package for the CSF. Teachers at all school levels experience major problems with interpretation of the CSF.

The Victorian Government has provided only general information both in written and verbal form together with small amounts of inservice for teachers to help them understand and master the printed matter. In light of the Victorian Government's cost-cutting measures mentioned above, the mass of documentation may be considered by the Government to be a cheaper means of implementing the Victorian CSF than by providing professional development.

6.2.2 Arts Language

The language used to describe the Music strand in the Victorian Arts CSF falls into two areas. Yeung (1997) comments that common usage English words are not a medium that can "stratify" the Music discipline, where he is referring to the difficulties of using the English language to describe increasing levels of Musical achievement. He considers this to be the biggest problem with the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. He says that "to explain the dimensions of the Music discipline in words weakens the description. By solely representing the curriculum in words, the language becomes 'fully stretched' as a search is made to find the right words". He remarks that "teachers do not use the kind of language found in curriculum documents" and therefore another language is needed. He does not suggest what it should be. The result as described by Yeung (1997) is that

The language of the Music CSF strand has become very complex because it takes substantial sentences and lists to explain meaning - and even that is not enough. It has become problematic for teachers trying to distinguish the criteria of one level
of the CSF from another, when the subtlety in language used to make each level different is not clear.

Yeung says that it is even more difficult for primary teachers who do not know the discipline of Music to decipher the language. He continues that at the classroom level, the Orff Schulwerk and Kodály Music Education approaches do not use a “bunch” of words. An example of the inadequacies of the English language is the word “interpretation” which is used throughout the Music strand and defined by Yeung as an “overly complex word”. He comments that as the use of “interpretation” progresses down the year levels “the meaning of the word is weakened but there is no other [word] to describe fine differences in Music to make it more meaningful and give it character”. Yeung elaborates on the word “interpretation”, remarking that “at CSF Levels 1 to 4 there are problems with how to interpret the word and the initial reaction of Musicians to what it means is quite different from what the document means”. Yeung comments that the Board of Studies’ desire to use the same language and model for all the Arts forms is a cause of this problem and a legacy from the development of the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE). A common language and model for the Arts was an expectation of the Board of Studies when the VCE was written.

Ferris (1997) describes the division of the Music strand into the “compartments” of Creating, Making and Presenting; Arts Criticism and Aesthetics; and Past and Present Contexts as a “conceptual turn-around” for Music teachers. She comments that particularly primary teachers find the common Arts language, which is a constructed one, complex, and its unravelling “assumes some mental gymnastics”. To understand the Arts language, teachers are translating from their own Musical language into a constructed language. The influence of Visual Artists is very strong, as seen, for example, when the word Presenting is equated to “performing” in Music. Although the elements of Music are described using a Visual Arts language, Ferris does not suggest that Music should break away from the Arts Learning Area and develop its own structure. She comments that it will be interesting to witness the fate of the common constructed Arts language in the long term. She questions whether it will survive and whether Music teachers will continue to talk about Presenting rather than
"performing" and whether they will really start talking about *Past and Present Contexts* instead of Music history.

Persons B (1997) and D (1997) comment on the issue of Music terminology. Person B comments that the Victorian *Arts CSF* was written to suit the untrained Arts teacher and the primary school teacher, and all the Arts technical language which was included in the draft document was removed during the final editing stages. The Board of Studies did not want terminology included because of primary teacher reactions to the complexity of the document at the draft stage. The need to accommodate the integrated programs run by primary schools and the calls of "I don't understand" from primary teachers were major influences on the Board of Studies' decision. Persons B and D argued that primary school teachers found the language in the draft *Arts CSF* "very secondary" (meaning that which is applicable to a secondary school) and noted that implementing the *Arts CSF* "has been a language problem". Person B recalls that participants in the development of the *Arts CSF* fought hard to have relevant Arts terminology included in each strand. They did not succeed with this endeavour; very little terminology is used. Person D (1997) comments that during the CSF consultation stage teachers were saying "its too terminology orientated" so therefore "we had to soften the sense of skills required". Person D is referring to the level of understanding of Arts terminology expected of teachers in the Arts Key Learning Area in the draft *CSF* and the need to modify the document to suit teachers' skills. The Board of Studies was also aware that cuts to Victorian Government school staffing were causing problems in implementing all the eight Key Learning Areas, resulting in the absence of *specialist* teachers in the Arts.

The overall determination to include terminology in the *Arts CSF* extended to the Arts booklet in the *Using the CSF* series, published by the Board of Studies. Person B recounts that the issue of terminology in this booklet was to suffer the same fate as in the *Arts CSF*, in that the terminology included is scant and not as specific as it might be for each Arts form. Person B remarks that *Course Advice*, an implementation document which only has the status of *advice*, addresses the matter of technical language. An emphasis on terminology is found in the *Arts Course Advice* to accommodate the removal of this element from the *Arts CSF*. 
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Person B describes the final version of the *Arts CSF* as “wishy-washy”. The same respondent continues that secondary teachers, who are trained and teach as *specialists*, have reacted to the document with the comment: “What a load of rubbish”.

Person G (1997) recalls that when the Victorian *Arts CSF* was first written and sent out to schools in draft form “there was huge criticism because there was too much Music language used” in the Music strand. It was returned to the writers to be written without using Music terminology “because the general teachers would not understand”. To accommodate this situation this respondent comments that a compromise was agreed upon, “where some things were referred to in layman terms and some things were referred to in layman terms with Music terminology in brackets”, and the direction from the Board of Studies was “not to confuse teachers, especially at the lower levels”. Person G says “the whole time we were writing the document we were told not to be subject or strand specific in the terminology, try and keep it broad”. The same respondent reflects that this “direction” filtered through into the secondary level as it was known that some people who were teaching Music were not Music trained and “therefore one has to make sure that the language is understandable by the majority of people: not just a few”. Person G thinks that “the broader the language expression used the better off you are in the long term”. In response to further questioning about removal of terminology from the *Arts CSF* by the researcher, Person G contradicts earlier responses and stresses that the Victorian *Arts CSF* encourages students “to learn to use Music terminology right through from Level 1 to Level 7 and to develop that terminology”.

Friend (1997) describes the removal of the terminology from the Music strand as a “sad loss” and she asks: “If terminology is not included how do you communicate expectations?” Friend also labels the *Arts CSF* as “wishy-washy”. Person A (1997) comments that *Course Advice* is “supposed to have helped with terminology but primary teachers still have no idea of what a descending melodic phrase means”. Person A is emphasising that a technical term such as “a descending melodic phrase” needs even more clarification for a primary teacher than the definition presented in *Course Advice*. Person E (1997) says that to include terminology in the Music strand will only make *non-specialists* even more confused and that,
as there are less specialists at the primary level because of the staffing cuts, more terminology is inappropriate. Person F (1997) comments on the terminology used to describe the Music strand and remarks that a term such as Arts Criticism and Aesthetics is not clear in its meaning. The same respondent says that student teachers are confused by the meaning of this substrand. This respondent thinks it means "what is happening as far as the elements of Music are concerned". Person F believes that the elements or fundamentals of Music which in the past had been associated with Creating, Making and Presenting are now an aspect of Arts Criticism and Aesthetics.

From a national perspective, Whitehead (1997), a contributing Music writer for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, and Pascoe (1997), an associate Drama writer for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, explain that during the Western Australian trial of the Australian Arts Profile, another section called Arts languages was added into the Creating, Making and Presenting strand. Whitehead comments: "It was thought that it [Art languages] would have something to say about the integrity of the Arts forms and help locate the Arts forms within the structure of generic outcomes. It did not prove successful in the trial because teachers found they were unable to use the language section by itself: they needed to work through the other strands". Pascoe also adds that an unsuccessful attempt was made to include an Arts language section in the Australian Arts Profile. Livermore (1997), a contributing Music writer for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, takes a global approach to the aspect of language. She expresses concern about the generic language used in the Australian Arts Profile and says "It's much nicer to read the English and the U.S. [United States of America] versions because they're using Music language when they're talking about Music and they use Visual Arts language when they're talking about Visual Arts". Livermore recalls that it was "a real gymnastic exercise in semantics" in the writing of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, noting that "Music making is not the same as making Art in Visual Arts and those subtle differences are quite important". Livermore concludes: "I think that it was a shame that they all had to use the same language".
6.2.2.1 **Commentary.**

The respondents to this issue either focussed on the use of the English language and the removal of technical language to describe the Music strand of the Victorian *Arts CSF*, or else they continued to describe the desire of the Victorian Government to satisfy the lowest common denominator in the education system, without offering a personal opinion. Once again, there were those interviewees who did not have a comment about any structural issues and they preferred to view the document as needing time to "settle in".

Not only are teachers coping with a new language - a Visual Arts language - to describe the Music discipline, but they are also required to understand, interpret and use the language of the Victorian *CSF* itself, and that of the support documents. The opportunity was available to include Music terminology in the Music strand of the Victorian *CSF* but it was removed in order to reduce the space that Music took up and so that generalist teachers would not be confused. Music terminology was replaced with common usage words in the English language, which in turn has created problems in interpretation and meaning for both primary and secondary teachers, and also added to the complexity of the document. Language is tied up with the complexity of the Victorian *CSF* and becomes very problematic for the primary teacher working within an integrated teaching program.

6.2.3 **Learning Outcomes and the Arts**

The interviewees interpreted the matter of structuring an Arts curriculum around Learning Outcomes from two perspectives: a general response to Learning Outcomes and a specific response related to the construction of the Learning Outcomes in the Victorian *Arts CSF* and the Australian *Arts Profile*.

Livermore (1997) rejects the idea that outcomes limit creativity as "a bit of nonsense", and suggests that teachers will have to think about their approach to teaching in a different way. She says: "You can write an outcome that is so broad that it gives you all the creative scope you need". Livermore cautions that the Victorian notion of equating Learning Outcomes with standards is inappropriate.
Person C (1997) considers that Learning Outcomes are not restrictive and comments that 
“creative people can take them to mean whatever you desire” and that it’s “something teachers 
have always been doing - it's now formalised”. Similarly, Person F (1997) reflects that the 
outcomes are so broad “that it is easy to fit in”, meaning that teachers will have little 
difficulty finding activities to meet the Learning Outcomes.

Askew (1997) says: “Learning Outcomes - they have to be there”, meaning that they form the 
structure of a curriculum for students, teachers and parents. Person E (1997) reflects that the 
Arts will have to come to terms with Learning Outcomes, otherwise the Arts will be seen by 
other subjects as “mickey mouse”. Person E remarks that “For our own integrity and profile 
in schools - we need them” (Learning Outcomes). Person E is concerned that Learning 
Outcomes can stifle creativity, “which is what the Arts are all about, and students might not 
reach the outcomes expected”.

McMillan (1997), the Music representative on the Course Advice Expert Panel, considers the 
Music outcomes to be “quite general, realistic and not restrictive”. She sees them as 
providing guidance for teachers and as a means whereby a structure is given to the document. 
“The Arts have enough trouble in establishing themselves in the curriculum without being 
wissy-washy”, says McMillan.

Person A (1997) comments that the outcomes are very broad and that this is necessary to 
accommodate all levels of student ability, but “they are so broad they can be open to be 
different interpretations, that's why I think we have to make the Curriculum Focus tighter”. 
Person A stresses that it is the activity in the classroom that is important, and Learning 
Outcomes may not be catering for and challenging the needs of students.

Friend (1997) remarks that “outcomes help to show children where they are going, but if the 
outcomes are too nebulous the children don't see the point”. Ferris (1997) says that the 
Learning Outcomes are broadly based and teachers understand the concept of outcomes when
they are compared to objectives. She asserts that as the curriculum document was written across the Arts, there was possibly no other way but to include generic Learning Outcomes. Ferris continues that teachers consider the notion of generic Learning Outcomes to be a matter of jargon, meaning that they are not specific to the individual Arts forms. McPherson (1997), an associate Music writer for the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, believes that the Arts generic Learning Outcomes are “really good conceptually”, but they are not something that can be used in schools. He asserts that at the developmental level the Learning Outcomes served as a compromise for every Arts discipline, but they do not provide for the specific description of outcomes appropriate to each Arts form.

Hammond (1997), a key writer of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, when speaking about the Australian *Arts Profile*, acknowledges that if the opportunity was available he would review the Outcome Statements and rewrite them. He reflects that as well as being used for teaching and curriculum development, the intended purpose was for assessment and reporting and, given this situation, “certain Outcome Statements don't hold up”. Although all the Outcome Statements were psychometrically tested nationally by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), Hammond comments that the testing did not pick up the actual intentions of the Outcome Statements and some are too narrow. He cites an example at Level 3 in *Creating, Making and Presenting*: “the kids have to show an ability to develop their ideas with reference to the works of other Artists and other cultures, and that's all it is”. Hammond says that a focus on this outcome for two years of school work is much too narrow when the Australian *Arts Profile* has a dual role as a curriculum document, and as an assessment and reporting document. If Hammond had the opportunity to rewrite some of the Outcome Statements he would be aiming for outcomes that describe a broader range of learning and achievement.

Emery (1997b), a key writer of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, in commenting about the Victorian *Arts CSF*, says: “Outcome Statements are the pin of the whole document” but she makes no further comment about changes to Learning Outcomes.
Person D (1997) comments that the idea of Learning Outcomes are integral to the Victorian Arts CSF, but now that the Arts CSF is being implemented in schools the critical point is how to make the Learning Outcomes more explicit. The same respondent suggests that a link between the Curriculum Focus and the Learning Outcomes would demonstrate more clearly the Arts standard expected to be achieved by students. This respondent acknowledges that some people think that the Victorian Arts CSF Learning Outcomes are "too general and should be more specific". The solution to this problem, as expressed by this respondent, is to include "more terminology in the Curriculum Focus and specificity in the Learning Outcomes so that the notion of progressive skill development and progressive knowledge acquisition is more clearly identified". As it is currently written causes Person D to remark: "What does it mean?" Person D suggests that the Victorian Arts CSF tried to give meaning to the Learning Outcomes through the inclusion of the Curriculum Focus, an improvement on the Australian Arts Statement and Profile "where there is nothing giving meaning". Person D comments further that "to be any more specific would take away teachers' freedom", a reference to a tradition in Victorian Government schools of school-based curriculum development. The present arrangements encourage more teachers to participate in the Arts, however, as expressed by this respondent it is at a cost: "The cost is that we may not be delivering the idea of a standard as clearly as if we had more specific Learning Outcomes. However, we may not get that standard in many schools because the teachers may not be there".

Yeung (1997) remarks

The [CSF] statements are basically one track based on a very common view of what is possible in terms of most schools given a minimum set-up, but they do not give any guidelines, guidance or recognition to schools which are much more focussed and much more committed to Music Education.

He continues that for schools with advanced Music programs to achieve the Learning Outcomes of the Arts CSF weakens the purpose of the curriculum document. Yeung is suggesting that the Arts CSF is not functioning as a curriculum document which can meet the needs of all school Music programs, from the fledgling to the well established, and therefore its overall purpose is impaired.
Persons D (1997), B (1997), and G (1997) all address the generic Outcome Statements of the Australian Arts Profile. In the Australian Arts Profile the same wording for each of the Arts outcomes is used for all the Arts forms. Person D indicates that the generic outcomes are still a feature of the Victorian Arts CSF, although the word “Arts” has been replaced by the specific Arts strand names. Person D remarks that the change in wording was a decision of the Arts Key Learning Area Committee, commenting further that “the generality was removed as schools could have assumed that any Arts work would do to satisfy the Learning Outcomes in the Arts”. Person B (1997) says that “the Victorian Government wanted the CSF Learning Outcomes to equal standards which could be tested”. To achieve this goal Person B comments that “the Board [of Studies] set out to destroy the Australian Profiles' feature of generic outcomes across all Key Learning Areas. For the Arts, the Learning Outcomes were made specific to the Victorian CSF Arts strands. Further, this respondent remarks that “The University of Melbourne participants in the Arts CSF development wanted the generic approach to remain”. In this instance Person B is referring to the key writers of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. If this situation had occurred, Person B suggests that “as most primary schools run Integrated Arts programs, school principals would tick off the Arts as being done” as a result of work in one Arts form.

Person G (1997) reflects that

The generic outcomes of the Arts CSF make a lot of sense, especially where schools run a semester of one Arts strand and a semester of another. If the school has a well devised curriculum they can make sure that the kids see the linking and that they are learning towards a common expression in each Arts area.

Person G stresses that the Victorian CSF generic Learning Outcomes are written for students acting as Artists in preference to stating factual outcome statements, in the form of specific skills. “Therefore, the Arts have tended to indicate the level of Musical maturity or Arts maturity that students have achieved”. Linked to this discussion, this respondent comments on the misinterpretation that has arisen in Victorian Government schools regarding the assessment and reporting of CSF Learning Outcomes. Person G remarks that teachers are matching the Learning Outcomes with an appropriate comment on a student's report card, a
procedure that was never intended to occur. This respondent continues to say that “Some of the big heads in the Board of Studies have also got the picture wrong, some of them actually imply that's the most appropriate thing to do”. Person G says that the CSF has been designed as a curriculum document to support teachers to develop school programs. Teachers are required to assess and report on the school programs developed from the CSF and not the actual CSF document.

Person A (1997) is most concerned about the Board of Studies' policy for teachers to assess and grade an individual student's work in the five Learning Outcomes of the Arts CSF all at the same CSF Level. The CSF Levels are in turn tied to school years. Person A comments that this approach is most inappropriate “because there is a huge range of probabilities for the different substrands and students will be performing at a different CSF Level for each area of work”. This respondent elaborates: “Some kids have a natural ability in creating Music which they don't have in reading Music or developing Music skills. Other kids have terrific memories and great manipulative skills and they have never created a thing in their lives and would not know where to start”.

Whitehead (1997) criticises the Victorian approach to assessing Learning Outcomes in the Arts. She states that it is a normal expectation that students will be working at different levels in each of the Learning Outcomes and each of these levels cannot be added together to equal one level. Whitehead says that “An outcome is at the level at which you cannot proceed further. If an outcome level can be added to another outcome level it wasn't a true outcome in the first place. To truly be an outcome it's got to be something that you can assess and it contributes something that is unique”.

Pascoe (1997) comments that in the Western Australian Arts Framework it is perfectly acceptable to report a student performing at a different level for each Learning Outcome. As an example Pascoe says: “They have more opportunity to develop their skills in the Arts than to develop their understanding of the role of the Arts in society”. He continues that for the purposes of discussions with parents, teachers might adopt a subdividing pattern similar to
the South Australian system of terms such as “entering into, halfway there, almost there and then finally there”. Whitehead (1997) adds that the Western Australian Arts Framework is really “an outcomes-based approach to education on the broadest front”. The Western Australian Arts Framework, developed from the Australian Arts Profile, retains generic Outcome Statements and teachers interpret the relevant Arts discipline from the generic outcomes. Pascoe adds that the Western Australian Arts Framework is written from an outcomes orientation, so that the four major outcomes in the Arts are consistent with the four Arts strands. In the Western Australian Arts Framework, the Arts strands refer to learning processes, whereas in the Australian Arts Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF, a strand means an Arts form.

6.2.3.1 Commentary.

All the respondents in this study agreed with the notion of using a Learning Outcomes approach in the development of an Arts curriculum. The perceived restrictions on creativity were rejected by most of the interviewees. It is interesting that respondents who had been non-committal about other aspects of the Victorian CSF expressed an opinion about the use of Learning Outcomes in the Arts. The “newness” of the Learning Outcomes approach to teaching and learning in general, and more specifically in the Arts, caused these people to formulate an opinion about the topic. Some of the interviewees cautioned that the Arts Learning Outcomes are so broad that they are open to a variety of interpretations by both generalist primary teachers and specialist secondary teachers.

The debate about the removal of terminology from the Music strand, an issue discussed earlier in this chapter, was also raised by the respondents in the context of the Arts Learning Outcomes. The respondents considered that this situation has created inadequacies. Some said that the inclusion of terminology would serve as a means of “restricting the breadthness” of the Learning Outcomes. It would also provide an element of guidance to assist teachers in interpreting the meaning of Learning Outcomes, and in writing a curriculum based on those outcomes. It is ironic that the reason given for the removal of terminology from the Music strand (to reduce the confusion for the generalist teacher) is, on reflection, causing difficulties
for the Board of Studies in establishing the meaning of the Learning Outcomes and the CSF Level of the accompanying standard.

The interviewees focussed on the broadness of the Arts Learning Outcomes commenting that this characteristic did not stifle creativity in the Arts. The generic outcomes of the Arts Profile were transferred to the Arts CSF, although there is still a debate in Victoria, as illustrated by the interview data, whether generic Learning Outcomes are a feature of the Victorian Arts CSF or not. It can be argued that the broad generic Learning Outcomes can be interpreted differently by generalist teachers and specialist Music teachers. The broad nature of the Learning Outcomes allows the generalist teacher, who may have no understanding of what is expected with respect to a particular Music Learning Outcome, to take advantage of the generic Arts outcomes and focus specifically on other Arts form with only small references to Music. For the specialist, the broad Learning Outcome, leaves them wondering what is exactly required as directed by a particular outcome.

The broadness of the Learning Outcomes was a deliberate ploy to allow schools to exercise the attributes of school-based curriculum development in the midst of a centralised curriculum. School-based curriculum development has been a characteristic feature of the Victorian Government school system. The end result has been a series of Learning Outcomes to suit the lowest school Music standard, with no encouragement to stretch the Music curriculum. Arts Course Advice, which was planned as a set of exemplary units, resulted in units of work that could be taught to students without further alteration. One respondent stressed that it had been recognised that the Learning Outcomes in the CSF may not be performing their designated job in determining standards.

The Victorian Government, through the auspices of the Board of Studies, has ignored the accepted meaning of the use of Learning Outcomes in a school curriculum as a profiling mechanism for individual student achievement, and instead used them for the purposes of setting standards. The Government has rejected the accepted notion that an individual student will achieve at a different rate for each Learning Outcome. The Government has taken the
use of Learning Outcomes one step further by requiring teachers to assess each student in all Learning Outcomes in every Key Learning Area at the same level. The CSF Level at which a student is to be assessed is tied to the appropriate school years. The Arts support documents referred to in Chapter Five indicate to teachers that students can be expected to achieve at different levels in different Learning Outcomes and in different Arts forms, but no advice is provided regarding how the different levels can be added together to equal one level. The ultimate expectation of the Government is that all students will be assessed at the CSF Level that matches their school year irrespective of actual achievement. Although it has been indicated in the interview data that it is unlikely that students are going to be achieving at the same CSF Level in all components of each Arts form, the requirement of the Government encourages teachers not to take the notion of profiling a students' achievement as a serious element of schooling.

6.2.4 Arts CSF Structure

The structure of the Victorian Arts CSF is very similar to the Australian Arts Profile, the major differences being a different set of Examples, the use of different headings in the layout of the CSF, the addition of Graphic Communication for secondary students and the inclusion of the sub-substrand Presenting in the Visual Arts strand. A comparison between the two documents has been presented in Chapter Five. Interviewees responded with reference to either document. Because of the similarities between the Arts documents, comments made regarding the Australian Arts Profile can be considered relevant to the Victorian Arts CSF. For this reason, comments about the Arts Profile (the Australian document that influenced the Victorian Arts CSF) are presented first in this section. Issues concerning the Victorian Arts CSF are addressed second.

Hammond (1997) comments that the strand organiser Creating, Making and Presenting is clear, but more distinction and linking is needed between the two other organisers Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts. He remarks that there is a need to develop a connection between these two organisers, and to distinguish between them. There is also a need to distinguish between Arts Criticism and Arts Aesthetics. He says that the
difference between aesthetics and criticism is “hazy” in both the Australian Arts Statement and Arts Profile. Hammond comments that “they are meant to be different and they are treated as different things conceptually in the Arts Statement but for the purposes of assessment there is not a clear enough distinction allowing a teacher to recognise the different aspects”. In terms of linking the strand organisers, Hammond uses the example of a student who is given a task to write about a painting. “The student will commence a response by writing about the context of the painting (the Past and Present Context Outcome Statement) and is almost always asked to give a critical analysis of the painting and asked for a personal opinion (the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics Outcome Statement). The result is the intertwining of the processes of distinction and linking involving the two Outcome Statements”.

Hammond (1997) reflects on the need to add more cross-disciplinary Arts activities, particularly in the first four levels, and he suggests that the Australian Arts Statement is the most appropriate place to include them. With a specific reference to the Victorian Arts CSF, he remarks that to maintain equality of the Arts as a Key Learning Area, integration both within the Arts group and across the remaining Key Learning Areas is often the only way. He suggests a further publication is needed to guide teachers in cross-disciplinary Arts activities. Hammond reflects that if he could start the writing process again, he would closely tie the writing of the Australian Arts Profile to assessment and reporting. He recalls that in the actual development of the Australian Profiles almost no attention was given to assessment and reporting, even though that was the original intention of the Australian Profiles and it was discussed as part of the Arts Brief.

Emery (1997b) comments that the placement of Music terminology and the content associated with the theory of Music, in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile strand organisers Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts may be impacting on the traditional way of thinking about Music. Emery is mindful that teachers may be experiencing difficulties in teaching the theory of Music because in the past it would have been found in the strand organiser Creating, Making and Presenting. With Music terminology now placed in the two
strand organisers of *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts*, the theory of Music is more closely linked to other elements in the study of Music.

McPherson (1997) describes the initial Australian Arts model as a Visual Arts model. He comments that developments lead to a model where Music was placed at one end of the continuum and Visual Arts at the other, while the remaining Arts forms, being more malleable, positioned themselves in the middle territory. The Visual Arts personnel wanted only *Making* and *Presenting*. McPherson remarks that *Creating* is an important attribute in the study of Music as Musicians do more than "make" and they also have a different definition of the term *Making* than do Visual Artists.

Livermore (1997) comments that the *Past and Present Contexts* strand organiser should be acknowledged as underpinning the other two strand organisers "because it contextualises all three processes". Livermore describes this strand as "the meat of the other two strands" in that an analysis of an Arts form cannot be done without reference to the context and the history. She praises the inclusion of the strand organiser *Past and Present Contexts* as it "forces teachers to work in what is known as a weak area". Livermore remarks that in the *Creating, Making and Presenting* strand organiser, separating *Presenting* out from *Making* is a "bit artificial", when *Presenting* [performing] is the culmination of a task for a Music student. Livermore strongly supports the inclusion of *Creating*, an aspect that she and Martin Comte, as representatives of the National Affiliation of Arts Educators, recommended should be included when the content of the *Arts Statement and Profile* was initially considered. Livermore argues that the Australian *Arts Profile* does not address the need to revisit the same skills at a higher level of difficulty and therefore does not acknowledge the need for repetition to acquire Musical skills. She comments that the levels seem to be constructed through a pattern of recognition of information, followed by the ability to use, analyse and synthesise it.

Person D (1997) comments that the Australian Arts documents do not take account of the implementation realities with links to the classroom. This respondent says that "there is no sense of record keeping, reporting or accountability". In a defence of the Victorian document
not correcting this fault, Person D says that “probably the Arts CSF should have been accompanied by more assessment and if it was not for practical realities everything should have been published at once”.

The interviewees' responses to the Arts CSF structure in Victoria either reflect the need for the document to be given the opportunity to settle in schools or they express opinions about specific areas of concern. Askew (1997) comments that the Arts CSF “has brought back a balance in the Arts curriculum”, but given the nature of the primary school curriculum, he would like to see a stronger emphasis given to combining the Arts. He remarks that the Arts CSF “is a bit weak in the way it develops consequential pedagogical development, with the development of sophistication from level to level being a bit contrived”. He adds that “it's hard to see the development: it's possible to see infants and older students doing the same thing”. Person A (1997) comments that the structure of the Arts CSF brings the Arts together and produces a balance in the Music curriculum between composition, performing, listening, and understanding. Person C (1997) considers that the choice of substrands (referred to as strand organisers in the Australian Arts Profile) has only formalised what has been done for years. Person A continues that through the use of generic processes “Music must now see itself as part of the Arts - it has not done that before”. In contrast, Ferris (1997) reflects that people really don't think of the Arts as belonging together in the sort of document like the Arts CSF. She says that “they get out the Arts document not really planning to look at all the Arts but only to look at the separate strands”. In other words she is suggesting that teachers continue to think only in relation to one Arts form at a time: there is little if any evidence of thinking across the Arts.

Friend (1997) remarks that it is “good to see Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts included - it expands more of what Music is about”. Person F (1997) comments that the three substrands of the Victorian Arts CSF are satisfactory, but disagrees with the further sub-division of Creating, Making and Presenting into three sub-substrands each of which has a separate Learning Outcome. Person F says “It becomes confusing. What does it mean?” To overcome this complex problem, this same respondent suggests that it
may be better to use Arts subjects and not have any substrands, followed by a curriculum emphasis and some term other than "strands". An example of Person F's suggestion would be the Arts area of Music focussing on composition.

Person G (1997) comments that "there was most certainly a lot of conflict" in discussions about the process categories selected, and the structure had to be simplified for a teacher's interpretation "it has to be divided to allow for the understanding of it and you can't really talk about it as an wholistic thing because it makes it too difficult for teachers to iron out exactly where they're at". At the same time this respondent was critical of teachers who intended to teach the three processes as separate unrelated entities:

A lot of people I know in their initial interpretation said we'll have a term where we do Creating, Making and Presenting, then we'll have a term on Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and then we'll have a term on Past and Present Contexts; and some of these were quite "high" educators who thought like this.

In the practical teaching situation Person G (1997) describes this as:

A load of garbage because everyone knows that Music is an wholistic subject and whether you're doing it through a performance base, or whether you're doing it through a composition base, or whether you're doing it through an appreciation base, you've got to have all the others [the substrands] working with you otherwise it just does not work.

Person G (1997) offers an example to describe the teaching situation discussed above where the substrands are isolated from each other:

Just because a kid is playing something, you don't put it into the performance category. It's taking on the creative ability, it's taking on the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics knowledge, it's taking on the Past and Present Contexts and they all bring that to a focus in their actual performance.

Yeung (1997) comments that the use of a common Arts model is the biggest stumbling block for Music and that it had always been a Board of Studies policy to use the same language and same structure for all the Arts forms. He considers the common structure only to be for the purposes of the presentation of the document, resulting in a compromise for all the Arts forms. He says the question must be asked: "Is the document communicating?" He remarks
that the Arts CSF model presented is based on a Visual Arts concept where “words explain the visual world very well”. Yeung uses the example of Presenting - a visual word - and comments that Presenting is “peripheral to Visual Arts”, but in Music “performance is quite central to the actual Artistic and aesthetic experience”. He fears that the use of this word instead of “performing” will mean that “Presenting in Music is treated with the same unimportance as in the other Arts”.

Griffiths (1997), the Deputy Convenor of the Arts KLAC, considers that the “biggest danger that can be perceived in any individual Arts form is the conceptualisation of it into Creating, Making and Presenting”. He comments that “homogenising all the Arts forms is a way of achieving some kind of commonality within each of the Arts, but in the case of Music, it implies a slant towards an aspect of Music that only pertains to one part of Musical activity”. Griffiths gives the example of a person who has an interest in classical Music and therefore is only really interested in the making process: “they never need be involved in the creating process”. He acknowledges that Creating may be useful in the lower levels so that students begin to learn the composition process but in the higher levels of schooling performance often becomes the dominant feature for the student. Griffiths proposes that flexibility in implementation should be available and provision should exist to “phase Creating out”. He strongly disagrees that all students should be expected to create, noting that “the push to include it came from individuals mainly outside Music who wanted to make of Music something that in the real world it isn't”. He describes the pushing of an ideology onto a reality as “poor”, implying a limitation in the Victorian Arts CSF.

Ferris (1997) comments that the Arts CSF substrands Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts are “a bit problematic for primary teachers”, particularly in Levels 1 and 2. She says that these two substrands seem to have been “an area that is kind of imposed on Music from the other Arts areas”. Ferris suggests that although primary teachers do have an interest in these areas they are “normally able to deal with them in a much more incidental fashion, even more incidental than the CSF would suggest”. She comments that the two substrands discussed should be dropped from Levels 1, 2, and 3 of the Victorian Arts CSF and
included under the substrand of *Creating, Making and Presenting*. At the beginning of Level 4 they should be included in a formal way with their own headings. Ferris remarks that the "influence of Visual Artists is very strong" in these areas.

Person A (1997) remarks that the Curriculum Focus of the Victorian *Arts CSF* should be made more substantial, contain more detail and be combined with more Examples, especially for the primary teacher. Overall, the Curriculum Focus should be a specific guide for primary and secondary teachers. Person A comments that "because the *Arts CSF* has not been inserviced properly teachers don't know they have to read the Curriculum Focus which sets out the kinds of skills expected from students". This same respondent continues that generalist primary teachers need more help to understand the document, but for secondary teachers who are Music specialists it challenges what are their notions of 'correct' learning skills at particular levels". This respondent remarks that many secondary teachers focus on Music Education as being very skills-based and instrument-based and the Australian Music Examinations Board (AMEB), an Australian organisation that sets a Music Examination syllabus for many instruments, has a strong influence in Music Education and reinforces the skills-based and instrument-based view of Music Education.

Person B (1997) also comments on the Curriculum Focus, saying that it should be "three times as long with up to 10 Examples". The editing process referred to earlier prevented this from happening. Emery (1997b), on the other hand, describes the Curriculum Focus as a summary of the Learning Outcome statements and sees no need for enlargement.

Person B (1997) describes the construction of the Victorian *Arts CSF* as a debate between The University of Melbourne and the Board of Studies. Person B acknowledges an implementation dilemma where the structure of the *Arts CSF* no longer justifies a primary school choir as an acceptable way of teaching Music, but expects continuous Classroom Music programs in both primary and secondary schools - despite the fact that this is no longer a reality. Ferris (1997) picks up on this topic saying that primary schools have an erratic history in teaching Music. With the arrival of the Victorian *Arts CSF* for example, a group of
Year 6 children, who have not had Classroom Music for many years, “really need to be taught the same content as Level 1 or 2 in a way that is appropriate to Year 6”. Ferris identifies this as “very much a Music issue” and “much more a Music issue than other curriculum areas”. She comments that it is a “pity that the Music document hasn't dealt with that and provided some sort of thoughtful advice”.

In the development of the *Western Australian Arts Framework*, Whitehead (1997) discusses *Presenting* as it appears in the Australian *Arts Profile*. The planners of the Music curriculum in the *Western Australian Arts Framework* felt that the way in which *Presenting* was written in the Australian *Arts Profile* depended very much on the performance opportunities available for students. Whitehead comments that it seemed that *Presenting* was not really related to learning programs and that at the higher levels it was not necessarily more complex, but instead just different. It was decided that different levels of presentation are appropriate for different tasks which are not necessarily related to different ages or a developmental sequence. She remarks that “older students often do a lot of their *Presenting* in very informal contexts in class or in small groups” and the use of informal performance is not only restricted to junior classes. Subsequently, *Presenting* was written into the four parts of the *Western Australian Arts Framework* known as strands (strand organisers in the Australian *Arts Profile*). The four strands in the *Western Australian Arts Framework* are Creating, Exploring and Developing Ideas; Skills, Techniques, Technologies, Conventions and Processes; Responding, Reflecting and Evaluating (*Arts Criticism and Aesthetics*); and Understanding the Role of the Arts in Society (*Past and Present Contexts*). These strands are supported by the five Arts forms of the *Arts Profile*. Pascoe (1997) lists the four major outcomes that flow from the Arts strands in the Western Australian document:

The first one is that students will generate Arts works that will communicate ideas; the second is that they will use the tools of the Arts - the skills, techniques, conventions, processes and technologies for making Arts works; the third is that they will respond to, reflect on and evaluate the Arts; and the fourth is that they will understand the role of the Arts in society.

Whitehead (1997) explains that in the trial of the Australian *Arts Profile*, Western Australia considered something very similar to the two-strand model used for the *English National*
Curriculum: Expressing and Appreciating. Whitehead states that “the two big strands actually got in the way because people thought that Expressing only consisted of ideas and skills, but it also involves reflecting and evaluating - all done in a context of understanding the role of the Arts in society”. She comments that “the contextual thing underlays it all because everything exists in context”. Appreciating was interpreted as only happening when people responded. She remarks that “the strand areas covered by Expressing and Appreciating were acting as a false distinction and it was better to establish four strands that are interactive”.

6.2.4.1 Commentary.
In the discussion about the structure of the Victorian Arts CSF, the respondents raised the issue that the model complements the philosophy of the Board of Studies to use a common model for all the Arts forms. The choice of a common Arts approach for the Australian Arts Profile became a convenient model to keep for the development of the Victorian Arts CSF. One interviewee stated that the use of a common model between all the Arts forms allowed the element of composition to imposed onto Music. The decision to use a common model combined with generic Learning Outcomes was a compromise means of solving the subject versus processes debate at the Australian level. At the Victorian level, with some of the same Arts Profile people involved in the Arts CSF development, it was seen as an opportune time to carry through the Australian design. About one third of the respondents interviewed for this study had no comments to make about the structure of the Victorian Arts CSF and wished to let it settle in schools and evolve into a working document before commenting.

The issue of language is raised again, where the use of a Visual Arts model determines what words are used to describe the content of an Arts form. This approach is considered suitable for the visual world but not appropriate for the aural world. A connecting issue with language is that of the conceptual problems identified by Musicians in the use the Visual Arts substrand titles. The respondents indicated that in the teaching of Music it is impossible to separate the issues of language, interpretation and meaning from the Visual Arts structure. The breakdown of the substrand Creating, Making and Presenting into three more sub-substrands
(Exploring and Developing Ideas; Using Skills, Techniques and Processes; Presenting) compounds the matter of understanding meaning and adds to the complexity of the document. Two other inseparable issues are the withdrawal of Music terminology from the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand and the language used to construct the overall structure of the Arts CSF. The language used in the support documents is another complicating issue. Accommodating the needs of Instrumental Music is yet another dilemma which will be discussed further on in this chapter.

Respondents commented on the significance of enlarging the content base of Music beyond the traditional areas of Making and Presenting. The unique and traditional approaches to teaching the Music discipline have become “problematic” within the Victorian Arts CSF structure and Yeung summed up the issue as he saw it by asking: Is the document communicating? The substrands of the Arts CSF were designed as interrelated processes, but the presentation of the document gives the impression that they are separate entities.

The Victorian Arts CSF did not include work samples which were a feature of the Australian Arts Profile. It was hoped that Arts Course Advice would be used to rectify the problem, but it was not the case for Music because no work samples have been provided. Subsequently, Music teachers are confronted with a mass of words in both documents. Work samples in the Arts CSF would have provided one opportunity to tie in assessment suggestions and indicate the desired standard. Two respondents commented about the absence of assessment: one in relation to the Australian document, and the other concerning the Victorian document. The initial focus on assessment, as required in the Arts Brief, was not strongly developed in the writing of the Australian Arts Profile. Ironically, the Victorian CSF project which identified this weakness in the Australian document did not include assessment material in the central curriculum document. The Course Advice was used to solve this matter, but only in relation to the sample units presented. That is, no overall information regarding assessment is provided.
6.2.5 Arts Course Advice

Each Key Learning Area of the Victorian CSF is supported by Course Advice, an implementation document published by the Department of Education but having no official status in the Board of Studies' CSF project. Person F (1997) expresses concern about the thematic-based structure of Course Advice and says: “It does not allow for the sequential development of Musical skills or the same relevant knowledge in any Arts form”. The same respondent argues that Course Advice illustrates units of work based on themes, and subsequently the Course Advice design “does not allow for the expectation of a standard to be reached according to the levels of the CSF”. Person F gives the example of a student in a Year 3 class who comes to the class with a background in learning about the Arts based on themes, and is now being taught by a teacher who is a Music specialist. The student does not have the prior experiences to be working at Level 3 of the Arts CSF Music strand. The question can be asked: “Where do the student and the teacher pick up?” This same respondent detects a tension between teaching Music skills and knowledge and the teaching of a smattering of unrelated Music content. Person F reflects that given the problems of primary school Music teaching, the thematic approach is the most pragmatic, but in terms of teaching Music skills the “continuum is broken and it is left to secondary teachers to start all over again”. On a practical level of using the Arts Course Advice in the classroom this respondent comments that Arts Course Advice includes items that were left out of the Victorian Arts CSF, for example Arts terminology and references to Instrumental Music, but it introduces another element of confusion and complexity with the term “unit focus”. Person F remarks that writing a curriculum and developing individual lesson plans requires a lot more skill and consideration than is exhibited in the Arts Course Advice. Person F comments that a “big gap” exists between the Arts CSF, the Arts Course Advice and teachers in the classroom developing a curriculum.

Person B (1997) comments that the non-inclusion of Arts technical language and details for Instrumental Music teaching in the Victorian Arts CSF are addressed by Arts Course Advice. This respondent stresses again that Course Advice only carries the status of advice and it is not compulsory. Person B remarks that Arts Course Advice is in an unsuitable format to assist
teachers in writing courses as it represents a collection of self-contained units. This same respondent emphasises the framework nature of the Victorian *Arts CSF* and remarks that "it is a quantum leap to writing courses and teachers do not have the expertise or skills". *Course Advice*, it has been suggested, has been "no help". Person A (1997) says that "*Arts Course Advice* is supposed to have helped with terminology and exemplify the *Arts CSF*". But as indicated earlier by Person A, *Course Advice* has not been used as a reference by teachers and the appropriate inserviceing has not been offered. Yeung (1997) comments that *Arts Course Advice* was "meant to be a collection of exemplars but finished up as a collection of sample units". Yeung is acknowledging that *Arts Course Advice* has not been written to exemplify the Arts Learning Outcomes in each Arts form, instead unrelated units of work have been developed.

6.2.5.1 **Commentary.**

The *Arts Course Advice* was issued in two sections: *CSF* Levels 5 to 7, distributed towards the end of 1996, and *CSF* Levels 1 to 4 distributed during term one of 1997. Only a small number of the Victorian interviewees commented on *Arts Course Advice*. These people were, on the whole, involved in the writing or reviewing of the *Arts Course Advice*. The remaining Victorian respondents expressed the concern that the document be given time to settle (like the *CSF* itself) before any comment is made. The respondents who were only involved with the writing of the Australian *Arts Profile* could not be expected to have any knowledge of the *Arts Course Advice*.

As has been mentioned earlier, *Course Advice* has no official status. It became the vehicle to implement the Department of Education proposals which were not taken up by the Board of Studies. Music strand work samples were one expectation of *Arts Course Advice* that did not proceed. *Course Advice* was to assist with the transition of content and the expectations of a standard between primary and secondary schools. Complete sets of *Course Advice* were distributed to all schools but the internal dissemination, particularly within secondary schools, has been haphazard. The result has been that in secondary schools Arts teachers have only been issued with the *Course Advice* for their Arts form for Levels 5 to 7. They have not been
given the opportunity to understand the approach taken at the lower levels. Examples of Instrumental Music units are included in the Music strand of the secondary *Arts Course Advice*, but none in the primary *Arts Course Advice*. As some of the respondents have stated, the vision of exemplary units did not eventuate and the sample units published in *Course Advice* represent isolated activities. This arrangement does not provide a guide to teachers for writing a series of interlocking lesson plans that develop skills, techniques, understandings and processes. *Arts Course Advice* continues to reinforce as acceptable the notion that Music teaching is a collection of unrelated activities and, by chance, some link may occur between them.

6.2.6 Instrumental Music and the Music strand

The dominant and popular nature of Instrumental Music in schools, together with the staffing cuts effecting Classroom Music teaching in Victorian Government schools, led interviewees to question why Instrumental Music was left out of the *Arts CSF*. Friend (1997) says: “Instrumental Music teachers - they don't see where they fit”. She strengthens this remark by saying that Instrumental Music has not been included in the *CSF*. Yeung (1997) comments that “Instrumental Music does not have a place”. He says that the problem with the Australian *Arts Profile* and the Victorian *CSF* is the use of levels with regard to practical Music, where it takes many years of experience to learn an instrument. He uses the example of a student who might start the violin before starting school, and compares this situation to the appropriate age level, for example, Year 7. He remarks that in this situation the wording of the Learning Outcomes for a Year 7 student “are far below the years of experience of the student” who has been learning an instrument from an early age. Yeung reflects that the Arts KLAC had the opportunity to develop an Instrumental Music strand in the Victorian *Arts CSF* but the “structure of developing such a concept was too difficult for the committee to master”. With regard to Instrumental Music and the *Arts Course Advice*, Yeung remarks that *Arts Course Advice* attempts to rectify the non-inclusion of Instrumental Music in the *Arts CSF* by including at least one Instrumental Music unit at Levels 5, 6 and 7, but *Course Advice* does not recognise students who start learning below Year 7. Yeung says the Instrumental Music units in *Course Advice* are “encouraging because now there is some recognition of the sort of
teaching that has been going on in schools and in the community as having a place in the CSF”.

Person B (1997) comments that most definitely an Instrumental Music strand in the form of an extra strand was needed in the Arts CSF “for Instrumental Music teachers to track”, and as a demonstration that the Arts KLAC recognised that Instrumental Music is often the most continuous part of Music teaching available in Victorian Government schools. Person B continues: “The Instrumental Music section needed its own Learning Outcomes, Examples and Curriculum Focus”. The earlier reference to editing the overall size of the draft Arts CSF, which was much larger than the other Key Learning Areas, was one reason for its non-inclusion. Person B reflects that another reason was that Instrumental Music teachers are deemed to be “problematic”. This same respondent says: “They only want to teach their style of Music, not teach any theory and do not bend to changes”. This respondent recalls that there were “attempts to include Instrumental Music examples in the Examples list but they were not deliberately to be flagged as such otherwise the Classroom Music teachers would reject it”. Person D (1997) comments that in the design of the Victorian Arts CSF the question was asked: “To what extent should Instrumental Music be a separate or distinct strand?”. Person D acknowledges that the skills associated with Instrumental Music are not formally recognised in the Victorian Arts CSF and that the document was written for the classroom teacher teaching Classroom Music.

Ferris (1997) remarks: “I can't imagine how Instrumental Music has been left out, it's as if Instrumental Music is just stuck on the edge of the curriculum which is really inappropriate”. She comments that the Arts KLAC should “at least flag the fact that there are really strong and lively Instrumental Music programs in schools”. She continues:

This situation is really quite a philosophical problem because when a lot of people think about Music in schools what they are really thinking about is Instrumental Music, they're not thinking of Classroom Music at all. Yet the official document is to do with Classroom Music which is a problem especially at secondary school.
The opinion of Person G (1997) with respect to Instrumental Music provides a sharp contrast to that of others. This respondent strongly rejects the need to create a separate strand for Instrumental Music and comments:

It has been implied throughout the whole document that Instrumental Music is part of the Arts and the Arts document does actually speak to that. The information included - especially for Levels 3 to 7 - it's all there: it's how you interpret it. Course Advice has shown how that is actually done.

The same respondent elaborated with the following:

Instrumental Music is most certainly covered. There was a lot of discussion and that's why it is in the Course Advice. Well it's in the CSF, read the introduction to the document where it specifically mentions it. I made sure it was mentioned and when we were developing the CSF there was always a focus that this was not just for the classroom program but also for the Instrumental Music programs in schools. So I have always consciously addressed it. It specifically mentions Instrumental Music in all the Curriculum Focus areas; Instrumental Music is mentioned.

Person G (1997) describes the Instrumental Music people as a “difficult group”, adding, “I guess that Instrumental Music people overall are Musicians first and Educators second. I guess that's where part of the problem is”. Many Instrumental Music teachers no doubt will be surprised by this comment. The same respondent remarks that the Victorian CSF was not written to have three equal components and that if a separate strand for Instrumental Music was created “I would almost be saying the same things”. This respondent goes onto provide examples of how the CSF components interrelate in terms of Instrumental Music teaching:

So you might focus on composition in your school and through the composition you would have all the elements happening because Music is wholistic. You cannot have composition without the performance of it, you cannot have it without the kids having some sort of skills - the making - you cannot have it with kids not knowing anything about aesthetics, or being able to criticise, being able to develop an Artistic critical mind. You can't have them compose without having them understand the context of the Music, you cannot do that. In the same way, you cannot have a performance program without a knowledge of Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts. So in the Instrumental Music program, you have the kids performing and you talk about the Art of creating and re-creating a piece of Music.
Emery (1997b) acknowledges the problem relating to Classroom Music versus Instrumental Music and reflects that in the development of the Australian Arts Profile the writers tried to “break the separation between Classroom Music and Instrumental Music, to bring the gap between Instrumental and Classroom Music closer together”. Emery and her co-writer Hammond (1997) wanted to express a vision that all students can compose Music as well as re-create Music from the past. According to Emery, “the Australian Arts Profile was written as it was hoped things would happen”. Whitehead (1997) says that despite the Western Australian teachers “thinking that the Arts strands are a bit general when they are focussing on technique” [referring to Instrumental Music teaching] they still use the generic Arts strands for teaching instruments. She does not seem to find the omission of a separate Instrumental Music strand a problem with regard to the Western Australian document.

6.2.6.1 Commentary.

The issue of Instrumental Music in the Music strand of the Arts CSF has been discussed in the context of the Victorian Arts CSF. The respondents who identified this as an area of concern were either administrators of large school Music departments or key personnel involved in the writing process. Contradictory statements made by the key personnel are evident from the interview data. Interviewees who were involved only with writing the Australian Arts Statement and Profile could not be expected to have been aware of the issues affecting Victorian Music teachers. Understandably, they did not comment on the issue, with the exception of the personnel from Western Australia. The fact that Whitehead from Western Australia expressed an opinion is probably because she was a contributing writer to the Arts Profile and Western Australia was the only State to officially trial the Arts Profile before proceeding with the writing of its own document. She has had to grapple with this issue in her own State's document. The Victorians who wished to allow the document to “settle down” could not isolate the issues affecting Instrumental Music for discussion.

The provision of Instrumental Music teaching in Victorian Government schools is recognised as an important element of a school's curriculum. Schools are prepared to hire additional staff
to supplement the teachers assigned by the Government. Most Instrumental Music teachers in Government secondary schools (which account for approximately 80 percent of the secondary school population) attend a different school each day of the week. It is to be regretted that despite a few assertions to the contrary the CSF does not include - or at least fails to make obvious - the importance of Instrumental Music within the Music strand.

It has been mentioned that the Victorian Arts CSF Levels do not take account of the student who begins learning an instrument before the official school commencement age. In the same way, the Victorian Arts CSF Levels do not accommodate the majority of Instrumental Music students who commence learning an instrument at the beginning of Year 7 (the beginning of CSF Level 5). It is arguable that in terms of the Victorian Arts CSF substrands, these students will only be achieving at Level 1 standard. Again, this highlights the concern of some regarding the failure of Music in the Arts CSF to explicitly acknowledge the specialised work undertaken by Instrumental Music teachers.

6.2.7 Alternative Level Structures for the Arts

The structure used for the Victorian CSF Key Learning Area, Languages other than English (LOTE), is not tied to school years and does not describe curriculum according to seven CSF Levels. Van Ernst (1997), the Convenor of the Preparatory Year to Year 4 Arts Key Learning Area Committee (KLAC) Working Party, recalls that there was no contact between the KLAC convenors during the CSF development and she makes the open-ended the comment: “[In hindsight] if we had known what LOTE did, we would have considered the possibility in the Arts”. Van Ernst says that the LOTE structure “makes sense for the Arts”. As an aside she said that “when the convenors of the working parties and the KLAC across all the Key Learning Areas met with the Board of Studies it was for the purpose of receiving information and no discussion or comment was permitted”. Ferris (1997) considers the LOTE structure more relevant to the Arts but politically not secure as students would not be assessed according to CSF Levels and corresponding school years - and this could contribute to a diminishing status of the Arts in the overall curriculum. Likewise, Person F (1997) comments that “pragmatically the LOTE structure would have been a better way for Music, but perhaps
not politically”. Like Ferris, Person F is acknowledging that the LOTE structure will not establish a standard according to CSF Levels which are tied to school years. Person F argues that following a multiple entry point structure “leaves the door open, especially for generalist primary teachers, not to teach Music and leave it to specialist secondary teachers”.

Yeung (1997) likes the approach that LOTE took of multiple entry points and comments that “the thing I like about it is that the course structure reflected the age groups”. He draws a parallel with students who start the violin at 3 years old and others who start the tuba at Year 10 and because of the difference in technical expertise, the tuba student is able to secure a place in a tertiary institution. He suggests that the LOTE structure would have suited the Orff Schulwerk and Kodály approaches that are used in primary schools. He comments that the people who were working on the Victorian Arts CSF were Victorian Government school teachers who taught in environments where comprehensive Music programs were not offered on a continuous basis from Preparatory Year to Year 10, the scope covered by the CSF. He continues that the structure would also suit Dance - even though less students are involved - and Visual Arts, where a “smorgasbord of activities” is offered to students rather than a speciality focus on one. Yeung remarks that “it's a shame that the LOTE structure, where you have different starting points, was not taken up”. He appreciates that for the Arts it was a structurally complex and costly procedure because a new structure would have to accommodate skills involved in the learning of all instruments and the varying length of time that students study an instrument.

Person B (1997) recalls that the Board of Studies permitted only the LOTE structure to be untied from school years; by contrast, “no wavering” was allowed in the other Key Learning Areas. The LOTE structure results from the VCE influence where two courses are available: one for native speakers and one for non-native speakers. Person B remarks: “Personally I would not tie the CSF Levels to school years, as it is difficult to judge. What makes Level 3, Level 3?” Emery (1997b) states, “That's the way the Board of Studies wanted it”. Hammond (1997) remarks that the Victorian Government has used the Australian Statements and Profiles in the Victorian CSF for a purpose that was never intended - tying levels to school
years. He recalls that the Department of Education has admitted that the tying of levels does not work in reality “because kids don’t perform like that”. McMillan (1997), Person E (1997), and Friend (1997) also disagree with the notion of tying CSF Levels to school years.

Person G (1997) comments that it was a Board of Studies decision to tie Victorian CSF Levels to school years with the exception of LOTE, but argues that it is impossible to write the Arts CSF Level 1 Learning Outcomes to be applicable to both a Preparatory Year student and a student in Year 7 or 8. Person G says that because the older students have experienced the Arts, even if only informally,

They are most certainly not at Level 1 - you could not put them there and I don't know what kind of language you would use. The ability of their Artistic expression will be more mature, will be more Artistic than the average 5 year-old. You're looking at Artistic expression not skills and knowledge.

At the same time, Person G does acknowledge that in terms of the Learning Outcomes a Year 7 student may be operating at Level 3 instead of Level 5. The fact remains that to this point the issue has not been satisfactorily addressed.

6.2.7.1 Commentary.
The issue of tying school years to CSF Levels in order to set standards, particularly in the Arts, elicited lively responses from the interviewees. It is interesting that those who agreed with the Victorian Government policy in this area were all members of the Principal Class in Victorian Government schools. The majority of respondents addressed the practicalities of untying the CSF Levels from school years and the value of presenting the Arts in another format, but they acknowledged that this procedure would not establish standards. One interviewee commented that she considered it is impossible to write CSF Level 1 Learning Outcomes to suit Year 7 students as these students already had experience of the Arts. Despite this, the respondent acknowledges that such students may be operating at a CSF Level lower than the expected Level 5 Learning Outcomes. Taking this statement even further invites the suggestion that it may indeed be possible for a Year 7 student to be operating at CSF Level 1.
The wide variety of provision and quality of continuous Music teaching in Victorian
Government schools, together with opportunities for students to participate in Instrumental
Music tuition both in and outside the school system, suggests a need to unlock the CSF Levels
from the school years. The reduction in Classroom Music teaching across the State of
Victoria exposes a student population at the end of their primary school years who may be
unable to meet the standard expected of CSF Level 4. Although some students will be
learning instruments they will not be working through a program which interleaves the three
substrands of the Arts CSF, and therefore will most likely have developed less wholistic
skills. The requirement of the Board of Studies and the Department of Education that the
three substrands or five Learning Outcomes are to be totalled to equal a CSF Level is not a
satisfactory expectation given the obvious difference in learning opportunities for each
Learning Outcome. The provision of a different system for LOTE indicates that an
alternative is possible.

6.2.8 Influence of the Victorian Certificate of Education

The Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) was introduced into Victoria in 1989 and has
been reviewed on a number of occasions. In 1997, the VCE was the subject of a major
Victorian Government review and a further review was announced in June 1998. The VCE is
the curriculum for Years 11 and 12, the post-compulsory years of Victorian schooling, and
signifies the “completion” secondary schooling. A number of interviewees commented on the
influence that the VCE was having on the CSF. With the introduction of the CSF, Person A
(1997) comments that there are now two legitimate approaches to teaching Music in the
Victorian Government school system. Person A observes that the approach to teaching VCE
Music has had a strong influence on the way in which Music is taught in the lower school
years. This is not surprising as one might expect that the two-year curriculum for Years 11
and 12 would have implications for subject content and structure in the early years of
secondary school. The irony, as this respondent has remarked, is that no pedagogical
connection exists between the VCE and the CSF. McMillan (1997) comments that the CSF
was “supposed to link up” with the VCE, implying that in practice it has not. Person G (1997)
provides a minority opinion, asserting that the writers worked from "both ends" in the construction of the Victorian Arts CSF and considered what a Year 7 student would need for the VCE: "it most certainly has been written with a great deal of linking and there is not one wagging [the tail of] the other". Person G describes Level 7 of the Arts CSF as "just like the VCE course, like the 11 and 12 stuff" and comments further, "if you look at it you will find that it is well and truly linked". In reference to schools that have organised their entire school using the VCE structure and language, Person G argues that this "works hand in hand with the CSF - it depends on how you have devised your curriculum. Personally I don't see how they find that a difficulty". Clearly, there is a major difference of opinion between this key person and other key personnel.

Person A remarks that the Victorian CSF must become a curriculum document for Preparatory Year to Year 12 (not just Year 10), or it will not, ultimately, be successful. Unfortunately there is a clear divide between the CSF, which ends at Year 10, and the VCE which is designed for Years 11 and 12.

Yeung (1997) remarks on the influence of the VCE in terms of the use of language in the Arts CSF. Friend (1997) is hoping that the Arts CSF will be allowed to settle and grow rather than being subjected to the constant change that has plagued the VCE. In contrast to those interviewees who commented on the influence of the VCE on the CSF, two interviewees remarked on the influence being reversed. Griffiths (1997) comments that Music in the VCE is being influenced by the CSF. He says that not only is Music forced to assume the same structure as all the Arts forms, but there is political pressure to establish a composition factor in the VCE. He considers that this is being driven from the CSF.

Person B (1997) addresses the influence of the CSF on the VCE in terms of the Victorian Government's policy to establish tighter standards in education. The Government believed that the VCE "needed fixing" in terms of tighter standards and Person B commented that the Government did not think that schools by themselves could be relied upon to achieve this. Subsequently, this respondent argues, the Victorian Government took control through the
production of the Victorian CSF, which it saw as providing a vehicle for the setting and implementation of standards.

Other interviewees have reflected on the influence of the VCE in the areas of Arts discipline choice and assessment; these views are included in the second main part of this chapter under the heading of The construction of an Australian Arts Key Learning Area.

6.2.8.1 Commentary.

The respondents' comments on the influence of the VCE come from two perspectives. They discussed the structure chosen for the Victorian Arts CSF and the curriculum connection between the Arts CSF and the VCE. Three of the interviewees for this study had been involved with the initial writing of the VCE. The Australian Arts Profile writers are both Victorians, and one had been involved in the development of the VCE in the Arts Learning Area. Two other interviewees were writers for the VCE Music Study Designs. These two people were Music representatives on the Arts KLAC. The past involvement of these Arts Profile and Arts CSF writers with the VCE points to a strong link between the two Victorian documents.

The element of “composition” is not specifically included in the VCE Music Study Designs. Yet, composition or Creating is a part of the other Arts forms in the VCE. The absence of this element for Music has been a source of criticism by the representatives of the other Arts forms at the VCE level. It is considered that the Australian Arts Profile writers used the opportunity to include Creating in the Arts Profile as a means of influencing the inclusion of composition in the VCE Music Study Designs at some later date. However, the majority of Music teachers who responded to a review questionnaire from the Board of Studies at the end of 1996 about the inclusion of composition in the VCE Music Study Design rejected the proposal. Despite the fact that some personnel saw the Victorian Arts CSF as a vehicle for reform of the Music Study Designs in the VCE, their hopes have not been realised and composition is still not included in the VCE Music subjects.
After an initial uneasy reaction to the implementation of the VCE in 1989, secondary schools have structured their programs across all the school years to reflect preparation for it. As far as school structures are concerned, the arrangements for the VCE have had a major impact on primary and secondary schools. Schools have adapted the language and assessment processes of the VCE to all years of schooling.

6.2.9 Government support for implementation

Interviewees also reflected on the support of the Victorian Government for the implementation of the CSF and expressed opinions about the successful uptake of the CSF in schools. After executing massive staffing cuts and rapid system change the Victorian Government designed and trialed the CSF in less than twelve months. The expectation is that this compulsory curriculum document will be implemented in all Victorian Government schools in a period of two years. The political reasons for the development of the CSF so soon after the presentation of the Australian Statements and Profiles to the Ministers for Education in 1993 have been discussed in Chapter One.

Van Ernst (1997) expresses concern that the Australian Arts Statement and Profile was not trialed in Victorian schools and that the Victorian Government commenced its own processes before the “dust had settled”. She says that the consultation process associated with the draft Victorian Arts CSF was hurried and the sample of participating schools and teachers was not scientifically analysed. Van Ernst gave the example where one isolated comment from a teacher was included in the consultation report, taking on added meaning it possibly did not deserve.

Person D (1997) comments that the Australian Statements and Profiles would have been implemented in Victoria if there had been community agreement, but the Victorian Government, through the Board of Studies, required a curriculum which could fit into its policies: to create standards and tie them to school years. Person D's comment about achieving community agreement refers to the education policy presented by the Government during an election campaign. Person B (1997) also takes up this point, declaring that the
Victorian Government, through the auspices of the Board of Studies, considered it had an electoral mandate to establish standards in education and to show student progress through the school years. The CSF was written to achieve this specific purpose. Person D continues that not only did the Board of Studies view the two parts of the Australian document - the Statement and Profile - as unmanageable, but it saw inadequacies between the two documents and did not know to what degree each was to be made compulsory. Two questions were raised: “What was the relationship between the bands in the Statement and the levels in the Profile?” and “How were the levels in the Profile guided by the bands in the Statement?” Person D reports “that clearly confusion about the Australian documents existed at State [Victorian] level”.

Discussion about implementing the Victorian CSF brings forth varying opinions. Person D (1997) clarifies the division of labour: the Board of Studies had the responsibility for writing the Victorian CSF and the Department of Education had responsibility for implementing the CSF through the publication of support materials. Although such a division exists, the Board of Studies also continues to write and publish support materials. These publications are referred to in Chapter Five.

Askew (1997), as well as Van Ernst (1997), Hammond (1997), Person A (1997), and Person F (1997) all express strong concern about the inadequate support provided for schools and teachers in the implementation process. All comment on the noticeable absence of “people support” to assist implementation. Askew considers that support materials are more critical to the success of the CSF than the actual CSF document. He suggests that the greatest impact will be made by providing ongoing professional development and resources. Person A, Person F, and Van Ernst stress that the Victorian Government expects that support for CSF implementation will be provided by professional teacher associations rather than by itself. Person F and Van Ernst refer to the often total voluntary capacities of these associations and Van Ernst highlights that such associations may not have access to the necessary skills and knowledge to assist teachers in the process of implementation. Person F recalls the difficulty of University teacher education departments in obtaining the support materials KIDMAP and
Course Advice at a time when graduate teachers were expected by schools to be familiar with the Victorian CSF. Hammond comments that the two major areas lacking in the implementation of the Victorian CSF are adequate exposure and appropriate levels of staffing in schools. Hammond refers to the inadequate provisions made by the Victorian Government to make teachers in schools aware of the content and use of the CSF. Person A describes the CSF as a "waste of paper" - because of the lack of Victorian Government implementation support, Victorian Government money for inservice training and poor dissemination. The same respondent adds that the supporting document Course Advice is suffering the same fate as the Victorian CSF, adding, "It's pathetic".

Person G (1997) is the only interviewee who defends the implementation support offered by the Victorian Government but, in doing so, acknowledges that the support documents and personnel training came 18 months after the release of the Victorian Arts CSF and so "lost the punch line". Person G remarks that the Victorian Government "did not spend much of its own money in the Arts but instead used the Australian Government's" financial support. The same respondent comments that the Department of Education established a system of Arts network leaders but "the Arts network leaders were not trained, they did not really know what they were doing, and there were not enough people available to provide them support". This respondent suggests that additional material on video or the internet is needed to support the Arts network leaders. This same respondent acknowledges that continuing problems are evident with only very general support being available to assist teachers with assessment and reporting according to the Learning Outcomes of the CSF. Writers of the assessment and reporting material were told to focus on broad guidelines and not to refer to specific subject concerns. Person G says that the open-endedness of the assessment and reporting guidelines were to allow schools to devise assessment procedures to meet the needs of their students, but in reality schools want more specific detail.

6.2.9.1 Commentary.

Some of the interviewees raised the issue of inadequate Victorian Government support for implementing the Victorian CSF with the exception of one person, who strongly defended the
Victorian Government's commitment to the CSF but, during the discussion, also exposed the weakness of inadequate people support. The interviewees who commented on this matter did so as part of their observations about implementing the Music strand of the Victorian Arts CSF. The respondents were all very aware of the political environment surrounding the rejection of the Australian Statements and Profiles and the demands of the Victorian Government to use the school system to implement its own agenda in the area of setting and measuring standards. The respondents had grasped the issue that the CSF was being used by the Victorian Government as a political document to win support from the electorate for its education policies. All of these respondents are involved with professional teacher associations and are sympathetic to the difficulties experienced by professional associations in coping with the Victorian Government's expectations.

The Victorian Government has taken this approach as part of its "privatisation policy", where it is considered cheaper to use the often voluntary services of teachers, who give their "after hours" time to provide professional development activities for their colleagues. The Victorian Government also veils the fact that the CSF is a compulsory Government document by outsourcing the implementation. The Victorian Government hopes that teachers will have some form of ownership of the centrally developed curriculum and come to believe that there are no overtones of Victorian Government involvement. The implication is that teachers will be held responsible by the Victorian Government if the CSF is not implemented successfully. The Victorian Government has failed to realise that teachers are experiencing difficulties with the implementation process and that its plans are not being fulfilled appropriately. The involvement and subsequent inconsistency of two Victorian Government departments - namely the Department of Education and the Board of Studies - in preparing the CSF and the support materials cannot be separated from this discussion. The Department of Education and the Board of Studies have publicly stated that they each have a different interpretation of the CSF. As the two bodies responsible for the implementation for the CSF, this is an extremely unfortunate situation.
6.3 The construction of an Australian Arts Key Learning Area

6.3.1 Single Arts Subjects

Interviewees were asked to suggest the Art forms that could be included in an Australian Arts Key Learning Area. As the majority of the interviewees were only involved with the writing of either the Australian or the Victorian document, the responses are divided according to the Arts Statement and Profile and the Arts CSF. The responses with reference to the Australian Arts Statement and Profile are presented first and those in reference to the Victorian Arts CSF are presented second. A small number of interviewees were involved with the writing of both documents.

6.3.1.1 Australia

Emery (1997b) comments that during the construction of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile there were “heated debates” as to what constituted the Arts forms. Emery and Hammond (1997) have noted that there was disagreement about the content of Visual Arts, and a political lobby from the Craft Council of Australia pushed for more significance to be given to Craft. Prior to the Arts Statement and Profile, the discipline of Media was not included in the curriculum of all Australian States and Territories, because it was not seen as an Arts form. Emery states that in the end it was decided to use the Arts forms contained in the 1988 Victorian Arts Framework, and that this was “a bold move for all the other States and Territories which did not have all these Arts forms in their curricula”.

Emery, Hammond, and Livermore (1997) all comment that the Australian Literature Board (within the Australia Council) identifies Literature as an Arts form and Emery says: “they would like to have seen it in the Australian documents”. Emery continues “that there is a force that sees Literature more aligned with Art, rather than the teaching of grammar”. Hammond harks back to the efforts to include Literature in the Victorian Certificate of Education on two occasions, prior to the writing of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. He recalls that “everyone saw the whole logic of that and the need to really push the creative aspects of Literature and the making of Literature, rather than just the study of it and poetry and so on. It wasn't to be”. The debate was lost on political grounds. Like Emery,
Hammond also suggests that “nothing would have remained in English”. Hammond continues that when the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* was written, he and Emery pushed once again for the inclusion of Literature. The debate was lost for the second time. Livermore (1997) comments that it was “a shame that Literature and Creative Writing were not included [in the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*] but perhaps it was tidier to keep them in the language area”. A contrasting opinion comes from McPherson (1997) who considers that adding Literature to the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* “would have made it a humanities document and then where do you stop?”

Hammond (1997) recalls the discussions with the writers of the Technology Key Learning Area on the place of Design and remarks: “What they came up with in terms of their concept of Design and what we did was quite a different definition and it shouldn't have been”. He is implying that both the Technology and Arts Key Learning writers should have been able to cast a common definition of the concept of the Arts form, Design. Instead, for the Arts Key Learning Area, Design has its own “Arts” characteristics, whereas in the Technology Key Learning Area, Design is subsidiary to the product. Hammond believes it is now important to concentrate efforts on “cross-fertilisation” between the Key Learning Areas rather than adding or subtracting any Arts forms from the current list. Livermore (1997) considers that Design is an element which is found in every Arts form and is not purely part of Visual Arts. She says: “You can't talk about Design in the abstract, it does not start to do anything until it's in some Arts form or some form of expression”.

McPherson (1997) questions the inclusion of Media as one of the five Arts forms in the *Arts Statement and Profile*, at the same time suggesting that “Media is starting to take off and it might become an umbrella for the Arts”. Livermore (1997) is of the opinion that the fundamental Arts forms are Dance, Drama, Music and Visual Arts. Although acknowledging Media as an Arts form she refers to it as a construction of Dance, Drama, Music and Visual Arts in the form of visual images. Livermore sees Media in a different class from the other fundamental Arts forms which represent Artistic expression. She does not consider Media to be on an equal footing with the other Arts forms; but in saying this she is not diminishing its
importance in education. Van Ernst views the fact that Media was included in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and Graphic Communication left out “as interesting”. She proposes that there is a case for both of them coming together, just as there is a case for Visual Arts and Graphic Communication coming together.

Whitehead (1997) addresses the inclusion of Arts forms in a curriculum, and in this case she focusses on Arts forms in terms of the outcomes that are being addressed as the important factor, rather than the label placed on the curriculum area. Therefore, as an example, she says that the place of Literature depends on the teaching approach to the subject. “It does not matter if it's done in an English class or a Drama class or as part of a Music class or a production”. Pascoe (1997) comments that in the development of the Western Australian Arts Framework, “one of the good things about not using the Arts forms as strands is that we have been able to avoid too much fracturing of the curriculum”. The Western Australian Arts Framework makes the assumption that there are five Arts forms - Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts, and Multi-Arts combinations of them.

6.3.1.2 Victoria.

The responses of interviewees involved with the writing of the Victorian Arts CSF are included in this section. The possible inclusion of Literature elicited the majority of opinions. Person D (1997) says that there was no pressure to include Literature in the Victorian Arts CSF, although it was mentioned. Person B (1997) thinks that each State and Territory should offer the same six Arts forms as Victoria. This respondent refers to Literature “as a can of worms” and comments that “Literature is an aspect of the Arts - writing poetry, a play, a screen play, a concept for a book. Literature does not fit into English. Literature should be in the Arts”.

Askew (1997) comments on the inclusion of Literature from a primary school perspective: “Literature's got to be somewhere: it's easy in the primary school - cross curriculum nature all the time”. Literature would be part of an Integrated Arts program in the primary school. Like Askew, Person E (1997) also views Literature from a primary school perspective, where it
Ferris (1997) would like to see some Creative Writing in the Arts Key Learning Area, commenting that a lot of Music teachers, when teaching composition through the Learning Outcome Exploring and Developing Ideas, use Creative Writing, particularly poetry, as a stimulus. She says: “I can't see any problem with some putting Creative Writing into the Arts stream, even if it's only writing it into things like the Drama, Music and Visual Arts streams”. Ferris is curious to know why Media and not Literature has a place in the Arts and she remarks that “If you are going to use an aesthetics basis for the rationale for the Arts then you can look at Literature and Creative Writing”.

Van Ernst (1997) comments that the inclusion of Literature in the Arts is also a University debate and that “there is always going to be a bit of tension” if Drama, English, Literature, Professional Writing and Creative Writing are separated.

Person C (1997) considers that the English Key Learning Area relies on the Artistic values and the Artistic aspects of Literature to enhance its teaching and learning, and this respondent would not be in favour of Literature as part of the Arts “because I think it would destroy English, the teaching of English”. Person A (1997) holds a similar view to Person C but approaches it in a different way. This respondent considers that to include Creative Writing in the Arts would mean incorporating “the whole of the English language”. As a compromise Person A would like to see a creative area in English. Griffiths (1997) suggests that to incorporate a creative part of language would separate it from the language itself. McMillan remarks that “it would not be good for the Arts to have Literature amongst it as literary people are most “un-Artistic”. They have differences in thinking and outlook and don't comprehend the Arts”.

Askew remarks that “Craft has such an important part in society as people can be involved in Crafts all over the place. It's border-line between I suppose serious Art and Craft Art”.
Person C recalls the historical debate about Art and Craft: "Are we Art teachers or Craft teachers? Then we came to that horrible Art/Craft thing". Person C expresses that "you've got to learn the Craft of any Art before you can express yourself, so every Art has its Craft".

Person D (1997) explains that Graphic Communication was lost in the Australian debate where it was absorbed into Visual Arts. The inclusion of Graphic Communication in the Victorian Arts CSF was an influence from the VCE when during its development "Graphic Communication, Design and Technology fought it out". Person D is recounting a debate similar to that which took place when the Arts subjects were chosen for the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. The decision made during the development of the VCE placed Graphic Communication into the Arts, and Design into Technology. Graphic Communication was also included as an Arts form in the 1988 Victorian Arts Framework and this factor had an influence. This same respondent comments that teachers expected Graphic Communication to be included and the decision to commence the Arts form at the secondary level was made by the KLAC. Teachers were also delighted to see six familiar Arts forms and not processes. Person D recalls that an argument was made for the inclusion of Design instead of Graphic Communication as an Arts CSF strand. Van Ernst (1997) also reflects on the influence of the VCE and remarks that Graphic Communication was put back into the Victorian Arts CSF as a result of the subject's popularity in the VCE.

Askew comments that he would include Graphic Communication in primary schools because students are presently working in this Arts form in the Social Education area. He is hesitant though, as teachers would say "not another thing!" Person A (1997) comments that "because of the changes in technology, Graphic Communication has become much more of an 'Arts' subject than it used to be", and this respondent agrees with Askew remarking that "it must be included from Preparatory Year".

McMillan (1997) recalls the inclusion of Graphic Communication in the VCE, which she describes as a subject "with not a lot of Artistic outcomes, but a mix of Design, Technology and Graphics". She suggests that "to a broad thinker and creative thinker it could be seen as
Art”. Person E (1997) describes Graphic Communication as being creative within very strict guidelines. This respondent says that when it is approached from an Arts base it is creative, but as a Technical Drawing subject it not very creative at all and the students produce the same product according to set guidelines.

Person E (1997) comments that Media does not quite sit in an Arts Learning Area as it's not really creative and perhaps it belongs in the Technology or Studies of Society and Environment Key Learning Area. Yeung (1997) suggests that recognition needs to be given to different forms of Media - Multi-Media - as computers now allow students to create in Painting, Drawing and Music where they have not had the skills previously.

Person F (1997) answered the question from the point of view of training teachers suggesting that six Arts forms are unrealistic when there is a need to give students knowledge in the discipline area, in methodology, and in curriculum skills. This respondent says there should only be three Arts forms: “Music (including Dance), Drama and Visual Arts (including Graphic Communication). Media, like Information Technology integrates into all Arts”. Person F justifies this choice with the comment that “the primary and secondary system is not up and running where everyone is familiar with all Arts forms”.

Person D (1997) also answered this interview question in terms of fragmenting the Arts Key Learning Area, leading to the laying down of a curriculum, not a framework. Person D suggested that the development of an Instrumental Music strand as an example. Likewise, Friend (1997) approached this interview question from the perception of fragmentation of the subjects currently included. She explained that Music can be broken into four strands: history, performance, aural, and creative which could be considered as separate subjects. She comments that the Arts area creates a teaching difficulty because of the nature of the individual disciplines and their separate identities. Friend says that it is important to represent the different areas of intelligence - the visual, the kinaesthetic and the aural - but she thinks that to make an Arts program successful with many different strands, the terms Performing or Visual Arts program need to be used.
6.3.1.3 Commentary.

The interviewees responded very passionately to the discussion about Arts subjects that could be included in an Australian Arts curriculum. Concerns about the provision of teaching Arts subjects also dominated the discussion. It was difficult for people to escape the topics of the overcrowded curriculum, the inclusion of more Arts disciplines, and the training of primary teachers. One respondent was concerned that it was unreasonable to expect primary teacher trainees to absorb the methodologies and content associated with each Arts discipline. The respondents who had offered non-committal opinions about the structure of the Victorian Arts CSF were stirred by the opportunity to comment on the inclusion of Arts disciplines. Respondents were more interested in discussing the current subject offerings rather than taking a more lateral approach to considering subjects which could be included.

Settling on the Arts forms included in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile was the source of a heated debate. Interviewees expressed opinions about the inclusion of Literature, as well as Craft, Design and Media as single Arts subjects. The Victorian participants were influenced by the Arts forms contained in the VCE, as well as having opinions about the inclusion of the Arts disciplines of Literature, Craft, Design, and Media. Graphic Communication had been part of the Victorian Arts Framework (1988) and, in the opinion of a number of the respondents, it was returned “to its rightful place” in the Victorian Arts CSF. Significantly, the Victorian Arts Framework model (1988) was the prime influence of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile in the first place. Some of the respondents would like Graphic Communication to be included from Preparatory Year, as it was in the 1988 Victorian Arts Framework. There was support from interviewees for Literature to be included in the Arts Learning Area as an individual subject, although there were respondents who considered Literature to “lack creativity”. Craft was recognised by some respondents as being an Arts form that made a contribution to the other Arts forms rather than functioning in a stand-alone position. A few respondents commented about the status of Design, suggesting that like Craft, it only has a purpose when used in conjunction with other Arts forms. As an
Arts form, Media is broadening its scope to represent all the "traditional" Arts taught in schools as well as incorporating computer generated Arts forms.

6.3.2 Multi-Arts
Interviewees were asked to reflect on the inclusion of Multi-Arts in an Australian Arts Key Learning Area. The concept of Multi-Arts was discussed during the developmental stages of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. Specific reference to Multi-Arts was not included in either document although the concept was "incorporated" into the Australian Arts Profile. From an Australian perspective, Emery (1997b) recalls that "the Arts were under constant scrutiny because we did not fit the model of all the other curriculum areas". She states that "we argued vehemently to retain five discrete Arts forms rather than pushing them all together to form a "muesli subject", an Arts muesli subject called 'The Arts". Emery states further that "we believe quite seriously that learning is sequential in each Arts form". She and Hammond (1997) had to argue strongly that learning is not transferable from one Arts form to another. She says: "Learning Music has nothing to do with learning Dance or Art". Emery comments further that

To learn each Arts form is to learn a separate code of understanding and they all have their own meaning systems, their own forms of expression. Training to be a Musician is nothing like training as a Visual Artist - they're such separate vocations so I've always argued for that discreteness to remain. The Arts are separate symbolic languages - they function discretely.

Emery (1997b) says that during the development of the Arts Key Learning Area there was constant pressure to reduce the number of Arts forms simply because there seemed too many. Although she argued strongly for the presence of discrete Arts forms in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile she expresses that in her own view, Multi-Arts projects are useful as short-term projects enabling students to understand that there are commonalities in the Arts and that the Arts do work together.

Hammond (1997) reflects on the need to add more cross-disciplinary Arts activities, particularly into the first four levels of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. He comments that, based on his own research, the possibility of developing a Multi-Arts subject
for the VCE, “was doomed to failure”. He points out that: “If you have generic Outcome Statements you should be able to write pointers, but you can't write assessments for them”.

Hammond continues that the most common definition of Multi-Arts involves using a common theme, but he argues that this is not what he regards as a Multi-Arts approach. For Hammond, Multi-Arts implies the development of a new subject. To pursue this further with reference to the present Arts subjects, he uses the example of Music, Drama and Dance being merged and a new name created. In this case the three subjects would not be working together but a new subject that has emerged out of them would be created. He says that “No-one's done it although people really like the idea conceptually”. Having said this, Hammond asserts that in the final analysis he would not recommend a Multi-Arts study as part of the Australian Arts Profile, principally because of what he perceives to be major assessment difficulties.

Like the debate about Arts Learning Outcomes, the discussion about the place of Multi-Arts in the Victorian Arts CSF is described by interviewees as a debate between The University of Melbourne and the Board of Studies. Emery (1997b) remarks that there was pressure for a separate Multi-Arts strand from the Board of Studies representatives. She says: “We nearly did write in this multidisciplinary set of Learning Outcomes; we were going to have added separate Learning Outcomes that were Multi-Arts outcomes at the end of each level.”

Van Ernst (1997) comments that “One or two people within the Board of Studies office were pushing for a creative Arts program”. She thought it strange that Music would be left out of “something called creative Arts”. Van Ernst recalls that although there were sufficient people on the Arts KLAC to understand what multidisciplinary activities in the primary school meant, there was a concern that if there was a Multi-Arts strand “You'd finish up with no basis in any one of the Arts forms for studies in later years. So you'd be starting again like we used to do teaching the fundamentals of Music in Year 7”. She stated that “the KLAC worked really hard to keep the strands separate, and that was the first big battle”. In expressing her concerns about Multi-Arts, Van Ernst says: “Sadly Music is usually the servant, it's usually the tape put on in the background while they Dance or while they act”.
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Her biggest concern is that no attention would be given to developing each of the Arts forms in their own right before they are brought together in a combined production which needs the knowledge of each Arts form as its basis.

Person B (1997) confirms that Multi-Arts was a Board of Studies policy and these representatives did not want to discourage it, but The University of Melbourne representatives “objected violently”. Person B suggests that given the current low provision of Arts teachers in Victorian Government schools and the inconsistent teaching of Arts disciplines, “a combination will give them continuous access to all Arts strands, give them more Arts Education than at the moment”. This same respondent argues that a Multi-Arts program will provide access to other subjects and will not take away the specific knowledge and identity of each Arts strand.

Person D (1997) reflects back to the attempt at including a Multi-Arts subject in the VCE and comments that “When we could not do it in a more rarefied, purer context in the VCE, we did not follow up the possibility of a Multi-Arts segment in the Arts CSF”. The same person comments that throughout the planning stages the KLAC voted against examples of Multi-Arts put to them:

Partly on the grounds that I remember saying what we're going to have is one generic Learning Outcome and preceding it five or six specific curriculum descriptions about the strands. Then the argument was if all you had to report on was the generic outcome, it did not matter. How could you say what you did in Music was the same as Visual Arts,? You couldn't! You have to have some integrity. There is a need to preserve the separate bodies of knowledge.

This respondent continues that “there was no push to introduce a new strand of Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts” and it was always argued that Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts could be developed in the school curriculum at present. Further, reference is made in the Victorian CSF to Integrated Arts. Person D (1997) elaborates on this:

It's not developed, it's pretty quiet and the reason why it's pretty quiet is that right through the development of the Victorian CSF there was a genuine concern from the KLAC and the KLAC members that the integrity of each discipline not be
undermined in any way. On the other hand it was allowed for in the sense of Cross-Arts, Integrated Arts, Multi-Arts - in that sense it was okay, and that extended to identifying a set of Curriculum Focus statements and Learning Outcomes. It was a concern, there was always an awareness that in primary schools in particular the integrated curricula in the Arts would be sort of blended. There was also a fear that the Arts would then be watered-down, and that's why in the introduction to the CSF it says that if you offer a strand at a particular level you should offer all the substrands and the related Learning Outcomes to try and preserve the idea of discipline integrity within a particular strand at a particular level.

Yeung (1997) explains that it was discussed that should there be a next stage to the Victorian CSF, Integrated Arts or Multi-Arts units were to be written to help with the situation in primary schools. He says that it was hoped that at least one unit per CSF Level would be included in Arts Course Advice to show some level of integration. Yeung comments that an Integrated Arts program does not allow levels to be attached to the separate Arts disciplines, which is a requirement of the CSF. Further, he says, although Multi-Arts has a place in schools the difficulty comes in its implementation “because the pedagogical structures are not there”. Yeung is referring to the lack of knowledge amongst teachers in schools about developing and assessing a Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts program.

Person A (1997) comments that the similarity in the Victorian Arts CSF Learning Outcomes “which are all the same, bar one or two words” provides for the connection between all the Arts as well as allowing the strands to retain their individuality and identity in competition with the priority areas of literacy, numeracy, and technology. This respondent continues: “You talk about each of the Arts strands, then Multi-Arts as something different and it isn't. It's become a political thing, you have to be really careful that Multi-Arts doesn't become 'Arts' and that it takes over from the strands”. The same person remarks that there are several units that illustrate the way that the strands can operate together in Arts Course Advice.

Person G (1997) goes even further and remarks that the generic Learning Outcome structure perfectly suits a Multi-Arts program but this respondent stresses that one Arts teacher should not be the sole teacher of the program. Person G offers the example of students experiencing a common Learning Outcome through all the different Arts media or a thematic approach.
“The students may produce a film or play covering all the Arts areas and the learning skills pertaining to each of the specific Arts areas or they may consider a concept such as impressionism from the Visual Arts point of view then from a Music point of view”. At the same time this respondent stresses that all the Arts strands need to be given individualised attention.

Askew (1997) comments that the Victorian CSF needs to include a stronger reference to combining or integrating the Arts than at present, especially for the primary school. He acknowledges that “Multi-Arts can lead to mush”, but gives the example where each of the strands takes the lead and attempts to achieve equality over a two year period. He says: “You are still doing Music all the time, but it may not be the most important Arts form for that focus”. Person E (1997) comments that in primary schools, Multi-Arts is the only way schools are able to cope with a “full curriculum”, and the eight Key Learning Areas:

I know there is a distinct body of skills in each of those areas and I know some people are concerned that if you have too much of this integrated curriculum some of those distinct skills and body of knowledge will get a bit lost in the whole scheme of things. But the reality in a primary school in particular is that a generalist teacher has to try and fit in all the aspects of the Arts. Secondary school is different because you have distinct teachers teaching those subjects.

This same respondent suggests that “Music is a very strong distinct subject in its own right and it has its own body of skills that you can't get anywhere else”. Person E would start with Music and then bring in other Arts subjects as a example of an approach to a Multi-Arts program.

Person F (1997) comments that in order to break the cycle of ill-equipped primary teachers, with respect to the Arts, Level 1 to Level 4 of the Victorian Arts CSF should be designed from a Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts perspective with more achievable outcomes. At secondary school, according to this respondent, a segregated Arts approach with elective choice in discrete Arts forms is more appropriate. Person F also suggests developing a Multi-Arts curriculum through concepts such as movement, line, and colour across all the Arts forms, showing the definite parallels between the Arts, rather than commencing with strands
or disciplines. This respondent indicates “that ideally each Arts form should stand-alone but its probably better to have achievable goals and Learning Outcomes rather than the sort of notionally unrealistic ones that we've got at the moment”. This person suggests that “the Learning Outcomes are achievable because they are broad, but a specialist interprets them differently from a generalist”.

Ferris (1997) proposes two ideals for the inclusion of Multi-Arts to ensure that there are connections made: as a separate strand or built into existing strands. She opts for the second, commenting that “A separate strand creates another compartment and we don't have a clear understanding of what we mean by Multi-Arts”. Livermore (1997) comments that “Multi-Arts is a fact of life” but curriculum organisation and assessment procedures make it very difficult. She suggests that schools need to use themes or other linking mechanisms and establish democratic opportunities for the different Arts forms to take the running.

Griffiths (1997) believes that there is no need for Multi or Integrated Arts “because I believe very strongly that without technique you're pretty limited.” He acknowledges that Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts are a feature of primary schools and suggests that building appropriate Multi-Arts indicators into each of the discrete areas would be valuable. McMillan (1997) remarks “that Multi-Arts too often waters down the discrete Arts forms”. She comments that to include Multi-Arts in the curriculum would mean training teachers in all the Arts and, “it is impossible for people to have expertise in all areas”. McMillan continues that too many primary schools are heading towards Multi-Arts as a way of trying to give students a bit of an Arts experience when ideally students should have access to the Arts individually, but also participate in projects where the Arts work together. Friend (1997) comments that her perception of Multi-Arts “is that everything gets watered down” with a predominance of one Arts form and a less resourceful time use. She remarks that “It is important to develop individual Arts subjects throughout the curriculum and to argue that at a senior level it is imperative that students have individual Arts subjects in their curriculum”. She continues that students never develop enough skills to be truly competent in any one Arts form and they view Multi-Arts as a token situation because they do not know enough about each of the Arts.
Pascoe (1997) says that the *Western Australian Arts Framework* has included Multi-Arts experiences, under the name “Multi-Arts combinations of Arts forms”, in addition to the single disciplines, and the term “strands” has been reserved for learning processes, making for a more interactive approach. Pascoe comments that the 1970s Multi-Arts projects resulted in watered-down courses with an absence of discipline knowledge and the term has become “loaded”. In the present climate “it is an area of delicacy, seen as an infringement upon individual disciplines and much work is to be done before the notion of Multi-Arts combinations are firmly in place in schools”.

6.3.2.1 **Commentary.**
Interviewees were asked to respond to the place of Multi-Arts in the school curriculum. A response made by one interviewee that learning in Arts happens sequentially and therefore Multi-Arts is of no value as an Arts subject, deserves some comment. The notion of developing the Australian *Arts Profile* was to layout sequential stages of achievement which teachers could use as a structure to plot the Artistic understandings of students. It is generally appreciated that student learning occurs at an uneven rate and not in a sequential pattern.

The implementation of Multi-Arts as a way of accommodating the issue of provision of individual Arts subjects was highlighted and those respondents who had connections with primary schools stressed the importance of Multi-Arts. It was confirmed by a number of people that the inclusion of a Multi-Arts strand was a Board of Studies policy. On the other hand, one interviewee stated that the Board of Studies KLAC did not agree with Multi-Arts. Some of those serving on the KLAC were primary teachers who, when interviewed, expressed a different opinion. The research done for a possible introduction of Multi-Arts in the *VCE* was offered as the reason for not proceeding with the notion in the Victorian *Arts CSF*. Three of the respondents suggested there was potential for including Multi-Arts activities in the Australian *Arts Profile* and in the *Arts CSF*, but ultimately this did not happen. It seems from the differing comments that the Board of Studies is really unsure about its position on Multi-Arts in a school Arts curriculum.
The difference between the Western Australian structure and the Victorian Arts CSF is one of the language used to describe the curriculum parts. Although the Learning Outcomes in the Victorian Arts CSF are interrelated, the use of the term "strand" to describe the Arts subjects takes the focus away from developing a more interactive approach. The focus is placed on the subject itself and the parts (the Learning Outcomes) which describe it. Another hindering point is the issue of assessment for Multi-Arts which was well researched during the development of the VCE with the eventual conclusion that it was too difficult.

6.4 Standards in the Arts

The final question asked interviewees to consider the possibility of the introduction of ranked Performance Standards in the Victorian Arts CSF to complement the Learning Outcomes, and the effects on Music teaching and learning.

One purpose of the Victorian CSF is to use Learning Outcomes to set standards by tying the CSF Levels to school years. Interviewees were asked for their responses to the establishment of ranked Performance Standards in addition to the already published Learning Outcomes, should such an event occur in the Arts Key Learning Area. Person D (1997) states:

We need Performance Standards and samples which will anchor the Learning Outcomes. It makes more concrete not only the standard expected, but how to identify the standard that might be there or may not be there in an individual student's work. By itself, I think the CSF only goes a certain way. Its got to come, we've got to have material in all of the Arts strands supporting those Learning Outcomes, otherwise it will just struggle.

In support of this claim this respondent comments that teachers are saying "How do I know my students have achieved this Learning Outcome?" Person D (1997) does not agree with those who argue that Performance Standards will raise the status of the Arts and make the area more credible. In terms of the effects on teaching, this respondent comments that it will lead towards a more common restrictive curriculum and remove the creativity from teaching, especially if a specific task is embedded in the criteria. The same person questions whether Performance Standards will further reduce Music teaching in Victoria, because teachers feel
"I just can't do it". This respondent further remarks "In reality a piece of work is a snap-shot of a student in a particular context coming from a particular personal experience and interrelating with the Arts experience". This leads to the question: "To what degree can you generalise beyond that, to in fact identify an objective benchmark for a Learning Outcome?"

Person E (1997) believes that Performance Standards will be imposed on the Arts, assisting Arts teachers "to hold our own in such an overcrowded curriculum", adding that "it's one way to make it a legitimate subject". In establishing Performance Standards, this respondent suggests that the Arts "need to do it from within before we get bullied". Person F (1997) comments that a set of standards in the Arts would "make teachers bite the bullet and get kids up to standard". This respondent continues: "Teachers say they haven't any Music skills, they simply have not bothered to quantify them. Assessment is a big stick and teachers need it".

Van Ernst (1997) comments that "Establishing Performance Standards is denying that there's any part of assessment that belongs to process. It's really saying the product is all that matters. What happens along the way can be far more powerful, far more informative than what happens in the final product". She says that the establishment of Performance Standards also assumes that the teachers will have the expertise to make the comparison between the Performance Standards at each CSF Level. She thinks a moderation exercise would be better than trying to establish what must be arbitrary standards. Van Ernst highlights the danger in the process where one student can put together a "slick product" and the opposite where a student focusses on risk-taking and exploration in his or her work. She is concerned that there is an over-emphasis on Learning Outcomes and an expectation that students acquire knowledge in a linear pattern, and not enough attention given to the process, resulting in an assessment that is based on an adult interpretation of an outcome. She says: "I don't think an Arts form exists without an outcome, I think that's still absolutely essential. That's why I think Music must have performances, because if you stop short of that you've really stopped short of the full experience". She recalls that during the development of the Victorian Arts CSF the Board of Studies talked about "it being a standards document". She disagreed at the time and said to the Board of Studies: "Words will not convey standards and there is no way
that you can write into Level 3, a standard”. As an example, Van Ernst suggests that if an activity for students includes a statement such as “students will create a piece of Music expressing a feeling”, it is difficult to express in words the standard expected from students in different school grades.

Yeung (1997) comments that politically it would be appropriate to establish Performance Standards where accountability is more easily measured, but the different standards and varying levels of teacher competency and resources in Victorian schools create a complex situation. He remarks that should Performance Standards be made compulsory “they will become the lowest common dominator to account for all schools, but where the resource is available for teaching to a higher standard no credit will be given”. He explains that to make a judgement that accommodates different instruments, different styles of Music and different ages groups, the assessment activity needs to be very specific and will result in compromise. He uses as an example the differences in level of proficiency required by a violinist compared with a double bass player to achieve a position in a symphony orchestra. He suggests that the best way to measure Music-making in the CSF is to replicate the same procedure as the VCE solo performance assessment where a separate repertoire is printed and reproduced by students. Yeung ventures into other forms of Music-making which are not reproduced but “created on the spot” and questions how is it possible to use words to describe the character of the Music and specify the degree of complexity required from a performer in this situation. He suggests that performers will become “less spontaneous because they have to fit written characteristics into their spontaneous performance”. He comments that “When the two approaches are compared the standard is not clear”.

Griffiths (1997) identifies two purposes for the Victorian CSF. He describes the first as “to assist teachers in designing courses of study and to standardise to a certain extent the kind of information and educational experience that students have that will make interchangeability between schools smooth”. The second purpose according to Griffiths is for staff development, “where assessing teachers by the Victorian CSF can pick up any weaknesses in skills or knowledge”. His understanding is that the CSF was for a completely different role
than that of a testing mechanism used to assess students. He says if the Victorian CSF is used to create standards “then I think you need to have a system that is not just a lot of superficial polarva”. He comments that the introduction of Performance Standards creates “assessment that demands a level of uniformity that is in diametric opposition to the so-called flexibility that the system is supposed to create”. He describes this situation as a waste of time and money where the Department of Education is sending a message saying “We don't trust you”. It establishes the “lowest common denominator mentality” and he suggests that if this is to be the case “abandon the CSF and create tests”.

Hammond (1997) says that if Performance Standards are to be established the assessment criteria must be developed from the key element of the Victorian CSF structure: the Learning Outcomes. However, he comments that “The Arts don't lend themselves to being described by words”. He continues saying that using Learning Outcomes to write assessment descriptions is harder for the lower levels because finding the appropriate words to describe development in the Arts is more difficult at this stage. The process becomes easier for the upper levels. Hammond says that the four sub-levels of assessment generated by KIDMAP in each CSF Level creates overlap with the last and next CSF Level requiring many work samples to be found. Regarding the most suitable number of categories of Performance Standards for each CSF Level, Hammond discusses a project which he and Emery completed in early 1997 for the Board of Studies. The advice of the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) was to use only two categories of Performance Standards where the assessment is to cover a wide range of abilities and standards. More than two categories are successful if the assessment is focussing on the development of a specific technical skill; but young children do not have the understanding or the command of skills. Hammond comments that finding work samples for “not achieved” and “achieved” is quite possible but “developing” is a big area requiring many work samples. To relate this to the assessment of Music composition, he comments that “finding the work samples to illustrate all the aspects of all composition techniques is a feat”.
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Emery (1997b) suggests that it was a fairly logical extension from writing the CSF to collecting work samples that would illustrate typical achievement of "levelness". She remarks further that at present "teachers do not have a common understanding about a CSF Level". She recalls the value of the VCE moderation exercises and the number of years it took teachers to become confident in establishing a mark. In the project with Hammond, she says that if they had used the KIDMAP categories many more work samples in finer gradings would need to be found, and teachers would find it difficult to make a judgement at a fine discrimination level. Emery and Hammond settled on the categories of "working towards" and "achieving" only in the Visual Arts. In addition they were required by the Board of Studies to develop questions in the form of short response items, medium response items and extended response items for Visual Arts. She explains that the three types of questions do not suit all the Arts forms, and short response, which has been interpreted as the true and false form, is not used in Visual Arts and is an area of difficulty.

McPherson (1997) comments that the original idea of establishing some uniformity in the Australian curriculum through a set of Australian Profiles to meet the needs of a moving population, seems to have been lost with a push to use the Profiles to reflect international standards. He suggests that if the Australian Profiles are to be used for this purpose they need to be rewritten without the present inconsistencies. With respect to the Music activities in the Australian Arts Profile at Levels 7 and 8, he remarks: "Some are University standard; others you would expect from Years 9 and 10".

Livermore (1997) comments that Performance Standards are "inevitable" if the Arts want to be part of the general curriculum and highlights the qualitative aspects of Music interpretation and performance with regard to assessing students according to a number of categories within a level. She says "assessment differences in achievement are more related to knowledge and level of skills than acquisition of the content". The design of the assessment task is also crucial and Livermore is not convinced that teachers are good at designing tasks that are really going to test a particular level. She comments that "You can't build those sorts of assessment levels into the kind of framework that we're working with". She poses the
question: “Does this mode of assessment address the fact that some kids are going to be more skillful and have better technique and do more Musically - interpret something better than another child?” She continues that the student is demonstrating processes and “descriptors do not address qualitative differences of ability in performance of those processes”. Livermore asks other questions: “How do teachers assess?”; “What is the difference between an outstanding Level 4 and a Level 5”; “What are the qualitative differences within a level in Music”; “If someone’s in Level 4, how do teachers give a variety of grades within Level 4?”; “Is it that they’re achieving the Level 4 outcomes more effectively?”; “But then for someone who goes beyond, why isn’t it Level 5?”; “If it’s so beautifully interpreted, and showing such Musical sensitivity, which implies an understanding of structure and awareness of the stylistic things, hasn’t that bumped it onto Level 5?”

Friend (1997) comments that consideration needs to be given to developing Opportunity-to-Learn Standards as well as a lot more work done in Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts if competency is expected in these two areas. She adds further that if standards are established it is important not to create a notion of elitism and cut people out because they cannot reach the required level of excellence.

Ferris (1997) stresses that outcomes, standards or levels of achievement cannot be expected unless provision of the service is adequate. She suggests that two advantages might result. Firstly, the procedure of benchmarking might persuade people to be more accountable with their planning, and she uses as an example Music teachers who “have a history of pinching ideas from here and there and blending it altogether and are not sure what their outcome should be”. Secondly, Ferris comments “it might also encourage schools to see to it that provision is made, and budgeted for, so that they can meet whatever the Government says you have to be able to do”. In practice, Ferris comments that where teachers decide to teach to the Performance Standards the likely result will be a narrow perception of what the Arts represent in schools. She remarks that if work samples, which are a means of elaborating on the word “text” are collected, then “you either have to have lots and lots and lots of them so that people can see clearly that there are all sorts of ways of skinning a cat, or none at all”. Alternatively
work samples should only exist in relation to professional development where the connection between the work sample and teaching can be discussed as well as the connection with the curriculum document itself. Ferris warns that if the work samples stay with the document for some years, “skew-whiff developments occur” as some try to meet the set standard and others introduce changing standards.

Person B (1997) focusses on the major differences in Victorian Government school Music programs in areas such as resourcing, the absence of continuous teaching and lack of specialist staff as being crucial elements that need to be considered in developing Performance Standards. Students who have access to Music lessons outside the school would have a significant advantage. This same respondent comments that many work samples would need to be found in every instrument and in every style to illustrate the number of gradings of the chosen scale. Person B says that the VCE Music Performance Study Design is unable to do this at present, resulting in a big difference in the standards demonstrated by students. This respondent does not think it is possible to specify Arts behaviours and suggests that “It would spell doom for non-Arts teachers who would be devastated by the exceptional standard”. McMillan (1997) sees value in developing Performance Standards using fine discrimination gradings supported by work samples where teachers are presented with a model to copy and then hopefully they would replace them with work samples from their own students. Person C (1997) is a firm advocate of the similarity between each of the Key Learning Areas in the Victorian CSF and is quite comfortable that the same standard is applicable to all the Arts. Person C's experience from the VCE moderation was that teachers expected a clearly defined scale to place students' work.

Askew (1997) comments that Performance Standards linked to Learning Outcomes will “hamper flexibility, creativity and incidental teaching in the Arts as teachers will feel pressured to teach to measurable outcomes”. He says that the descriptors between the levels in the Victorian Arts CSF just add a couple of adjectives, for example, “more developed”, and he comments “How are you going to measure that type of descriptor, it's a bit difficult?”
6.4.1 Commentary.

In response to this question regarding the possible introduction of Performance Standards, the respondents commented that the standards would set up a number of opposites. The interviewees reflected that Performance Standards are necessary to support the Arts Learning Outcomes and make the standard (for the Victorian CSF) expressed in the Learning Outcomes clearer. The respondents considered that Performance Standards are the only way to make Music and the Arts more credible and open the door to the Arts being accepted as part of general education. Some of the interviewees thought that Performance Standards would make teachers present better quality Music programs and teach towards a high standard. These interviewees considered it was important that Music teachers design the Performance Standards most suitable for the subject before an expectation is forced upon the discipline. In comparison, some respondents commented that creativity would be removed as teachers taught to the Learning Outcomes (the CSF standard) or that teachers may not teach Music because of a perception that they and their students could not meet the requirements. Interviewees suggested that the criteria would reflect the lowest common denominator with no encouragement for excellence, leading to the presentation of a narrow view of the Arts. The issues of provision of Music teaching, the availability of specialist teachers and the variance in competencies of teachers raised doubt about whether teachers have the ability to judge the differences between Performance Standards. Two respondents stressed that Performance Standards would undermine the importance of observing the progress students made.

Some respondents addressed the unsatisfactory arrangements of using words to describe Arts behaviours and standards although they supported the structure of Learning Outcomes. Finding words to describe qualitative differences is a difficult procedure but it becomes harder at the lower levels of schooling because students have less basic skills, and so it becomes more difficult to find words to describe the assessment of those skills. In Victoria, the preliminary work that has taken place in describing assessment for the Visual Arts according to a particular structure is proving to be problematic. The extension of this activity is a proposal for all Arts forms in the Victorian CSF to have assessment described using a
common system. The possibility of the proposal being successful appears to be entangled with difficulties. As has been discussed earlier, the Victorian Arts CSF was written for the generalist classroom teacher. All technical language was removed so these teachers could understand the document. The question can be asked: “How will Performance Standards be described for Music when no technical language is permitted, when it has been identified that words are inappropriate for describing Arts assessment?” Placing Performance Standards for Instrumental Music in the Victorian Arts CSF will also be difficult, especially given the general perception that the document was principally written for Classroom Music programs. The matching work samples to illustrate the “developing” and “achieving” standards would need to be many and varied. Similarly, the most neglected area of the Music curriculum - composition - would need many work samples to illustrate all aspects of composition in the completed and developing stages.

6.5 A Reflective Summary of Issues raised by the Interviewees

This chapter has brought together the responses of the key writers, associate writers and contributing Music writers of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, the Music writer of the Victorian Arts CSF and personnel involved in the Victorian Arts Key Learning Area Committee Music Working Party, Course Advice Music writers, an expert panel and reference group contributors. Seven interviewees chose to retain anonymity protecting their private opinions in light of the expectations of the Code of Conduct for the Victorian Public Sector. About one third of the interviewees had not formulated any substantial opinions regarding questions one and four in particular. Question one asked the interviewees to discuss any modifications they would make to the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF, and question four focussed on the possible establishment of Performance Standards in the Arts CSF. Although the interviewees had time to consider the questions before the interview took place and were free to ask for clarification from the researcher, these people had adopted the view that the CSF was an evolving curriculum document. Many of the remaining interviewees found it impossible to focus on one aspect or one question without discussing other interrelated issues. Interviewees most often moved “off
the track” when considering questions one and four, but they also brought in related concerns when talking about questions two and three.

Question one asked interviewees to suggest possible modifications to the Australian or Victorian documents if an opportunity for review were available. A variety of individual, but related, topics emerged and four major issues dominated the discussion. These are:

- the provision of teaching Music in schools
- the expectation by the Victorian Government that teachers in the work place would be responsible for implementation of the CSF
- the use of a Visual Arts model to structure the Music strand, and
- the use of language to describe the Music strand.

These issues contribute to the complexity element of the Victorian CSF.

Interpreting the Music strand of the Victorian Arts CSF, which has been designed and written according to a Visual Arts model, with no Music terminology to act as a means of clarification, was seen by the respondents as troublesome for the primary teacher, the specialist and non-specialist Music teacher. The respondents discussed how each would find difficulty in understanding a Visual Arts model destined to cover all Arts forms, with the Music content described using non-specific language. This is coupled with a framework requiring teachers to interpret the meaning of Learning Outcomes and convert achievement in each Learning Outcome into a standard totalled to equal one CSF Level. In turn, CSF Levels are tied to school years. The place of Instrumental Music has become lost in the development of the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand and the overall complexity of the document only complicates the problems for Instrumental Music teachers. The main support document which was supposed to assist teachers to implement the CSF - Arts Course Advice - was instead used to address the differences between the Department of Education and the Board of Studies. The development of the CSF and the continuing changes to the VCE were recognised by the respondents as vehicles for political interference. Delegating professional development to various teacher support groups and publishing CSF support materials to accommodate a broad agenda, has been the Victorian Government's attempt to return a very
political document to the ownership of the profession. These actions were clearly identified by some of the interviewees as the Victorian Government neglecting its duties and responsibilities. Without obvious Victorian Government support, negotiating the complex nature of the CSF and the accompanying support materials becomes a major dilemma for classroom teachers.

Question two asked the interviewees to comment on the particular choice of Arts subjects for an Australian Arts Key Learning Area. The issues of provision of teaching time, specialist staff and the expectations of primary teachers were priority areas for the respondents when they considered what Arts subjects were appropriate to include in an Arts curriculum. Some interviewees thought the current selection was just right, whereas others interpreted the question as further refining the current disciplines, especially Music, into its specialist parts. The Victorian Arts Framework (1988) played a big role in the choice of subjects for the Australian Arts Profile, and in Victoria the influence of the Arts Study Designs in the VCE were seen as important. Some respondents focussed on creativity as the sole criteria for making their choice of Arts forms. Many interviewees thought that a place should be made for Literature. The Arts disciplines of Craft, and Design were seen as underpinning the Arts forms currently making up the Arts Key Learning Area. Media, the newest of the Arts forms, is still experiencing a settling-in period having moved from the dominance of the English Key Learning Area where the content of the subject was very different. The extension of Media into Multi-Media is a possibility that is yet to be explored.

Question three asked the interviewees to consider the value and place of Multi-Arts in the structure of Learning Outcomes and processes. Discussions about the issue at the Australian level centred around two topics: the value of Multi-Arts as an Arts form and the pressure to reduce the number of Arts forms in comparison with other Key Learning Areas. The matter was never resolved. The two Australian Arts Profile writers disagreed with the development of a Multi-Arts strand for different reasons, one believing in sequential learning of knowledge in each Arts form and the other had found it problematic when researching the topic for the VCE. Subsequently, in Victoria, the experiences of trying to develop a Multi-Arts subject in
the VCE were seen as a strong influence for it not to go ahead in the Victorian Arts CSF. The actual opinion of the Board of Studies is difficult to pinpoint. Respondents with an involvement in primary schools commented that Multi-Arts is the only way to deal with the issue of provision and to accommodate the remaining seven Key Learning Areas. The issues of language and assessment seem to be the major sticking points rather than the adoption of a structure which uses interrelated learning processes.

The final question, Question four, foreshadowed the possibility of the introduction of ranked Performance Standards in the Victorian Arts CSF in conjunction with the Learning Outcomes, and the effects on Music teaching and learning. Respondents divided the question into an additional category and discussed “how” the proposal might take place. The effect on Music teaching and learning was seen as reductionist, but as a necessary evil, to raise the stakes of Music in the curriculum. The major concern of respondents was how the development of Performance Standards might take place when issues of provision of Music teaching were an obvious problem in Victoria. The use of words to describe the Arts and the issues surrounding language were highlighted as problematic in developing Performance Standards. The need for a common assessment system using standardised questions from the Board of Studies has already created a difficulty for the Visual Arts. The known inadequacies of the Victorian Arts CSF and the results of the Visual Arts pilot assessment program suggest that the actual development of Performance Standards may remain an unresolved issue for some time. Although respondents have pondered the effect that Performance Standards may have on teaching and learning, the actual effect of their usage is still largely unknown.

Chapter Seven draws together major issues in this study for discussion.
CHAPTER SEVEN

7.0 DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction
The content of this chapter draws upon the major issues highlighted throughout the study: from the Literature Review; from a survey of Arts curricula gathered from the member countries of the OECD and countries which are affiliate members of the International Society for Music Education; from an analysis of the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF; and from responses to interviews with key personnel participating in the design and development of the Australian and Victorian curriculum documents.

The discussion is presented in three main sections. The first section focusses on the characteristics of an Arts Learning Area. Seven major issues arising from the design and development of an Arts Learning Area are addressed from a Victorian, Australian and international perspective. At the Victorian level, the issues are considered in terms of their impact on the Victorian Arts CSF with a special focus on the Music strand. The second section focusses on the issue of setting standards in education and their place in the Arts. The third section addresses two topics associated with the implementation of the Victorian Arts CSF, specifically, and the Victorian CSF in general. The structure of the chapter is as follows:

The Characteristics of an Arts Key Learning Area
A Key Learning Area for the Arts
Arts Forms
Multi-Arts
Common Learning Processes in the Arts
Using Language to explain the Victorian Arts CSF
Instrumental Music in the Victorian Arts CSF
Alternative Level Structure for the Victorian Arts CSF
Standards in Education

General Standards: An International View

Arts Education Standards: An International View

Implementation Issues

The complexity of the Victorian CSF

Implementation of the Victorian CSF: the Department of Education versus the Board of Studies

Chapter Summary

7.2 The Characteristics of an Arts Key Learning Area

7.2.1 A Key Learning Area for the Arts

In the Australian literature, discussion about an Arts Learning Area focusses either on the possible uncertainties of an Arts Key Learning Area structure or the positive values of an Arts Key Learning Area for Arts Education. At the practical level, the Australians taking part in the interviews conducted for this study were supportive of the values of an Arts Learning Area.

The inadequacies of an Arts Learning Area are addressed by Pascoe (1992), Boughton (1992, 1993a, 1993b), Boyd (1993), Rizvi et al. (1993), Stevens (1993), Stowasser (1993b), Brown (1994), the Australian Senate Inquiry entitled Arts Education (1995), and a Hansard extract (Commonwealth of Australia, 1997) - Hansard is the record of proceedings in any Australian Parliament. The concerns raised by these people focussed on the design of the Australian Arts Learning Area - a structure that links all the Arts forms through a common language. It was discussed that this approach lessened the knowledge, skills and understanding which are unique to each Arts form. As a general observation about the use of combined subject areas, Hannan (1989) supports these writers with the comment that combination subject areas lead to less clarity in content and difficulties in teaching cross-curriculum material. Grenfell (1993) and Weate (1993) considered the placing of the Arts in a group to be the result of economic rationalist theories that were being adopted in Australia with the development of a Statement and a Profile for each Learning Area.
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The positive views of an Arts Learning Area for Australia are presented in the literature by Bannister (1993), Livermore (1993), McMillan (1993), Stewart (1993), Knight-Mudie (1994), Hoepper (1995), McPherson (1995b), Hammond (1995, 1996), and Stefanakis (1996). These people believe that an Arts Learning Area encourages and provides opportunities for Arts Educators to learn and appreciate the uniqueness of each Arts form, and to apply the knowledge that is gained from participation in other Arts forms at a specialist level.

The interviewees participating in this study most often used the term "the Arts" rather than a continual reference to their specialist Arts form. They were certainly aware of the problematic nature of combining the Arts into one Learning Area and the need to represent the different areas of Artistic intelligence, but they appreciated the commonalities between the Arts and the learning opportunities provided by studying a variety of Arts forms. The aspect of the Arts Learning Area that was most criticised by the interviewees was the use of generic Learning Outcomes to design the Australian Arts Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF, where in both documents the same outcomes are applied to each Arts form. The collaborative writing process which took place to develop the Australian and Victorian Arts documents provided a valuable experience and forum for many Arts Educators to express their contrasting views about an Arts Learning Area.

Opinions expressed by overseas writers about an Arts Key Learning Area make an interesting comparison to opinions expressed by Australian writers. Whilst the Australians have accepted the notion of an Arts Learning Area, Hoffa (1994a) and Rush (1997) argue that there is little in common between the Arts forms to group them together. Abbs (1996), an Englishman living in Australia, is more supportive, viewing the Arts as autonomous subjects in a related family. Herbert (1995) values a unified platform and Robinson (1993) stresses a focus on different "modes" of practice rather than Arts subjects. Robinson's reference to modes suggests that he values the use of common learning processes as a linking element for Arts forms in an Arts Learning Area.
In practice, a survey of member countries of the OECD and countries where the national Music organisation is affiliated with ISME reveals that many countries have grouped Arts subjects into a Learning Area. Some of these areas are knitted securely together and others have a focus on individual subjects under a common heading. Countries where an overarching Arts link is evident, similar to Australia, include Canada (more particularly, Saskatchewan), Japan, Scotland and the USA. The remaining countries with a looser connection between their Arts subjects are Belgium (more particularly, Flanders), Brazil, Finland, France, Greece, Germany, Hong Kong, Hungary, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Sweden. Countries that list stand-alone Arts subjects as part of the curriculum include Argentina, Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Germany, Ghana, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Northern Ireland, Norway, Switzerland Turkey, and Wales. The decision to focus on individual Arts subjects in the English National Curriculum, which has had a subsequent flow-on to Northern Ireland and Wales, is the subject of comment by Pring (1989), Hargreaves (1990), Francis (1992), Abbs (1993), D. Graham (1993), Redsell (1993), Robinson (1993), and B. Moon (1994). The concern of these writers is the inclusion of only two Arts subjects in the English National Curriculum (Visual Arts and Music) when a previous document by the National Curriculum Council entitled The Arts 5-16 Framework published in 1990 listed Dance, Drama, Music, Visual Arts, Verbal Arts and subjects encouraged by Technology as Arts forms.

In the same way that some writers in the Australian literature argued that an Arts Learning Area has had a reductionist effect on the skills of each Arts form, it could be suggested that the curriculum planners of the English National Curriculum have included only two single Arts subjects for the same purpose. If more single Arts subjects had been included, as was the original plan, less time may be available to teach the specific attributes of each Arts form.

7.2.2 Arts Forms

Throughout the design and development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile heated debates took place regarding which Arts forms were considered appropriate to be placed in an Arts Key Learning Area. In Australia, the debate centred on the Arts forms to be included
and not on the value of establishing an Arts Learning Area. The same debate took place in Victoria when the Arts CSF was developed.

Although the Australian Senate Inquiry, *Arts Education* (1995), has stated that it accepts the five Arts forms listed in the Australian *Arts Profile* as those relevant to Australia, it is important to highlight the concern expressed in the report that no clear reason was given as to why they were selected. The debate concerning the choice and content of Arts forms, especially the content of Visual Arts and the place of Design and Craft, has been documented in Chapters Five and Six. Literature, Craft, Design, Media and Graphic Communication were the five Arts forms that generated the most discussion. In the final decision, only Media as a stand-alone Arts form was included in the *Arts Profile*.

The inclusion of Literature had the support of the Literature Board of the Australia Council, but the reliance on Literature in the teaching of English ultimately prevented it from being included as an Arts subject. Poetry, a subset of Literature, remains locked into the English Learning Area, without access to the elements of Music, of which Poetry has much in common.

Those who advocated the inclusion of Craft and Design as stand-alone subjects used the opportunity to improve the status of these Art forms, which had traditionally been subsumed under Visual Arts. The promoters of these two Arts forms were also aware of the growing dominance of Technology and the possibility that Craft and Design may become part of it.

Media and Graphic Communication were two Arts forms that had secured a place in the Victorian *Arts Framework*. Other States and Territories did include these two subjects in their Arts curriculum; under other curriculum umbrellas. Graphic Communication was not included in the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, although it was included in the *Arts CSF* as preparation for students studying the Graphic Communication VCE Study Design.
The obvious conclusion to be drawn is that the key writers of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, as they have acknowledged in the interview data, decided to develop the *Arts Statement and Profile* around an already established document, the 1988 Victorian *Arts Framework*. Not only did they use the Arts forms in this document, but also the Arts Learning Model. The similarities between the Victorian *Arts Framework* and the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* have been presented in Chapters Four and Five. The fact that both key writers were Victorians and very familiar with the *Arts Framework* document is a significant reason for the Arts writers choosing to proceed along this path. Obviously the structure chosen for the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* may have been different if one or both of the key Arts writers had not been associated with the Victorian *Arts Framework*. Indeed, it may well have been different also if one or both of them were not Visual Artists. The decision to model the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* on the Victorian *Arts Framework* has resulted in the Arts forms that were in use in Victoria being group under the Arts curriculum umbrella in every Australian State and Territory. This decision also removed the opportunity to introduce other Arts forms not traditionally included in Australian Arts curricula. This situation was noted by the Australian Senate Inquiry, *Arts Education* (1995). The reinvention of an already existing Arts curriculum has also provided a convenient way of avoiding an explanation about the reasons why the Arts forms were chosen and the reasons why the particular approach to the common Learning Outcomes structure was adopted.

The survey of Arts subjects in overseas countries revealed that Music and Visual Arts were the most popular Arts forms taught in schools. Dance, Drama and Media were considered as stand-alone Arts subjects or in conjunction with established non-Arts subjects, for example English and Physical Education. Some more unusual Arts forms itemised by countries surveyed were Aesthetics in Flanders (Belgium), Architecture in Brazil, Calligraphy in Japan, Domestic Science in Sweden, Gymnastics in The Netherlands, Physical Education in Scotland and Sweden, Movement in Italy and Portugal, Literature in Germany, New Zealand and Sweden, and Studies in Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage in Spain.
The expansion of Arts forms in school curricula, especially in the USA, promoted Colwell (1995a) to remark that the focus on breadth in the Arts has reduced the opportunity to clarify the objectives and standards in the Arts. At a personal level, Colwell (1996a) favours Music Education as the core subject in the syllabus.

7.2.3 Multi-Arts

The debate about whether Multi-Arts should be included in the Australian *Arts Profile* has remained unresolved throughout the life of the project and it is still an ongoing debate. A number of reasons account for the indecision. One of these was the initiative of the Curriculum Development Centre (Canberra) in the 1970s and 1980s to promote a focus on Multi-Arts. Many Arts Educators remember that little substantial learning in the Arts resulted from the Multi-Arts approaches of this time. A second reason has been that the actual meaning of the term has not been agreed upon. From an Australian point of view, Worby (1994) identifies three methods of Multi-Arts teaching, and Lett (1976) defines and discusses eight approaches to Multi-Arts teaching. Writers of literature use the terms making links, making connections, and integration; in each case with a different supporting definition. A third reason for rejecting a Multi-Arts approach was the concern that Arts in education would become - according to key Arts writer Emery (1997b) - “Arts muesli” if school personnel believed that it was quite acceptable to combine the Arts at the expense of the uniqueness of each Arts form. A fourth reason for not including Multi-Arts is the work completed by Hammond, also a key Arts writer, in the early stages of the *Victorian Certificate of Education*, when he recognised that designing assessment activities was a crucial, but difficult area. As an acknowledgment of the problem, the Australian *Arts Statement* recommends that students should participate in Multi-Arts experiences. The *Arts Profile* has been designed using generic Learning Outcome statements - a structure adopted to facilitate this approach to Arts teaching.

The Multi-Arts debate remains unresolved. Some Arts Educators strongly believe that knowledge and skills associated with each Arts form is not transferable and others believe that students should be taught the Arts as they are found in society.
The Multi-Arts issue was raised again when the Victorian Arts CSF was developed. The interview data indicates clearly that the debate was divided between the Australian Arts Profile writers and the Board of Studies. The third party involved, the Arts Key Learning Area Committee (KLAC), which is answerable to the Board of Studies, focussed on maintaining discrete Arts areas of learning. The dilemma faced in Victoria had been caused by the Board of Studies' own policy regarding the teaching of the Arts as discrete Arts forms. This was coupled with the recognition by the Board of Studies that primary schools traditionally teach most subjects in an integrated way and that there was and still is a lack of specialist teachers and resources to offer individual Arts subjects. The advice about this Government requirement is contradictory and confusing, and has been discussed in Chapter Five.

Although it has to be acknowledged that there will always be unresolved differences about the value of Multi-Arts teaching in schools, the Board of Studies should take a positive viewpoint and develop an Arts curriculum that accommodates Multi-Arts. A satisfactory approach to assessment must accompany this curriculum. Remarks made by the interviewees participating in this study suggest that the Board of Studies is currently uncertain about its opinion on the inclusion of Multi-Arts in the Arts curriculum, whilst at the same time it is aware of the teaching style presented in primary schools and the difficulties experienced by secondary schools in accommodating all Arts forms in the timetable.

Overseas countries are also engaged in the Multi-Arts debate. The possible inclusion of Multi-Arts in the USA is associated with the choice of terms and definitions used. The differences between making links, connections or integration appears to be a point of disagreement. Kushner (1994) comments that at the time of writing the English National Curriculum, the contemporary understanding of the Arts curriculum in England had been developing towards integrating the Arts forms in terms of combined Arts courses and exploring overlapping areas - this was not to be the case with single Arts subjects being included instead. Japan, Italy and Spain have discussed the Multi-Arts issue but have not reached a resolution. New Zealand has experienced strong resistance from the Arts
profession to Multi-Arts. Iceland favours specialist Arts teachers with the attitude that only a specialist can teach each Arts form. The Hungarian National Curriculum encourages diversity, flexibility and the development and assessment of Integrated Arts curricula. Portugal uses an Integrated Arts approach to teaching throughout all school levels. In Norway, Multi-Art projects as cooperative projects between several subjects are encouraged. Creative Arts is a feature in Sweden. Finland positively encourages Multi-Arts. Some integration of the Arts is allowed in Switzerland. The South African Arts curriculum will adopt an integrated approach for it is argued that meaningful integration of the Arts should be encouraged.

As has been illustrated in the discussion above, some countries have been able to develop and assess Multi-Arts as part of an Arts curriculum. Given that Multi-Arts has been included in the Arts curriculum in some overseas countries, it is possible that Australia and Victoria may learn from the experiences of these countries and be encouraged to develop a process that accommodates Multi-Arts in the school curriculum.

7.2.4 Common Learning Processes in the Arts

The structure used for the Victorian Arts CSF is identical to that used for the Australian Arts Profile, with the exception of two elements. The strand organiser Presenting is included in the Visual Arts strand of the Victorian Arts CSF and the Arts form Graphic Communication is added as a stand-alone subject, making a total of six Arts forms in the Arts CSF. The strong influence of the 1988 Victorian Arts Framework on the design of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile has been referred to earlier in this chapter. Part of the Victorian Arts Framework was the Arts Learning Model, a “generic” approach to describing learning processes for the Arts which depicts four interconnected processes of Perceiving, Transforming, Expressing and Appreciating. These four terms represent a language used by Visual Artists. An important aspect affecting the design and development of the Arts Statement and Profile is that no consistent basis was set for the structural development of any of the Australian Key Learning Areas, making the exercise more difficult, especially for the combination Key Learning Areas.
A common framework has been adopted by the Saskatchewan province in Canada, Scotland and the USA. Each Arts strand in the Saskatchewan Arts curriculum has three balancing components which are interwoven and not segregated. The three components are the Creative/Productive Component, the Cultural/Historical Component and the Critical/Responsive Component. The Scottish *Expressive Arts* area uses three common attainment outcomes in which students should become competent. These are described as Using materials, techniques, skills and media; Expressing feelings, ideas, thoughts and solutions; and Evaluating and Appreciating. The USA *National Standards for the Arts* incorporates Content Standards and Achievement Standards based across three broad categories. The varying number of Content Standards for each of the Arts forms fall into the three broad categories of Creating and Performing, Perceiving and Analysing, and Understanding Cultural and Historical Contexts.

The adoption of the same common framework for the *Arts Statement and Profile* and the *Arts CSF* also incorporates three other elements. These are that the common framework represents:

- a Visual Arts model
- a model that has been influenced by the structure known as Discipline-Based Arts Education (DBAE), and
- a model that includes a set of generic Learning Outcomes specific to all the Arts forms.

### 7.2.4.1 A Visual Arts Model

In the literature, two contrasting views about the use of a common structure for the Arts have been presented. Writers argued either that each Arts form would lose its unique attributes or that each Arts form would benefit from the qualities of another Arts form. The common framework positively encourages Music - one of the two dominant Arts forms in the school curriculum - to become part of the Arts. Music and Musicians must now share their attributes with the other and less dominant Arts forms and those who specialise in these Arts forms. Music and Musicians must now accept that they can benefit from aspects of other Arts forms,
especially with respect to approaches to composition and improvisation, which are known elements of weakness in Music.

The Visual Arts model (used for the structure of the Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents) has created an expectation that the content of Music will represent more than re-creating a piece of Music and performing it. The value of Creating or composition in Music was acknowledged by interviewees as having a stronger place in the content of a Music syllabus than previously. The strand organiser Past and Present Contexts has a significant place in Music teaching in that it represents not only the historical aspects of the Arts form - an element that has traditionally been taught - but it also introduces the importance of considering present contexts in Music.

The real concern for Music teachers is placing the discipline of Music into the common Visual Arts framework used to structure and describe the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. The use of a Visual Arts structure as the basis for the Arts Key Learning Area at both the Australian and Victorian levels has been criticised as an inadequate format for the discipline of Music. The common processes are considered by Music Educators to have been imposed from the Visual Arts with the expectation that Music is able to demonstrate its Arts form according to thinking processes used by Visual Artists. At the same time there is an awareness of the value of Arts Education and the political strength achieved by promoting Arts Education. Although the key writers have remarked that the common processes of Creating, Making and Presenting; Arts Criticism and Aesthetics; and Past and Present Contexts interrelate, Music Educators find the relationship between the common processes difficult to interpret and convert into lesson plans. The term Creating, Making and Presenting carries connotations of attributes of the Visual Arts, and is viewed within the Music discipline as an unsuitable term. Musicians interpret the meaning of the concepts Creating and Making differently from an Artist working in another Arts form, including Visual Arts. The identification of Presenting as a separate aspect, with its own Learning Outcomes, is also a difficult concept for Musicians to understand and accept when traditionally performance is the end product of a Musical activity. The remark by Lokan
(1997) that the implementation of the *Statements and Profiles* are hindered by the inclusion of language that is unfamiliar to teachers, is significant in this context.

One major point for discussion here is the background of the two Australian key writers for the Arts. Both are Visual Artists and at the time of writing the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* were employed in the same University department. It has been noted that during the writing of the *Arts Statement and Profile* the Arts unlike other Key Learning Areas, experienced stability, in that the same writing team was responsible for both the *Arts Statement* and the *Arts Profile*. In hindsight, perhaps the Arts Learning Area and especially the Music strand may have benefited from input from key writers representing different Arts forms. This is not to say that the collaborative process which was used to write every Key Learning Area *Statement and Profile* has not been beneficial for the Arts. Nonetheless, the language used to describe the common framework certainly creates difficulties for Music.

Hammond (1997) acknowledges that more clarity is required in the meaning of the two strand organisers *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts*, both with respect to the connections between them and with regard to isolating the distinguishing features. The differences between aesthetics and criticism also needs further clarification, especially to enable teachers to differentiate for assessment purposes. Hammond, a key writer, has recognised that perhaps all the Arts forms, and not only Music, are experiencing difficulties interpreting these strand organisers.

During the development of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* the option of splitting the Arts forms into two larger headings of Visual Arts and Performing Arts was rejected. On analysis Dance, Drama, and Music can be categorised into the Performing Arts; Media is establishing itself as overarching Arts form with a growing focus of presenting a visual performance in terms of a "Media Production"; with Visual Arts standing separately. It can be seen from the delineation of the Arts forms that the Performing Arts represent the majority of Arts forms. It could be argued that the selection of two key Arts writers with Visual Arts
backgrounds was not the most appropriate choice when the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* includes a weighting towards the Performing Arts.

7.2.4.2 **Discipline-Based Arts Education.**

The key writers of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* have been influenced by Discipline-Based Arts Education (DBAE), a structure grounded in the Visual Arts. The strength of the model lies in the fact that it expands learning and teaching in the Arts beyond the tradition of performance and production and treats all Arts disciplines as equal. The USA *National Standards for the Arts* has been written drawing on an influence from DBAE. It is interesting to note that the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* was developed first. Given the strengths of DBAE, it is possible to draw a link between the common Visual Arts framework used in the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* and the Victorian *Arts CSF*, and the elements of DBAE as it applies to all Arts forms; especially Music. The Australian common framework for the Arts, together with the use of generic Learning Outcomes requires all Arts forms to explain their output in common terms. The common framework also includes processes traditionally used by the Visual Arts. All Arts forms are expected to be able to produce end-products which can be compared equally among each of the Arts forms, and which represent all the parts of the common framework with an equal balance between each of the component parts. In terms of Music Education, DBAE is supported by Reimer (1997) who acknowledges what appears to be a global movement away from performance-based Music Education. This shift is in recognition that performance-based Music Education may not have been the most productive approach to effective Music Education as not all those involved in Music Education take part in performance. Performance still remains the crucial part of such activities as composing, improvising or re-creating the work of another composer. DBAE is a neat way of bringing together the same elements in balanced quantities that are perceived to be important in all Arts forms.

7.2.4.3 **Generic Learning Outcomes in the Arts.**

Coupled with the common Visual Arts framework of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* are generic Learning Outcomes applicable to each of the Arts forms. Although the
interview data presented in this study indicates some dispute about whether generic Learning Outcomes are also used in the Victorian Arts CSF, for the purposes of this discussion the replacement of the generic word “Arts” with the specific name of each Arts form does not suggest the removal of the generic Arts Learning Outcomes. Associated with the use of generic Learning Outcomes in the Arts Statement and Profile is the discussion in the literature about the value of Learning Outcomes as a means of describing subject content and teachers’ abilities to adjust to an Outcomes-Based Education system.

Writing outcomes to describe achievement in the Arts is generally acknowledged by participants in this study as a way of catering for diversity and individual differences in the Arts without restricting creativity. The dilemma of generic Arts Learning Outcomes in the Australian Arts Profile is that the degree of generality does not give a specific idea of the type of student work that indicates an understanding of a strand organiser or an understanding of a particular Profile level. As one of the key writers of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, Hammond (1997) acknowledges that although the Arts Profile is being used for both teaching and curriculum development purposes, certain Outcome Statements need to be rewritten in order to accomplish the intended purpose of the Arts Profile as an assessment and reporting document. He indicates in the interview data of this study that the focus on assessment and reporting was ignored in the development of the Australian Profiles.

The dilemma of using Learning Outcomes is evident in Victoria where the Learning Outcomes have been used to equal a standard, which in turn is tied to school years. It has been recognised that the broadness of the Arts Learning Outcomes in the Victorian Arts CSF do not satisfy the Victorian Government's requirement that Learning Outcomes can be measured and graded. The Arts CSF performs a dual function as a Curriculum Framework and as a Standards Framework. The Learning Outcomes in the Arts do not convey the specific meaning that assist with the understanding and demonstration of the Arts standard expected to be achieved by students. For the purposes of the requirements in Victoria, the Learning Outcomes in the Arts are lacking a clear identification of the progressive skill development and knowledge acquisition that is required to accomplish the standard.
Livermore (1997) stresses that Learning Outcomes and Standards are not the same thing, an aspect that is not given acknowledgment in the Victorian CSF.

As part of the trial conducted in Western Australia of the Australian Arts Profile, an Arts languages section was included in Creating, Making and Presenting. Pascoe (1997) and Whitehead (1997) initially thought that a separate Arts languages section would assist in establishing the place of the individual Arts forms within a generic outcomes structure. Teachers taking part in the trial reported that they needed to refer to the actual common framework of the Arts Profile - described as Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics, and Past and Present Contexts rather than implementing each Arts form only with the assistance of the relevant Arts languages. The reactions of the teachers to the Western Australian trial suggests that an Arts curriculum structure based on generic outcomes needs to have specific Arts form terminology and working Examples of each Arts form placed in each section of the structure to assist with meaning.

7.2.5 Using Language to explain the Victorian Arts CSF

An issue specific to the Victorian Arts CSF is the absence of terminology in each Arts strand. The interview data of this study highlights this issue, especially in Music. The Board of Studies requested that the Arts CSF be written so that it could be understood by the non-specialist teacher. As a result, all terminology was removed from each Arts strand. A consequence of this action is that teachers without specialist knowledge of each Arts form have difficulty interpreting the meaning of the Arts forms in the Victorian CSF. The language used to describe the content of each Arts form has become very general, and any number of interpretations could be seen to be “correct”.

Yeung (1997) is particularly vocal about the use of the English language to describe the discipline of Music. He comments that the discipline has been weakened by the use of words and that the English language has become “fully stretched” as the search is made to find the right words. The need for many Examples to explain what is meant leads to the complex use
of language. A further consequence of this procedure is that it adds to the complexity of the Victorian CSF at the Arts Key Learning Area level.

The references to Music terminology in the Music strand are inconsistent and complicated. Not only was detailed Music terminology deliberately removed from the Music strand: it was placed in Arts Course Advice as a “band-aid” measure. This action raises two issues. Firstly, it appears that the same curriculum document cannot be written for both specialist and non-specialist teachers of Music - or any other Arts form - as it may confuse one group and frustrate the other. Secondly, using Arts Course Advice as the means of addressing the problems of the official compulsory curriculum document is unacceptable, especially when Course Advice, written by a different group - in this case the Department of Education - only has the status of advice and teachers are not required by law to refer to it. The initial plans for Arts Course Advice to provide exemplary units of work did not result. Subsequently, this document has not been as helpful as was expected.

7.2.6 Instrumental Music in the Victorian Arts CSF

The interview responses suggest differing opinions about the inclusion of Instrumental Music in the Music strand of the Arts CSF. Some indicated that the Music strand was a wholistic representation of a Music curriculum and others commented that the specialist skills associated with Instrumental Music were not formally recognised in the Arts CSF.

It could be said that the inclusion of Instrumental Music into a single Music curriculum started with the writing of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile, when Emery (1997b) commented that the Arts writers tried to bring Classroom Music and Instrumental Music closer together with a vision that all Music students would compose Music as well as re-create Music from the past. In the Arts Profile, Music definitions referring to the meaning of Music terminology were placed in Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts, rather than in the more acceptable place of Creating, Making and Presenting. This action was an attempt to narrow the gulf between the two types of Music teaching and broaden the base of Instrumental Music away from re-creating and performance.
Although teachers involved with Instrumental Music programs recognise the need to include aspects of *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts*, the strength of learning an instrument still lies in mastering techniques applicable to an instrument, learning the language of Music and developing performance skills.

The requirement to tie a students’ achievement to a CSF Level, which in turn is associated with a school grade, is a concern for Instrumental Music teachers. Yeung (1997) identifies the problems associated with fitting achievement in Instrumental Music with the CSF Levels. His examples include a student who commences an instrument in his or her pre-school years and a student who commences an instrument towards the end of his or her school years. In both cases the Victorian CSF Levels do not accommodate the skill ability matched with their age.

The comment by Person G (1997) that Instrumental Music teachers are Musicians first and educators second raises the issue of whether the Music strand in the Arts CSF needs to be written to accommodate Musicians as Music Educators, as well as a teachers of specialist instruments.

As preparation for teaching Instrumental Music using the Arts CSF, Morrisroe (1995b), the writer of the Music strand of the Victorian Arts CSF, has suggested that teachers refer to *Designing an Instrumental Music Program* (1988) for curriculum support. She also remarks that a focus on a skills-based program is no longer appropriate for students; a comment which contradicts the structure of *Designing an Instrumental Music Program* where the focus is on sequential skill development. The comment is also contrary to the Board of Studies’ expectations about teaching the Arts, where a focus on sequential learning of skills and concepts is an important aspect of Arts teaching.

In light of the previous discussion about the removal of Music terminology from the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand, as well as issues regarding assessment and implementation, it could be suggested that a separate Instrumental Music section be developed. The same common
framework could be adapted with separate Learning Outcomes to accommodate the specialist teaching required in Instrumental Music.

7.2.7 Alternative Level Structure for the Victorian Arts CSF

Although it has been mentioned that the purpose of the Victorian CSF is to fulfill a dual role as a Curriculum Framework and a Standards Framework, the issue of tying the CSF Levels to school years has been identified by the interviewees participating in this study as an unsatisfactory procedure. An alternative structure has been accepted by the Board of Studies but deemed only to be suitable for Languages other than English (LOTE) where multiple entry points exist. Given that multiple entry points are part of the Victorian CSF structure a case can be made for the use of this approach in the Arts. The distinct absence of specialist Arts teachers in the primary school and the decreasing amount of time given to the Arts in secondary schools immediately prevents most Victorian Government schools from offering continuous programs in the Arts. The remark by Morrisroe (1995a), the Music writer of the Arts CSF, that teachers should not be concerned if students do not reach the required compulsory CSF Level could be taken to suggest that a multiple entry point system is more appropriate for Music assessment. Support could be gained from Taylor's (1996) comments that the linking of Victorian CSF Levels to school years ignores individual differences in children. Students who participate in Dance, Drama and Music activities outside of the school will most likely demonstrate a higher level of skill than the expected CSF Level. With respect to Graphic Communication, it could also be argued that primary school students may not experience sufficient Graphic Communication (within Visual Arts) to enter CSF Level 5 when they commence secondary school.

Person G (1997) says that it is impossible for an Arts CSF Level to be written to suit both a student in Preparatory Year and a student in Year 7 as the older student has experienced the Arts as part living so is “most certainly not at Level 1”. It is interesting to ponder the Board of Studies' (1995:12-13) contrary opinion: “It is essential that the students experience each of the Arts as a discrete learning experience so that the understandings and skills central to each
strand are developed sequentially... the Arts should be based on the systematic provision of strands to allow for the sequential learning of skills and concepts in specific Arts strands”.

The policy of the current Victorian Government to use schooling to create measurable standards for comparison with the rest of Australia and internationally would make any alternative assessment proposals politically unfavourable. Even so, the decision by the Board of Studies to allow a different CSF Level for LOTE and the remark by Morrisroe about not being overly concerned if students do not meet the correct CSF Level suggests that a change in policy for the Arts is possible.

7.3 Standards in Education

7.3.1 General Standards: An International View

Using school curricula to establish general standards in education is a developing trend. In global terms Marsh (1992), Skilbeck (1992), Apple (1993) and A. O'Hear (1993) all discuss the shift in government policy to tighten school curricula and assessment to support the economy of a country. Governments of countries have proposed a variety of methods to achieve the goal of setting standards in education. Some countries have legislated a compulsory “national curricula” combined with a centrally controlled assessment system. The English National Curriculum, French National Curriculum and the New Zealand Curriculum Framework are examples. Piper (1989) warns that a national assessment must not be allowed to dominate “national curriculum” goals and become a curriculum in its own right - a scenario well documented in the establishment of the English National Curriculum. In England, the focus of teaching was on achieving the demands of the assessment tasks at the expense of a focus on learning and discovery in education. Some countries have established compulsory “national curricula” which sets minimum goals and requirements. There is provision for input from the school level and examples of these arrangements occur in Hungary, Norway and Spain. Some countries have established compulsory “national curricula” which are controlled by a process known as “steering by goals”. Denmark, The Netherlands and Sweden are examples of countries where this approach has been adopted. In this instance general goals are predetermined and the development of a fuller curriculum and
assessment of the goals is the responsibility of each school. Countries have also developed *non-compulsory* "national curricula" which are more accurately described as Curriculum Frameworks. The curriculum structures in Australia, Scotland and the USA are examples. In these settings a common Core Curriculum is put in place which is also used as a framework for assessment and reporting.

Different reasons are put forward for using the education system of a country to set standards. Securing the economic future of a country in a competitive world and repairing the economic ills of a country are most often cited as reasons. Coupled with the economic argument is the desire to raise standards in education and establish a workforce with improved skills that is then able to support the economy of a country. A link is made between what is viewed as perceived falling education standards and the status of a country's economy. Australia, England, France, New Zealand, Norway, Spain and the USA are examples of countries where economic factors have been linked to the need to improve educational standards. Skilbeck (1992) refers to Australia proceeding in the same way as OECD countries and using a "national curriculum" to meet perceived economic, technological and social change.

With regard to the *English National Curriculum*, White (1990) and Sedgwick (1991) have written about its use to reinstate the social order of society. This factor can be linked to establishing improvement in a country's economy, where a section of the population can be trained to produce the necessary requirements to allow an economy to compete in international trade. The "national curriculum" in Spain focusses on preparing students in secondary education for the world of work. The preparation of students for the information age was a factor in developing the *French National Curriculum*, once again with a link to the economic status of the country where it was considered that an understanding of information technology would benefit the economy.

A focus on the provision of quality teaching in schools is a reason put forward for the establishment of "national curricula". As well as improving the efficiency of the Australian economy the Australian *Statements and Profiles* were developed to achieve a focus on
maximising scarce curriculum resources and reducing the curriculum differences between the Australian States and Territories.

The focus in the USA was not to instigate a “national curriculum” but to develop voluntary world class education standards. These include Content Standards, Performance Standards, System Delivery Standards, and School Delivery Standards. The strength of the development of the National Standards in the USA was to establish benchmarks in different aspects so that students had the opportunity-to-learn when they were at school. The standards debate has been taken further in the USA and education is now driven by a variety of standards, described by Smith (1994) as a “standards-based” reform. Discussion about standards in the USA has expanded to include the development of a national assessment system operating in tandem with the Voluntary National Standards. The National Council on Educational Standards and Testing has recommended that a national assessment system linked to the National Standards should be developed.

The writing of the Scottish “national curriculum” guidelines was in response to a need to raise educational standards and exercise control over what the school system was expected to deliver. The English National Curriculum has also been used to establish the effectiveness of individual schools. In England the issue of control has been taken further and the results of student achievement has been used to assess teachers.

Compulsory curricula can also be used to remove the power and a sense of trust from people in the control of a school curriculum. This is a view taken of the English National Curriculum and also of the Victorian CSF. The CSF has been legislated by the Victorian Government to set a Curriculum Framework and a Standards Framework. The standards are tied to school years. In addition, students in Grades 3, 5, 7 and 9 are tested to ascertain if they have achieved the content set by the Curriculum Framework at the required standard. These arrangements allow the Government to compare the ability of individual students in schools to each other, compare the quality of individual teachers to each other, and compare the achievements of individual schools to each other. The Government can also make
international comparisons. An important element in these comparisons is the need for the provision of adequate resources to enable teachers and schools to teach the set content.

7.3.2 Arts Education Standards: An International View

An international trend is developing towards the setting of standards in Arts Education. A specific concern of this study is the focus on setting written Performance Standards in Music. The movement towards written Performance Standards in the Arts is occurring in England, the USA and Victoria (Australia). In the USA, written Performance Standards have been developed in Music. The important connection between the Music Content Standards and assessment have been endorsed by Colwell (1995b), Lehman (1995, 1996), Lindeman (1996a), Mahlmann (1996), Schmid (1996), and Shuler (1996). With specific reference to developments in the USA, Cohen (1995) suggests the inclusion of work samples within the Performance Standards are a way of describing the sophistication that could be expected of individual performances. Contrasting views come from Ambach (1996), who questions if Arts standards are to be used in schools for establishing best practice or to set minimum level requirements; from Wilson (1996), who argues against the fragmentation of Artistic behaviours for the sake of assessment; and from Hope (1994), who questions if the standards will become a source of a power base for a particular faction.

In England a CD ROM with work samples for Music and Visual Arts at all Key Stages representing the levels of “working towards”, “achieving”, “working beyond” and “exceptional” has been developed. Knight (1996) was unable to identify an expected “pass” rate, and whether the different levels would represent a minimum or majority standard.

A pilot program in Visual Arts has been completed in Victoria by Emery and Hammond (in press). Visual Arts work samples representing two categories of Performance Standards - “working towards” and “achieving” - have been collected. Preliminary comments from Emery and Hammond suggest that it may be difficult to find work samples to represent all aspects of learning in all Arts forms; the many possibilities in the composition of a piece of Music are an example.
Setting Performance Standards in the Arts raises concerns. Using the written word to explain the exact meaning of a standard in the Arts has been identified as being problematic. Lehman (1993), Colwell (1995a), Shuler (1996), Hammond (1997), Livermore (1997), Van Ernst (1997), and Yeung (1997) have all addressed the difficulties experienced in the Arts by using words to describe the accurate meaning of a standard and equate the standard to a level. In using the written word to describe Music standards the process must take account of the discriminatory qualitative differences in the interpretation of a Music performance, the non-verbal Music behaviours demonstrated in an improvisatory piece, and the expectations of skill and knowledge at different levels of achievement. As was highlighted in the interview data, the more detailed language used to describe the meaning of a standard results in a greater complexity in the language used. The removal of terminology from the Music strand in the Arts CSF emphasises the difficulties created by using common usage English words to explain the requirements of a curriculum. The collection and publication of work samples in print and electronic format will be of assistance in the development of Performance Standards.

Setting Performance Standards in Music may have the effect of stifling creative and Artistic freedom and could be considered inappropriate because of the creative and expressive elements in a piece of Music. In total, learning in any Arts form involves a balance between technique and creativity and it could be argued that the Arts are devalued when excellence is determined by pre-set standards. Designing an assessment instrument to account for the many different instruments, styles of Music, age groups of students and levels of gradings required to establish Performance Standards would involve factoring in a wide margin for variation. Teachers value guidance with regard to levels of expectation. The important aspect is to provide clarity for teachers, so that specialists and non-specialists can understand the requirements. The establishment of Performance Standards in Music must not proceed without consideration of the importance of developing skills and knowledge in processes of Music and not pursue a total focus on a finished product. Creativity and exploration will be stifled if teachers are pressured into teaching to Performance Standards that define specific criteria for a finished product. Focus on a product also suggests that standards are being used
to demean the professional judgement of teachers and to inappropriately assess teacher performance.

As was suggested by one interviewee, the establishment of Performance Standards in Victoria are under consideration as it has been recognised that the Learning Outcomes in the *Arts CSF* do not convey the specific meaning and the required standard for each *CSF* Level. Designing Performance Standards both in writing and through a collection of work samples is now considered the most appropriate way to explain to teachers exactly what the *Arts CSF* Learning Outcomes mean. It is considered that without such material the teachers will find it difficult to carry out the purpose for which the *Arts CSF* was designed, that is, to establish standards at each level. The development of these standards will be viewed as demeaning to students and teachers if the focus is on the lowest possible standard. It has still to be determined if teachers will have the ability to judge a Performance Standard and compare the difference in gradings between the *CSF* Levels. The pilot project conducted by Emery and Hammond (in press) in the Visual Arts will form the basis for the establishment of Performance Standards.

Performance Standards need to be complemented by an adequate provision of Music teaching and resources in schools before any expectation can be made of their development. In the case of the *Arts CSF* more support is required at the curriculum development level for *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts* if acceptable competency levels are expected. Teachers will also need to understand what is meant by these two elements.

### 7.4 Implementation Issues

Issues associated with the design, development and implementation of the *CSF* have been raised throughout this study, especially in the interview data. They can be grouped into two categories: the complexity of the *CSF*, and the involvement of the Board of Studies and the Department of Education.
7.4.1 The complexity of the Victorian CSF

The CSF is generally considered to be a complex document. The complexity is compounded when a teacher begins to analyse the support material that accompanies it. The overall structure of the Victorian CSF, published in eight separate booklets, one for each Key Learning Area, is considered to be one contributing factor to the complexity of the document (especially for primary teachers). When the draft of the Victorian CSF was released for consultation in August 1994, schools and teachers were assured by the Board of Studies and the Victorian Minister for Education, in an article entitled “Major directions for curriculum in 1994” (1994), that the CSF would be more appropriate for school use than the Australian Profiles. The Victorian Minister for Education was particularly critical of using the Australian Statements and Profiles for direct implementation in Victoria because they were considered too complex for school use. Ironically, the presentation of the Victorian CSF in eight separate booklets has in itself provided a degree of complexity.

The different terms used to describe parts of each CSF Key Learning Area and the inclusion of a constructed language are two issues that create problems of understanding and interpretation for primary, secondary and tertiary educators. Primary teachers find it difficult to equate the content of each Key Learning Area in an integrated teaching program. As teachers translate the constructed language into one which they can understand and is relevant to the appropriate Learning Area, the document increases in complexity.

An additional aspect of the complexity issue is the support documents that have been published. A variety of support materials have been produced by the Department of Education and the Board of Studies to assist in the implementation of the Victorian CSF. Course Advice (1996) is a Department of Education publication. Assessment and Reporting Support Materials (1997) is also a Department project. The series titled Using the CSF (1995) is published by the Board of Studies.

Arts Course Advice, the publication designed to assist teachers to implement the Arts CSF, has failed to meet these expectations. The planned units of work which were to exemplify the
CSF were not written and the document was used to accommodate aspects that were removed or left out of the Arts CSF, in particular references to Instrumental Music and Music terminology with appropriate definitions. The unconnected sample units of work, based on themes, can be used as a teaching program but the Arts Course Advice units do not provide teachers with the examples and skills to write a syllabus for a continuous program, which in turn, is broken into daily lesson plans based on the CSF.

The integrative nature of the CSF is not directly supported by Arts Course Advice which does not include any examples of Integrated Arts or Multi-Arts activities. This approach is in keeping with the Board of Studies' specific advice about the teaching of the Arts as separate strands, but the advice contradicts the notion of an integrative framework - one reason why the CSF was written. It will be recalled that the Statements and Profiles were rejected for implementation in Victoria because they represented a documented that was too fragmented. The main support document for the Arts, Arts Course Advice, has not provided structures which support the prime function of the CSF. In contrast, Using the CSF: Integrating the Curriculum (1995), a publication of the Board of Studies, focuses on procedures to integrate the curriculum, including the Arts, and in doing so contradicts its own advice about teaching of the Victorian Arts CSF according to discrete strands.

Advice about assessment and reporting in the Arts CSF is also complex. Using the CSF: the Arts (1995) presents sample program layouts and sample report forms for individual Arts subjects. Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting (1995) illustrates report forms for an Arts Key Learning Area. The booklet also states that the Learning Outcomes are to serve as a basis for reporting, but the actual language of each is inappropriate to include on a report form. The Arts Course Advice and the Arts Assessment and Reporting Support Materials, both publications of the Department of Education, stress the inappropriateness of judging the Arts as a whole. The content of these publications focusses on the fundamental importance of making separate judgements in each Arts form and in each substrand for assessment and reporting purposes. The "one size fits all" sample report forms suggested by the Board of Studies in Using the CSF: Assessment and Reporting are clearly unacceptable and confusing.
for teachers. The suggested assessment coding systems issued by the Board of Studies and the Department of Education also contradict each other. The ability of schools to devise their own coding system adds to the confusion, removes the opportunity for any continuity, and defeats the original purpose of the Australian Arts collaborative project in making freedom of movement for students between schools much easier.

Two other comments about assessment add to the confusion. The first is from Person G (1997) who has stated that teachers are required to report and assess school programs and not the actual Learning Outcomes published in the Victorian CSF. The second is from Jeanes (1996) who remarks that it would be 1998 before teachers would be able or confident to make common assessments about levels and Learning Outcomes.

The Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) has had an influence on the Victorian Arts CSF and its dominance in the school system complicates teachers’ understanding of the CSF. The processes associated with the VCE have been adapted for use throughout the years of schooling, especially in the secondary years. Opinions from the interview data indicate that two systems of education are now operating in Victoria. Not only do the CSF and the VCE use different language to describe their respective constituent parts, the CSF is clearly based on principles of Outcomes-Based Education (“Implementing the CSF: Twelve Common Questions”, 1996; O’Connor, 1995; “Teaching and Learning in the Arts”, 1996). Howes (1997) reports that the DoE was aware that schools required considerable assistance to implement an outcomes-based curriculum, with few examples of a similar project available anywhere in the world. Schools and teachers now need to alter procedures to focus on an Outcomes-Based Education approach, rather than continue to be influenced by the curriculum structures associated with the VCE.

7.4.2 Implementation of the Victorian CSF: the Department of Education versus the Board of Studies

The Department of Education and the Board of Studies have two different purposes for the CSF. The Board of Studies considers the CSF as a curriculum planning tool whereas the
Victorian Government considers the CSF as an assessment and reporting tool. Comments were made by the interviewees that the Board of Studies requested the CSF be written as a very general curriculum document, although the writers were aware that teachers needed specificity in each Key Learning Area. This was particularly apparent when writing the assessment and reporting materials. It has been mentioned earlier in this chapter that the Board of Studies has recognised that the Arts CSF Learning Outcomes are not conveying the desired meaning and the support documents which were released after the CSF did not correct this need.

The Department of Education and the Board of Studies have offered differing opinions regarding the implementation date of the CSF. During 1995 representatives of the Board of Studies and the Department of Education commented that little change was required in order to implement the Victorian CSF, and that schools were already teaching the CSF. This remark was meant to be seen as a form of encouragement and was to be interpreted by the teaching profession that the Victorian CSF was reflecting the present arrangements in schools; “the reinvention of the wheel” was not necessary to implement the CSF. A major source of influence on the structure of school programs has been the VCE, the course taken by Years 11 and 12. As Victorian schools have organised their curricula around the VCE, the introduction of a curricula with a focus on “outcomes” would be seen as a significant difference. The suggestion that schools have little change to make in implementing the Victorian CSF could be questioned.

The Department of Education has set a date for implementation. Graham (1995b) has referred to individual subject implementation in 1995 and complete implementation in 1996. Total implementation was required by the end of 1997, when all Key Learning Areas were to be reported according to CSF Learning Outcomes, but this has not been successful. The Board of Studies has no pre-set timeline for implementation, as confirmed by Hirst (1996). References to implementation in the support materials produced by the Board of Studies gives another interpretation. A statement in Using the CSF: Integration (1995) refers to implementation taking place over a period of time, but the quotation from Using the CSF: An
Introduction (1995:1), the first published in the series, says: "Talk of 'implementing the CSF' in 1996 as though it involves the wholesale reconstruction of a school's program is not only daunting, it is unnecessary and misleading. Audit and review in 1995 will show how much of the CSF is already being 'implemented'". The question still remains unanswered about the true date of implementation.

7.5 Chapter Summary

The notion of a Key Learning Area for the Arts was something very familiar to Victoria prior to the design of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile; this structure was adopted for the Victorian Arts CSF when the CSF was developed. The 1988 Victorian Arts Framework was used by the key writers for the Arts as the basis of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. The key writers of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile were both Victorians, so their familiarity with the Arts Framework was quite strong. The key writers focussed on two elements of the Victorian Arts Framework: the Arts Learning Model and the Arts forms. The key writers adapted the Arts Learning Model to represent the strand organisers in the Arts Profile. The key writers also decided to use the same selection of Arts forms that were in the Arts Framework.

An important point to note here is that the Australian Statements and Profiles were not distributed to Victorian Government schools, a decision made by the Minister for Education. Therefore, unless Arts Educators in Victorian Government Schools had been aware of the development of the Statements and Profiles and the design specifications of the Arts Statement and Profile, in particular, they would not make the link between the Victorian Arts Framework, the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. In comparing the Arts Framework and the Arts CSF, teachers would recognise the notion of an Arts Key Learning Area and the same six Arts forms. They would not immediately recognise, if at all, the learning processes used in the Arts CSF.

The Arts Learning Model was the central pivot of the Arts Framework and each Arts form was structured according to the four learning processes of the model. The attention paid to
incorporating the Arts Learning Model into each Arts form varied greatly; Music being one discipline where little reference was made to the Arts Learning Model. Therefore, in practice, Arts teachers had differing experiences in the use of the Arts Learning Model as a teaching tool. As the *Arts Framework* was not a compulsory curriculum document, the strength of the document laid in the formation of an Arts Learning Area for Preparatory Year to Year 10 and the establishment of six Arts forms across these school years. The similarities between the first draft of the Australian *Arts Statement* and the Arts Learning Model are very noticeable. The Australian key writers used the same learning processes found in the *Arts Framework* as the structure for the *Arts Statement* in the first draft.

Developing a curriculum using a collaborative effort was also something familiar to Victorian Educators. Each of the *Curriculum Frameworks* booklets was written in this way. Although an Arts project team was responsible for the *Arts Framework*, the content of each Arts form was written by specialists. The interpretation of the Arts Learning Model was at the discretion of the specialist writers in each Arts form, so the Victorian *Arts Framework* does not represent a curriculum document that reflects total similarities across all Arts forms as would be expected of a true collaborative effort.

For Victorian Arts Educators, including the same six Arts forms of the *Arts Framework* in the *Arts CSF* was seen as an element of security in a curriculum document that has been imposed externally. Two external arms were at work: first the Victorian *Arts CSF* had been adapted, with little change, from the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* and, second, the Victorian Government had developed, for political reasons, a “Curriculum and Standards Framework”. The only change between the two documents was that Graphic Communication had become a “secondary school” Arts subject, where previously it had been applicable to all school years. Those Victorian Arts Educators who were familiar with the inclusion of Graphic Communication in Visual Arts in the Australian *Arts Profile* considered that it had been restored to “its rightful place” when it was included as a stand-alone Arts form in the *Arts CSF*. In general, Victorian Arts teachers were unaware of the debate that took place in the Australian collaborative effort to decide upon the Arts forms for the *Arts Statement and
Profile. They accepted the Arts forms included in the Arts CSF without question as no major alterations were needed to staffing or timetables in schools.

Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts is a common activity that takes place in Victorian primary schools, although no specific curriculum guidelines exist. The Victorian Arts Framework, the previous influential Arts curriculum document, did not make reference to integrating the Arts. However, the overarching booklet in this series, The School Curriculum and Organisation Framework: P-12, does acknowledge the need to make connections between and within Learning Areas. As an example of the organisation of a school timetable, the Arts are grouped with other Learning Areas into an integrated studies subject. The term Creative Arts is also used. The primary teachers who participated in the interviews for this study clearly identified the need for more Integrated Arts advice to meet the needs of the primary school. In primary schools specialist Arts teachers are not common, the school day is not divided into subject blocks, and the practice of integrating subject content is traditional and the norm.

The notion of all the Arts forms in a Learning Area sharing the same common learning processes should have been familiar to Victorian Arts Educators, as such an approach was used in the Victorian Arts Framework through the development of the Arts Learning Model. Despite this, not all the six Arts forms base their content on the Arts Learning Model. As has been indicated earlier, Music is one Arts form which makes little reference to the Arts Learning Model. Because the Arts Framework was not a compulsory curriculum document, Arts teachers may not have been aware of the significance of the Arts Learning Model and its adoption of common learning processes. Therefore, Arts Educators in Victoria may have difficulty in adapting to a situation where a set of common learning processes is used to structure the content of all Arts forms, although a curriculum precedent had been set for this approach.

The Arts Learning Model in the Victorian Arts Framework uses a structure and language which depicts a Visual Arts model; a major similarity to the Arts CSF. The four interconnected learning processes: Perceiving, Transforming, Expressing and Appreciating
have been re-worked into three interrelated learning processes: Creating, Making and Presenting; Arts Criticism and Aesthetics; Past and Present Contexts. These have been renamed using the term “substrands” in the Victorian Arts CSF. Now that the Arts CSF is being implemented in schools, Victorian Arts teachers should really be quite experienced in interpreting individual Arts forms in terms of a common framework that focusses on learning processes and has a Visual Arts model as its basis.

Although the Arts Learning Model in the Victorian Arts Framework is a generic model, where the learning processes are applicable to all Arts forms in each Learning Area, the addition of generic Learning Outcomes has created a dilemma for Victorian Arts teachers. Teachers are required to interpret the meaning of the generic Learning Outcomes for each Arts forms. For Music teachers this involves understanding the language of the common learning processes as they apply to Music, coupled with the Learning Outcomes. Teachers in Government schools are also required to link all Learning Outcomes to a standard (the CSF Level), to fulfill the Victorian Government's assessment and reporting requirements. The clarity of the generic Learning Outcomes is not as specific as it could be. The recommendations of some of the interviewees that the inclusion of a more substantial Curriculum Focus, more Examples and terminology would have assisted teachers to have a clearer understanding of the Arts CSF.

The Board of Studies requested that the Arts CSF be written for the generalist teacher. The Board of Studies also placed restrictions on the size of the Arts CSF. These two requests lead to the removal of terminology in each Arts form in the Arts CSF. A focus of this study is the effect that this decision has had on the Music strand. Coupled with the generic Learning Outcomes, this decision has resulted in Music Learning Outcomes which are not precise in their meaning. Overall, the content of the Music strand has little substance. Music terminology was replaced with common usage English words making the process to describe a Learning Outcome complex. As compensation, terminology was placed into the support documents, but for Music, including terminology in this way has meant that the definitions
are either associated with a unit of work based on a theme or they are seen in isolation. There is no link between Music terminology and the discipline of Music as a whole.

The minor references to Instrumental Music in the Music strand of the Arts CSF are of particular concern for those who coordinate school Music departments with a large Instrumental Music component and for individual Instrumental Music teachers. It should also be a concern to the Victorian Government because, although not all students in a school have access to Instrumental Music tuition, Instrumental Music is the only form of continuous Music teaching available to students in Victorian secondary schools from Year 7 to Year 12. Classroom Music is often now restricted to Years 7 and 8 as a core subject. Instrumental Music tuition is also available in Victorian Government primary schools. The removal of Music terminology from the Music strand and the complex descriptions used for the Learning Outcomes make it difficult for an Instrumental Music teacher to guide a student through a program. The CSF as a Curriculum Framework provides little support for an Instrumental Music teacher who works according to a structured method. The language used to describe the common learning processes is also unfamiliar to Instrumental Music teachers.

Tying CSF Levels to school grade levels is peculiar to the Victorian Government requirement that the CSF represent a Curriculum Framework and a Standards Framework. Irrespective of a level of knowledge and understanding, a student is expected to be working at the CSF Level designated for a particular school year in all Learning Outcomes and in all Key Learning Areas. This approach defeats the notion of creating an assessment Profile of a student’s ability. This arrangement may be satisfactory where a student has consistent teaching in all aspects of a subject. It can be argued that even if students do have consistent teaching in all elements of a subject they unlikely to make equal progress in all parts of the subject content. The Board of Studies approved the use of multi-entry points only for Languages other than English. This structure was not permitted for the Arts Key Learning Area where students have access to specialist teaching both inside and outside school. Therefore, the assessment of students in Music at a CSF Level according to a school year has the potential to be inaccurate.
The goal of the Victorian Government was to develop a curriculum document that would establish standards. Tying CSF Levels to school years provided a means of comparing and measuring standards across the compulsory years of schooling in Victoria. The CSF maintained the Learning Outcome structure of the Australian Statements and Profiles. In the case of the Arts, very minor changes were made to the Arts Learning Outcomes. The Victorian Government has equated the Learning Outcomes in all Key Learning Areas with a standard. The standards are defined in terms of a CSF Level, and CSF Levels are tied to school years. As all students are expected to be working at the appropriate CSF Level for the school year, the concept of establishing a standard that represents an individual students’ achievement is not fulfilled.

Although establishing standards in all Arts forms in the Arts CSF is a requirement of the CSF as a total document, the development of Performance Standards in the Arts is directly related to the fact that the generic Learning Outcomes are not communicating the meaning and the standard expected. Planned work samples have not been published and the preliminary work in the development of Performance Standards has only been completed in the Visual Arts. It is still unknown whether the Board of Studies will require the development of Performance Standards to focus on a finished product or show evidence in the development of student skills and knowledge in each Arts form, as is expected in the use of Learning Outcomes. The inconsistencies in Music teaching and the opportunity for some students to have access to specialist Music tuition compounds the design of an assessment instrument to measure the variety of Performance Standards that students will display.

The complexity of the CSF and the different interpretations that the Board of Studies and the Department of Education have regarding the CSF are two factors that make the implementation of the CSF in Victorian Government school classrooms difficult. The CSF as a stand-alone document uses different terminology to describe similar sections of each Key Learning Area. The support documents have been used to include information removed from the CSF, an issue that especially concerns Music teachers. The material published in the Arts support documents is not consistent and it is contradictory to the Arts CSF and to the Board of
Studies’ policy regarding the teaching of Arts. The advice about assessment and reporting in the Arts is particularly confusing. The dominance of the VCE in the way in which schools organise their curriculum structures has created an additional element of complexity in the implementation of the CSF.

The Board of Studies (the author and publisher of the CSF) and the Department of Education (the Government department responsible for implementing the CSF) have different interpretations about the use of the document. The amount of change that schools need to make towards the introduction of an outcomes-based curriculum is unclear, as is the official implementation date. These elements of indecision on the part of the two Government departments charged with the responsibility of the implementation of the CSF in order to meet Government policy is an unsatisfactory situation for teachers in the workplace to negotiate.

Chapter Eight presents the conclusions and recommendations for this study. Twenty-two recommendations for further research are offered.
CHAPTER EIGHT

8.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Introduction
This research project has been a study of curriculum development in the Arts, and specifically Music, with respect to Victoria, Australia, and selected overseas countries. The project involved interviews with key Australian personnel who were involved in various capacities in the design and development of the Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents.

This study did not gather opinions from teachers - who have the responsibility for implementing the CSF - although some of the interviewees incidentally had that responsibility. A subsequent study addressing the implementation of the Victorian Arts CSF would need to survey the practitioners at the grass roots level, that is, classroom teachers.

8.2 Conclusions
The conclusions arising from this study have been organised into ten sections:

- An Arts Key Learning Area in an International Context
- Multi-Arts in an International Context
- Setting Standards in an International Context
- Developing the Australian Arts Key Learning Area
- Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Music and the other Arts in a Visual Arts Model
- Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Understanding Language
- Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Instrumental Music
- Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Multiple Entry Points
- Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Setting Standards in Music
- Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Problems of Complexity and Implementation

8.2.1 An Arts Key Learning Area in an International Context
The establishment of an Arts Learning Area is linked to the various concepts and definitions of “national curricula”. Concepts such as Curriculum Frameworks, Centrally-Based Curriculum Development and Core Curriculum lead to the differing adaptations and
implementation of *compulsory* and *non-compulsory* "national curricula" on an international scale. The specific features of "national curricula" are dependent on the political landscape of a country and its cultural heritage. The question "What knowledge is of most worth?" is significant in the choice of Arts forms, as well as other subjects, included in a curriculum. With respect to this study, the issue has revolved around the inclusion of individual Arts subjects verses the grouping of subjects into an Arts Learning Area.

In the case of Australia, all States and Territories had included an Arts Learning Area in their curriculum structures prior to the writing of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*. This development was seen as a positive support for the adoption of an Arts Key Learning Area as part of the Australian *Statements and Profiles*. The real influence for the Australian Arts Key Learning Area came from the Victorian *Arts Framework* (1988) which grouped Art forms under one heading and devised an Arts Learning Model to function as a common learning structure for all the Arts forms. The Arts formed one of nine Learning Areas that comprised the immediate past Victorian curriculum document.

As was reported in the OECD (1994) study, Music and Visual Arts were the most common Arts forms taught in schools in the countries surveyed. The same study reported that Dance and Drama tend to be marginalised in school Arts Education programs. Within Visual Arts, Craft and Design are formally recognised by some countries as Arts forms, sometimes in conjunction with Technology. Graphic Communication is also recognised by some countries as an Arts form. In the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*, Graphic Communication was incorporated into Visual Arts, but included as a stand-alone Arts form in the Victorian CSF. Applied Graphics, a similar Arts form, is part of the extensive Hungarian Arts curricula. Other countries use the name Mechanical Drawing, but where this occurs the subject is not connected with the Arts. Handicrafts also has an important place in the Arts curricula of some countries. Other Arts forms such as Textiles, Metalwork, Woodwork, Photography, Home Economics and Physical Education are included in some countries and not in others. Literature is to be included in the New Zealand Arts curriculum and in Sweden there is
interest in including Literature with other aesthetic subjects for a cultural study. Literature is included in the Arts curricula in some States in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Music was included in the *English National Curriculum* as one of two stand-alone Arts forms, despite initial plans towards an Integrated Arts approach. The Arts subjects that make up the *National Standards for the Arts* in the USA were named specifically, in an attempt to encourage schools to a broad representation of the Arts. In Australia, attempts were made to include Literature in the Australian *Arts Profile*, with support from the key writers and the Australian Literature Board. Although the opinions of interview respondents demonstrate support for the inclusion of Literature, the subject remains excluded, mainly for political reasons and for the perceived devastation it would cause to the subject of English. The interview respondents acknowledged that Literature makes up a substantial part of English as it is taught in schools and its removal would leave the subject without any content.

A number of countries have grouped the Arts subjects offered in their curricula under an Arts Learning Area although some writers in the literature have argued that no such structure as Arts Education exists. The argument is put that each Arts form is unique and although the Arts share some common aspects, there are not sufficient commonalities to group them in an Arts Learning Area. With the development of Arts Learning Areas the importance of maintaining and strengthening the uniqueness of individual Arts forms is recognised. The trend also endorses a Multi-Arts approach to Arts Education. The Discipline-Based Arts Education approach is significant in this respect. It is acknowledged as being a strong influence in the Arts curricula structures of Australia, Japan and the USA. Music Educators in the USA argue that Discipline-Based Arts Education will provide a more comprehensive approach to teaching Music but they caution that the traditional processes of Creating and Performing will continue to dominate. Reimer (1997) draws attention to the inadequacies of a performance-based Music Education approach and suggests that this is recognised as a problem world-wide. With the development of an Arts Learning Area, the two most commonly proposed questions from literature writers in the USA are: Is there a hierarchy of Arts forms? and Can all Arts forms be equal? Writers also stress the importance of
establishing opportunities for students to learn, because without the infrastructure in the school system, none of the Arts forms is dominant. Colwell (1996a) strongly advocates the need to discover the consequences of having Arts Education as basic, instead of Music Education as basic. Arts Education in this instance refers to students studying different Arts forms. His question could well provide the basis of a philosophical/conceptual study in relation to “national curricula”

Even though a number of countries have adopted an Arts Learning Area structure, only a small number of countries have developed a common framework to enclose all the Arts forms. Countries which have adopted this approach are Australia, the province of Saskatchewan (Canada), Japan, Scotland, and the USA. These countries have chosen to use a common framework to describe learning in the Arts and, with the exception of Australia, they focus on the specific language of each Arts form. It is possible that South Africa may pursue this approach.

The Scottish Expressive Arts guidelines are the closest to the Australian Arts Profile in that they are structured according to generic Arts processes, with the inclusion of an additional level of processes that use Arts specific language to describe each Arts form. Australia has taken the concept of linking all the Arts forms one step further by developing generic Learning Outcomes, where the same language is used to describe the processes of each Arts form. Victoria adopted this approach for the Arts CSF.

8.2.2 Multi-Arts in an International Context

The establishment of an Arts Learning Area and common approaches to learning in the Arts invites debate about the provision of Multi-Arts. The debate in the literature involves interpreting the many definitions of three overarching terms: Multi-Arts, Aesthetic Education and Integrated Arts. The alternative debate focusses on the importance of allowing each kind of Artistic knowing to be acquired separately. Protagonists for Multi-Arts approaches suggest that they provide value to Arts Education by making connections between the Arts forms. Unfortunately, a Multi-Arts option in a curriculum is sometimes seen as politically attractive
because it allows schools to reduce the amount of funding and timetable space given to the Arts - and this can then be reallocated to subjects perceived as more important. The funding for the training of specialist Arts teachers can also be reduced based on the assumption that one teacher can teach all Arts forms.

The debate about the inclusion of Multi-Arts has not been resolved in many countries. Finland, Hungary, Portugal and Sweden positively encourage “integration” in the Arts. Other countries either offer cooperative projects in the Arts or take the approach that no restrictions are applied on teaching the Arts in this way, although the content is documented in terms of stand-alone Arts forms. Italy, Japan and Spain have had discussions about Multi-Arts but reached no conclusions, and Iceland and New Zealand have rejected the concept.

The Multi-Arts issue was not resolved in Australia at the time the Arts Profile was written. The decision to describe learning in terms of generic outcomes suggests that the Arts curriculum illustrates a potential Multi-Arts format. Because the same Learning Outcomes are used to describe each of the Arts forms, direct links can be made between each of them. The report from the Australian Senate Inquiry entitled Arts Education (1995) entered into the Multi-Arts debate, criticising Arts Educators for taking an isolationist approach to teaching in the Arts. The Inquiry report suggested that Arts Educators should recognise that their colleagues in other Arts forms were all aiming to reach the same goal by a different approach.

Multi-Arts was considered once more in the Victorian context when the Arts CSF was designed. The opinions expressed by the interview respondents suggest uncertainty on behalf of the Board of Studies about this issue. For those who were associated with primary schools, Multi-Arts was highlighted as an important avenue to overcome the crowded timetable and to fit in with the traditional integrated approach to teaching in the primary school setting. The problems of assessing Multi-Arts in the Victorian Certificate of Education were recognised as providing sufficient evidence that these same problems would be apparent in the design of the Australian Arts Profile and the Victorian Arts CSF. One interviewee acknowledged the difficulty of equating Multi-Arts to standards, one of the dual roles of the Victorian CSF. It
seems that from the Victorian discussions about Multi-Arts, as detailed in the interview responses, the uncertainty surrounding the notion of Multi-Arts was the factor that influenced its non-inclusion. Although it was recognised that primary schools taught and would continue to teach Arts forms in an integrated way, there was also concern that the integrity of each Arts form should not be lost.

8.2.3 Setting Standards in an International Context

Data gathered from the overseas countries surveyed as part of this research study indicated a relationship between the establishment of compulsory “national curricula” and the requirement that standards be set in every curriculum area. Greece, however, is an example of a country where the opposite is true. In some instances, countries have developed non-compulsory “national curricula”, which are used to set standards. Examples of these countries are the Belgium State of Flanders, Iceland, Italy and the USA.

The variation of standards accompanying compulsory or non-compulsory “national curricula” range from stipulating “what students should know and be able to do”, to setting minimum curriculum requirements for promotion to the next year level. Of those countries where compulsory “national curricula” operate, a focus on standards is not always the case. The priority in France, Hungary, the Netherlands and Spain is to ensure that minimum requirements are taught. The Scottish Secretary of State, through a consultation paper, initially proposed a curriculum designed to implement national standards and establish more control over what the school system should deliver. New Zealand focussed on the economic needs of the country in developing a “national curriculum”, but the decision is still to be made about using the curriculum to set standards. Norway was also attracted to school standards as a means of improving the economic climate of the country.

The philosophical debate about whether it is possible to develop standards, their value or otherwise, and how it should be done, has been discussed with great fervour in the USA. Topics discussed in the literature include the types of standards available, the possible meanings of standards, which standards are more useful in the school setting and what should
be the unit of measure of standards. Eisner (1993), Sizer and Rogers (1993), and Cohen (1995) argue for work samples and criteria as the basis for establishing standards. Lewis (1994) gives attention to the importance of Opportunity-to-Learn Standards as the most valuable in the school setting. O'Neil (1991), and Resnick and Nolan (1995) suggest that the aim should be to raise the school standards in general, rather than use standards as a monitoring tool.

A relationship between the economic decline of a country and the perceived need to raise educational standards through national assessment are two criteria most often cited for the establishment of "national curricula". The English National Curriculum is often given as an example of a country that has adopted these two criteria for the development of their "national curriculum". The concerns raised by these criteria are well documented, indicating the desire of a government to tightly control the activities of the school system.

Establishing standards in "national curricula" is also associated with assessment and benchmarking. The English National Curriculum is an example where national assessment was considered to play an important role in achieving the aims of the curriculum. Piper (1989) warns that it is important that assessment supports a curriculum as opposed to becoming the dominant feature of a curriculum, or worse, becoming a curriculum in its own right. The assessment element in the English National Curriculum became a major concern for teachers implementing the program. A cautionary warning has been issued that the proposed introduction of a national assessment program, in conjunction with the National Standards in the USA, should not allow assessment to dominate the curriculum. Colwell (1995b) reflects that the National Standards need some form of assessment to give them meaning.

National assessment is also linked to the notion of benchmarking. The origins of benchmarking come from industry and, some are arguing, are being applied to education somewhat hurriedly. The debate about the place of benchmarking in education focusses on two perspectives: the usefulness and transferability of the industry definitions of the term, and
the need for the education system to establish its own definitions. Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) is another current feature of education which can be associated with standards and benchmarking. Outcomes-Based Education has many definitions and those contributing to the literature comment on the value of adopting the approach to make patterns of learning clearer. At the same time they also warn that Learning Outcomes can become dominated by assessment and product achievement. In Australia, the use of outcomes-based learning is still in need of an agreed definition.

Standards may become a reality if the Australian Statements and Profiles are used as benchmarking tools. In Victoria, the development of standards has been thrust upon educators with the creation of the CSF which, as part of its dual role, sets standards. The approach to setting standards in Victoria has been to equate the Learning Outcomes of each Key Learning Area with levels that in turn are related to each school year. By creating a direct relationship between a Learning Outcome and a standard, the notion of an outcomes-based approach to learning is defeated. A Learning Outcome accommodates the growth of a student's knowledge and is not measurable against a school year level. Livermore (1997) notes that a Learning Outcome and a Standard are not the same thing, and Hammond (1997) comments that in Victoria, Learning Outcomes have been used for a purpose for which they were never intended, that is, equated to school years. Hannan and Ashenden (1996:10) leave no doubt in the readers' mind when they say: "Levels are not meant to correspond to age or year levels". The Victorian Government rejected the Australian Statements and Profiles because they were considered to have a "levelling uniformity" effect on schooling. The replacement curriculum in Victoria has, ironically, created this same effect. The Victorian curriculum ties the specific content of each CSF Level to school years and the assumption is made in the CSF and all support documents that students in a particular school year will be working at the appropriate CSF Level. The debate in Victoria about the issue of standards has been caught up in the complex nature of the CSF and accompanying support documents. At present, teachers in Victoria are unravelling the language of the CSF and interpreting the place of the support documents rather than participating in a debate about standards. It is possible to say that teachers are probably unaware that the CSF has two parts: a Curriculum
Framework and a Standards Framework. Perhaps the constant use of the acronym CSF as the
identifying trademark of the document is one reason for teachers not being aware of its total
use.

One topic currently being pursued in the literature is a discussion about the value of
standards. Questions about the use of standards are still to be debated and answered. Such
questions are not exclusive to the Victorian CSF but concern education on an international
scale. These questions might include:

- Can teachers understand and measure standards?
- Can teachers understand the meaning of predetermined grading systems to
  measure standards?
- When a predetermined grading system has been used to measure a standard,
  what does that standard mean in terms of a student's understanding,
  knowledge, skills and ability?
- Can standards be stated realistically such that teachers and students can work
  towards them?
- What are the consequences for the curriculum document and society if the
  standards are not met?

8.2.3.1 Music Standards.

Setting standards in school curricula also applies to the discipline of Music. Mostly the
countries surveyed for this study used either a numerical or descriptive grading to determine a
student's standard in Music. Some countries had specific testing procedures. The State of
Brandenburg in Germany uses three attainment levels increasing in complexity. In Hungary
the curriculum sets detailed objectives which are to be accomplished by students completing
Years 4, 6, 8 and 10. The Scottish curriculum has five levels of attainment that are matched
to school years. Music in the English National Curriculum has been formally graded for
pupils at Key Stage 3 and this was introduced in 1997. Northern Ireland uses eight level
descriptions. The National Standards for the Arts in the USA includes Content and
Achievement Standards for Year level clusters: Kindergarten to 4, Years 5 to 8, and Years 9
to 12. At the Year 9 to 12 cluster a Proficient and Advanced achievement standard are recorded to accommodate students who specialise in an Arts form.

A more recent practice in the USA has been to develop specific Performance Standard indicators in addition to information given in the Music curriculum document. The Music Educators National Conference (USA) has established written Performance Standards for Music with three levels of achievement. These standards supplement the Content and Achievement Standards that are documented as part of the National Standards for Arts Education. The Performance Standards include an assessment strategy designed for each achievement standard. A “basic”, “proficient”, and “advanced” level of response are described for each assessment strategy. The School Curriculum and Assessment Authority in England have placed work samples on CD ROM using four levels of achievement. The terms used are “working towards”, “achieving”, “working beyond” and “exceptional”. Performance Standards are proposed for the Victorian Arts CSF and the Exemplary Assessment Materials project in the Visual Arts by Emery and Hammond (in press) represents the beginning of this era.

8.2.4 Developing the Australian Arts Key Learning Area

The Arts Key Learning Area is one of eight Key Learning Areas that make up the Australian Statements and Profiles. The process of developing the Arts Profile required the Australian writers to identify the expected skills, knowledge and understandings for each Arts form, according to increasing levels of achievement. The development of a learning Profile for each Key Learning Area, where skills and knowledge are presented in a sequential linear format, has been criticised by some writers in the Australian literature as being unsatisfactory for learning. The division of knowledge into Learning Areas which are further broken down into strands across eight levels is considered by some to be artificial and an inappropriate way for describing learning. The skills and knowledge presented in each Australian Profile have been described by some writers as narrow and constraining, only reflecting the average performance of students. In contrast, the Australian Profile structure has been acknowledged as a means of documenting what students are learning, rather than what is being taught, and
the Profiles provide a mechanism for reporting and charting the Learning Outcomes achieved by each student. Overall, educationalists in Australia recognise that learners generally do not master information in a sequential, linear fashion and the Australian Profile structure, which is not linked to school years, forms a reference point for teachers to identify a student's scope of knowledge and areas requiring improvement.

One of the planned uses for the Australian Profiles (encompassing State and Territory differences) was to provide a means of mapping individual student learning in each Key Learning Area to develop a comprehensive Profile of student strengths and weaknesses. The decision taken by the State and Territory Governments in July 1993 not to honour the original understanding that each of them would implement these documents raises the question, “What did the process achieve at the Australian, State and Territory levels?” One of the major problems was the “unrealistic” timeline in which the writing processes took place. Despite this, the collaborative process has been described as being possibly unique in the world.

The Australian literature highlights the problems associated with the four combination Key Learning Areas, the Arts being one of these. Although there was commitment to a Learning Area structure, there was no written rationale produced by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee for either the use of this structure or the selection of eight Learning Areas. There was no purpose established as to whether the combination Learning Areas were to represent collections of existing subjects or the development of new studies. The literature refers to the ongoing debate about the use of learning processes, subjects or generic Outcome Statements for the construction of the Key Learning Areas. This debate was more complex with respect to the design of the combination Key Learning Areas. The design of the Key Learning Areas unleashed political criticisms, particularly in the Mathematics area, but in the Arts it brought together for the first time teachers of different Arts forms to develop the Learning Area. The Australian Arts writers had to contend with managerial and organisational decisions made by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. They also had to grapple with the major issue that haunted all writing teams: the nature of the strands or concepts that make up the Arts Key Learning Area.
It has been documented in this study that Australian discussions in the Arts did not proceed smoothly, although the partnerships formed by Arts Educators as they took part in the National Professional Development Programs were certainly valuable and remain ongoing. Comments about the Australian Arts Key Learning Area in the literature generally address the issues of collecting the Arts together under a common framework and describing learning in terms of outcomes. Australian writers were concerned about the possible loss of the unique character of each Arts form and the potential to blend all the Arts forms together with the development of the generic Learning Outcomes. The structure adopted for the Arts Key Learning Area - a combination of Arts subjects and generic Learning Outcomes - accommodates the differing views expressed during the development of the Australian Arts Profile. Arts Educators are able to interpret the document to teach in either an Integrated Arts approach or with a focus on individual Arts forms. In the draft Arts Profile document, Presenting, a term more appropriate to the Visual Arts, is included. In the published version of the Australian Arts Profile, this Learning Outcome is not included for Visual Arts as it is considered to have less significance for this Arts form.

8.2.5 Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Music and the other Arts in a Visual Arts Model

The structure of the Victorian Arts CSF was directly influenced by the Australian Arts Profile. The Board of Studies in Victoria considered the Australian Arts Statement as having little significance for the development of the Arts CSF. A discussion about the Victorian Arts CSF also implies a discussion about the Australian Arts Profile because both documents are very similar. The use of a Visual Arts model as a common format for the Arts Key Learning Area is a major issue, especially for the discipline of Music. The Visual Arts model, influenced by the Discipline-Based Art Education approach and the Arts Learning Model, an element of the Victorian Arts Framework (1988), was chosen by the Australian Arts Profile writers because it has the strength to push learning and teaching in the Arts beyond the traditional base of performance. The model also has the potential to treat all Arts disciplines on an equal footing, providing support for Dance, Drama and Media, the less dominant Arts forms in the Australian Arts Profile. The Visual Arts background of the key writers of the Australian Arts Profile is considered an important factor in their selection of this model. The views expressed
by writers in the literature - Boughton (1992, 1993a, 1993b), Flood (1994), Stevens (1993) and Brown (1994) - discuss the reductionist nature of the Australian *Arts Profile* structure through the use of a common format and generic Learning Outcomes. Concerns are expressed about learning in the Arts being defined in a linear pattern, and the establishment of prespecified Learning Outcomes with an emphasis on competencies. It is feared that teachers will teach skills that match the Learning Outcomes, at the expense of encouraging Artistic talent.

In contrast to the concerns expressed in the literature about the reductionist nature of the *Arts Profile*, the interviewees participating in this study were more focussed on determining how Music teaching could benefit from a structure specifically designed for Visual Arts teaching. The ideas represented by the three substrands *Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts* were generally considered to encompass the broad content of any Music syllabus. The inclusion of *Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts* were generally seen by the interviewees as positive processes to widen the traditional Making and Performing aspects of Music teaching. However, on a practical level the Visual Arts approach was considered to be inappropriate for the discipline of Music. The criticism comes in the choice of words used to describe the substrands, that is, *Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics* and *Past and Present Contexts*, and the interpretation that Musicians make of these words. Musicians mean something quite different from Visual Artists and - to varying degrees - the exponents of any other Arts form when they carry out the processes described by the three substrands.

The sub-substrands of *Creating* and *Presenting* are the areas causing most concern within the common Arts structure for Music. For some, the ideas associated with Musical composition are not clearly represented by the term "create". The sub-substrand *Creating* has been identified as a political push to require Music to incorporate composition into the syllabus. The writers of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile* are considered to have used the design of the Arts Key Learning Area to include an Arts process neglected by Music, especially in the Victorian school curriculum. The Victorian *Arts CSF* adopted the same
structure as the Arts Profile and therefore Creating is included in this document. The inclusion of Creating in the Arts Profile and the Arts CSF is seen by some interviewees as providing a basis for agitating for composition to be given more status in the Victorian Certificate of Education, the course for Years 11 and 12. In New South Wales, for example, composition is a compulsory element in the Higher School Certificate Music course. The Arts Profile writers, both Victorians, were concerned about the absence of a composition section in the VCE Music Study Designs. It is considered that they used the opportunity to include this element in the Australian Arts Profile which would be incorporated into Victorian school Music curricula when implemented in that State. In turn, they hoped that composition will become a part of VCE Music.

The term Presenting indicates the presentation of an end product. The term also suggests a separation from the making of the product and the display of the product in a public setting. It will be recalled that Presenting was not included in the Visual Arts strand of the Australian Arts Profile, as it was considered to have less significance for this Arts form than for the Performing Arts forms. Presenting has been included in the Victorian Arts CSF.

The Musical interpretation of Presenting, namely "performance", represents an activity which is both part of Creating or Making a piece of Music and an integral part of the Music learning process. The performance of a composition is a complex activity in itself and it becomes another source of learning. As a result, concern was expressed that the term Presenting as a separate element does not serve the needs of the Music discipline.

8.2.6 Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Understanding Language
Understanding the meaning of the language used in the Victorian Arts CSF and accompanying documents was identified as a major area of concern for teaching the discipline of Music. The issue of language falls into three areas. Two of these areas are found in the Australian Arts Profile: the names of the strand organisers Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts (language associated with Visual Arts), and, secondly, the use of generic Outcome Statements. These two aspects were
repeated in the Victorian *Arts CSF* with minor wording changes made to the Outcome Statements.

A third area was the proposal to include *specialist* Music language in the Music strand of the *Arts CSF*. This was not accepted by the Board of Studies and as a consequence all *specialist* Arts language (including that used in Music) was removed from the published Victorian *Arts CSF*. *Specialist* Arts language was included in two of the accompanying support documents - *Arts Course Advice* and *Using the CSF: the Arts* - to rectify the situation. Unfortunately, the definitions provided for the Musical terminology included in the *Arts Course Advice* give the impression that they are only relevant to the unit of work in which they are used. The definitions of terms as they apply to Music in general are obscure.

As indicated by the interview participants in this study, the priority for the Victorian *Arts CSF* writer was to produce a Classroom Music document suitable for interpretation by generalist (*non-specialist*) Music teachers. The re-wording of the Australian generic Outcome Statements in the Victorian *Arts CSF* to include the discipline names was one action designed to make the structure more relevant to each Arts discipline. The Victorian proposal to include *specialist* Arts language was a further attempt to link the generic Outcome Statements to each Arts form. The *specialist* Music language was replaced with common usage words in English, resulting in a more complex document where the meaning of the Music content is no longer precise. In addition, the definitions of Musical terms used in the Victorian *Arts CSF* are described in non-specific language and they do not remain constant from one CSF Level to the next. The removal of the Music *specialist* language in the *Arts CSF* Music strand has culminated in a curriculum document that still reflects a dominance of Visual Arts language. In Musical terms, the Visual Arts language does not express the same meaning as comparable words in Music. For the purposes of using the Victorian *Arts CSF* Music strand to write a syllabus, the document has little appeal to both *specialist* Music teachers and generalist (*non-specialist*) teachers. For the *specialist* Music teacher expecting a curriculum description in Music language, the challenge is to find the appropriate word in the Music language that means the same as that explained in the Music strand by a Visual Arts word. For *non-
specialist Music teachers, unaware of the Music connotation of a word, the Visual Arts definition may influence their understanding of the terms in the Arts CSF.

8.2.7 Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Instrumental Music

The interview responses presented in this study, combined with an analysis of the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand and accompanying support documents, illustrate a need to devise a structure to accommodate the place of Instrumental Music in the Music strand of the Arts CSF. During the writing process of the Music strand, some interviewees expressed their belief that the Music strand was written for the Classroom Music program; and some suggested that a proposal to include an Instrumental Music strand was scrapped. Instrumental Music has the status of not being part of the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand. There was concern expressed at the writing stage to accommodate this other significant part of Music Education in Victoria. The suggestion by Morrisroe (1995b), writer of the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand and secondary Music Course Advice, that Instrumental Music teachers should refer to Designing an Instrumental Music Program (1988), a previous curriculum document, for assistance in implementing the Arts CSF Music strand causes one to question why more substantial material was not included in the Music strand at the writing stage. Morrisroe also considers it now more important that students be offered an wholistic approach to instrument playing, as distinct from the current focus on developing specific performance skills. Ironically, this is in direct contrast to the skills-based program promoted by the booklet Designing an Instrumental Music Program and the Board of Studies.

Regardless of whether Instrumental Music is implicit or not in the Music strand of the Arts CSF, and regardless of whether it should be taught more wholistically, as Morrisroe asserts, the point to be stressed is that Instrumental Music must not be neglected in Music curriculum development.

The reduction in the amount of Classroom Music lessons provided to students and the recognition that Instrumental Music is now often the only form of continuous Music Education in Victorian Government secondary schools, is also an essential reason for
developing a separate Instrumental Music strand that accommodates the teaching style of Instrumental Music teachers and the peculiarities of learning an instrument.

The interviewees who participated in this study offered little comment on the place of Instrumental Music in the Music strand of the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*. Emery (1997b) commented that the key writers of the Australian documents aimed to develop a structure that would incorporate both Classroom and Instrumental Music. Morrisroe has made a similar statement in relation to the Victorian *Arts CSF*. By contrast, other interviewees have argued that Instrumental Music is not implicit in the Music strand. Clearly this is an issue to be resolved in the Victorian *Arts CSF* - and, it could be argued, in the Australian *Arts Statement and Profile*.

8.2.8 Developing the Victorian *Arts CSF*; Multiple Entry Points

Separating the Victorian *Arts CSF* Levels from school years to establish a system of multiple entry points is a proposal supported by many of the interviewees for this study. The *CSF* Key Learning Area, Languages other than English, has used this approach. The interviewees interpreted the tying of the Victorian *Arts CSF* Levels to school years as being totally unsatisfactory in principle. The act of tying *CSF* Levels to school years involves an expectation that teachers will teach the content associated with the appropriate *CSF* Level, although students may not have had the prior experience. The variety of entry skills and knowledge demonstrated by students in any one school year, either as a result of lessons provided externally to school programs or by the inconsistent teaching of the Arts in primary and secondary schools, is a worthwhile reason to consider an alternative. The change of status of Graphic Communication as part of Visual Arts in the primary school to a stand-alone Arts subject in the secondary school suggests that assessing the entry point for students in this Arts form may be difficult. *CSF* Level 5 is the starting point for the beginning of secondary school but a student with no experience in Graphic Communication from primary school may not be able to demonstrate *CSF* Level 5 Learning Outcomes. Likewise, a student who has not been offered Music in each of the primary school years may not have the requisite skills and knowledge to enter Music at *CSF* Level 5 at the beginning of secondary school (Year 7).
The *Arts CSF* was written during a time of major cuts to school teaching staff. The reduction of teaching staff was recognised as contributing to the inability of schools to implement any of the Arts forms with attention to detail. Although some Instrumental Music teaching takes place in primary schools, the majority of students commence learning an instrument in secondary school. The link between the school year and CSF Levels creates an expectation that these students will be achieving at CSF Level 5, when in reality a student’s achievement level may be much lower. An opposite example is provided by Yeung (1997) who asserts that the Learning Outcomes of the Victorian *Arts CSF* Music strand describe only the basic (lowest) expectation of student achievement. Yeung is critical that no recognition is provided for schools that have committed resources to Music Education and an extension of this comment is that the Learning Outcomes do not encourage schools to promote higher goals of student achievement. Tying Learning Outcomes, which represent the lowest expectation of an achievement, to standards, creates a dilemma for schools with advanced Music programs.

Morrisroe (1995a) has commented that teachers should not be overly concerned if their students do not reach the required Victorian CSF Level. This supports the argument for considering students’ prior learning as distinct from merely tying CSF Levels to schools years. The assessment support documents that accompany the Victorian CSF acknowledge that it is normal to expect students to be achieving at different levels in each Learning Outcome in each Arts strand. Unfortunately, the support documents stop short at providing the specific information which tells a teacher how to add the different CSF Level achievements in each Arts form to equal an overall CSF Level.

8.2.9 Developing the *Arts CSF*: Setting Standards in Music

In addition to the general standards set by the Victorian CSF, the establishment of Performance Standards in the Arts (including Music) is gaining interest. Person D (1997) clearly states that the Arts Learning Outcomes are not conveying the expected meaning, and therefore the required standard, as succinctly as it was anticipated. The same respondent confidently forecasts the development of Performance Standards to establish the expectation and standard of each Arts Learning Outcome in each Arts strand.
In Victoria, a pilot project focussing on establishing Performance Standards in the Visual Arts has been completed with a view to extending the process to include all the Arts. The Victorian project, conducted by Emery and Hammond (in press), involved collecting and grading Visual Arts into two levels of achievement. This work is initially in preparation for Statewide testing in the Arts, but it will also influence the development of Performance Standards. The work of Emery and Hammond has sparked the Music Education profession in Australia to ask a number of questions: Can equivalent work samples be found in all styles and levels of Musical development?, Can work samples be equated across all aspects of Musical development?, and Is it possible or a valid process to use the same criteria, the same structure and the same rating scales to develop Performance Standards for all Arts disciplines? If the Australian Arts Profile becomes a benchmarking tool, questions that could be posed are: Can standards in Music be equated either nationally or internationally?, and What is the meaning of a rating scale? Ambach (1996) advises that if education standards for the Arts are to be created the decision must be made as to whether they are to be viewed as representing best practice (in industry terms) or as minimum level requirements (in educational terms).

Not all the interviewees for this study were aware that, in the Visual Arts, work samples were being gathered and questions being prepared that reflected different levels of standards for this Arts form. The major points raised by the interview respondents to the proposal of establishing Performance Standards in the Victorian Arts CSF included the inadequacies of using words to describe standards and the damping effect on creativity and incidental learning. Shuler (1996) comments that using words to write standards for the Arts does not describe with precision non-verbal Artistic behaviours. The positive benefits of establishing standards include raising the expectations of Music teaching and curriculum in schools, and developing an acceptable level of Music skills and knowledge to be achieved by students. Interviewees generally accepted, albeit with a degree of reluctance, that Performance Standards would be the next development of the Victorian Arts CSF.
8.2.10 Developing the Victorian Arts CSF: Problems of Complexity and Implementation

Although this study has investigated the issues involved in the design and development of the Arts Key Learning Area, specifically the Music strand, it has been impossible to avoid reference to the implementation of the document as a total package. The use of the word “complexity” applies to many elements of the Victorian CSF. These elements are the language and structure of the Victorian Arts CSF, including the Music strand; the language and structure of the Victorian CSF as an integrated curriculum document; the supply and interpretation of the support documents; and the division of implementation responsibilities between two Victorian Government departments. The assessment and reporting information published by the Department of Education and the Board of Studies is not consistent. The units of work in Course Advice do not reflect a continuous program of teaching from Preparatory Year to Year 10; instead they are a collection of disjointed activities. Another example of complexity particularly affects primary schools. Primary schools are expected to accommodate all Key Learning Areas and interpret the conflicting instructions that, on one hand, indicate that the entire Victorian CSF was designed to benefit integrative teaching but, on the other hand, that the Arts are to be taught as separate disciplines.

The Victorian Government criticised and rejected the Australian Statements and Profiles as they were deemed to represent a fragmented curriculum. The writing of the Victorian CSF and the many associated support documents has not solved this situation. The involvement of two Victorian Government departments in the authorship of the CSF materials has contributed to the fragmentation. With a special focus on the Arts Key Learning Area, comments made by the interview respondents, reveals a situation where the support documents were used to solve problems inherent in the Victorian Arts CSF. Although this study did not investigate this issue in the other Key Learning Areas, there is some evidence from other Key Learning Areas that the implementation of all the Australian Statements and Profiles at the Victorian level has resulted in the production of a series of fragmented curriculum documents.
In general, the purpose of writing new curriculum documents is to reflect what should be occurring in a school curriculum. With this in mind, it could be commented that the Victorian CSF, which was written during a time of major economic and philosophical upheaval in the Victorian Government education system, has not fulfilled its role as a futuristic curriculum document. The development of basic implementation requirements, such as adequate provision and training of staff, appropriate equipment and spaces for learning, and ample timetabling for each subject, appear to be a necessity for the Victorian CSF to take its place successfully in schools.

The differences in understanding the purpose of the Victorian CSF between the Department of Education and the Board of Studies remains a matter of conflict. The teachers of the Victorian Government school system, who are responsible for the implementation of the compulsory curriculum document, have learnt to work within this environment. As a generic document, the Victorian CSF is designed to present an wholistic integrated curriculum, but in contrast, the advice provided for the teaching of the Arts in particular requires a focus on individual disciplines. The Department of Education had a fixed implementation date (December 1997) which in reality has not been completely successful. The Board of Studies does not have an implementation timeline on the Victorian CSF, although an additional confusing aspect regarding implementation has been created by a comment in the booklet Using the CSF: An Introduction (1995) which stated that the Victorian CSF was already being implemented.

8.3 Recommendations
It was indicated in Chapter One of this study that a limitation of it was the decision not to interview classroom teachers practicing in the field. The study sought to focus on gathering the knowledge of those involved in the design and development process rather than the opinions of teachers working in the classroom A major consideration in not interviewing teachers at this stage centred on the need of teachers to have one or more years experience in implementing the document fully before commenting critically on it. Teachers in the Victorian Government system are required by law to implement the Victorian CSF. The
implementation of the Victorian CSF in the non-Government school sector is varied and a specific study of individual schools would be necessary before a universal assessment could be made. For both school systems the matter of ownership of curriculum is also an issue. This study was conducted during the developmental and early implementation stages of the Victorian CSF (1994 to 1997) and it could be expected that a lack of clarity in response from teachers would be apparent at this time.

All the suggestions for future research require the participation of the actual practitioners, especially teachers in the Victorian Government school system who are legally responsible for the implementation of the CSF.

The following 22 specific recommendations have emerged from this study:

1. The study has summarised the history of the Australian Statements and Profiles and made reference to other publications where the detail is very well documented. As the collaborative effort to implement the Statements and Profiles on an Australia-wide basis did not proceed as planned, a further study could investigate what the initial collaborative process achieved for education in Australia. The study would need to reflect opinions at the Australian as well as State and Territory levels.

2. Although the literature suggests that there is no universal acceptance of a formal Arts Learning Area, a number of countries have nonetheless grouped subjects under such a heading. Another investigation needs to consider what common elements, disciplines and attributes combine to make an Arts Learning Area. As part of the Australian developments, the literature highlights that no rationale was evident for the creation of the combination Learning Areas, of which the Arts were one. Given this situation the research could also investigate the reasons that lead countries to make the decision to adopt Learning Area structures.

3. Colwell (1996a) expressed in the literature that Arts Education may become dominant in schools at the expense of Music Education. Subsequently, the consequences of Arts
Education as the basic Arts structure - instead of, according to Colwell, Music Education - requires investigation. An initial decision would need to be made regarding what constitutes Arts Education. Ideally, this should be undertaken in an international setting.

4. Multi-Arts, as a feature of international Arts curricula, remains an unresolved issue. The Literature Review and findings of this study suggest that although different definitions have been formulated, no clear understanding of the meaning of Multi-Arts is evident amongst Arts Educators. A future research study could aim to redress this issue.

5. Previous Arts curriculum developments in Australia, and particularly Victoria, have concluded that students participating in Multi-Arts activities may not acquire a substantial body of knowledge and skills in any one particular Arts form. Past research in Victoria for the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) has consolidated the fact that writing assessment for Multi-Arts is a difficult issue. This study has identified a need for the development of Multi-Arts activities within the Victorian Arts CSF, especially for use in the primary school. The issue that is yet to be resolved (based on the research carried out for the VCE) is that of devising an assessment system that reflects the connection between CSF Levels and school years. A future study could address this matter.

6. There are unanswered questions about the development of standards in general. The Arts (as a group or as individual Arts disciplines) would also benefit from exposure to these same questions. Research could investigate the following:
   - Can teachers understand and measure standards?
   - Can teachers understand the meaning of predetermined grading systems to measure standards?
• When a predetermined grading system has been used to measure a standard, what does that standard mean in terms of a student's understanding, knowledge, skills and ability?
• Can standards be stated realistically such that teachers and students can work towards them?
• What are the consequences for the curriculum document and society if the standards are not met?
• What type of Arts standards are the most appropriate for the school environment - those that reflect best practice as defined by industry, or those that establish a minimum educational level?

7. The project undertaken by Emery and Hammond (in press) to find and rank work samples for the Visual Arts has raised a number of questions with reference to all the Arts forms, including Music. The following questions need to be investigated:
  • Can equivalent work samples be found in all Arts disciplines?
  • Can work samples be equated across all Arts disciplines?
  • Is it possible or a valid process to use the same criteria, the same structure and the same rating scales to develop Performance Standards for all Arts disciplines?"

8. This study has referred to the inappropriateness of using words to describe standards in the Arts. It has been suggested that words do not describe with precision non-verbal Artistic behaviours, and that the description is harder at the lower levels of development. Further research could identify another way of setting standards in the Arts.

9. The findings gathered from overseas about how countries register a standard for Music revealed a popular use of numerical grading systems. Research questions arising from this material which could be investigated include:
  • What does, for example, a scale of one to five or a scale of A to E mean?
  • Can standards in Music be equated either nationally or internationally?
10. A further study would need to research and identify which parts of the structure of the Victorian *Arts CSF* and the additional support documents are really suitable and necessary for the generalist classroom practitioner teaching Music. The study would need to consider how modifications could be made to the Arts documents, specifically in terms of Arts languages, to accommodate the teaching needs of both the generalist (*non-specialist*) and the *specialist*.

11. Given that the Australian *Arts Profile* and the Victorian *Arts CSF* are based on a Visual Arts Model using Visual Arts language, an investigation needs to consider how the remaining Arts forms in the Victorian *Arts CSF* - Dance, Drama, Graphic Communication and Media - cope with teaching a curriculum under such arrangements. Would these Arts forms benefit from an umbrella structure that recognises the peculiarities of each discipline?

12. As has been shown in this research study, the common structural framework used for the Australian *Arts Profile* and the Victorian *Arts CSF* is not completely appropriate to articulate the needs of Music. Some alterations are needed to satisfy the special attributes of the subject. A future research project could investigate the following:
   - A structure that involves retaining Learning Outcomes grouped under the current three common strand organisers of the Australian *Arts Profile*, and adding a more refined level of strand organisers according to the appropriate needs of each discipline (a feature of the *Scottish Expressive Arts* guidelines).
   - Learning Outcomes (or Content Standards) described using specific discipline language as illustrated in both the *National Standards for the Arts* (USA) and the Arts Curriculum of Saskatchewan.
   - An expansion of the current Curriculum Focus for each Learning Outcome, as found in the Victorian *Arts CSF*, to explain finer details including how to establish links between the Arts forms at a particular process level. Each Arts form should remove the term *strand*, freeing up the use of this term for the common elements presently...
called strand organisers. The term strand organisers would be more appropriately applied to the description of specific processes for each Arts discipline.

13. In terms of an overall school Music program where both a Classroom and Instrumental Music program is offered, the educational validity and value of dividing the generic Arts Learning Outcomes between the Classroom and Instrumental Music programs requires a research study.

14. There is a need for a review of the Victorian Arts CSF Learning Outcomes as part of the overall structure of the Victorian CSF. In terms of this study the focus of attention would be on the discipline of Music to determine whether students are able to meet the Learning Outcomes presented. The ability of teachers to prepare Music students to meet these Learning Outcomes would need to be considered. A particular focus would need to identify whether teachers are adapting (or distorting) the Learning Outcomes (the Standards) in order for Music students to achieve them. A further issue would be to identify if Music teaching would be more successful with its own set of non-generic Learning Outcomes.

15. A review of all the Arts Learning Outcomes is necessary to determine if students are meeting the Learning Outcomes at the CSF Levels that are tied to the school years. Because the Learning Outcomes in the Victorian CSF represent standards, research would be needed to equate the position of Music Learning Outcomes against the Learning Outcomes (Standards) of other Arts disciplines in the Victorian Arts CSF. This should also be undertaken in the light of international findings.

16. The assessment and reporting CSF support documents describe how teachers may make an "on balance" judgement for assessing Arts forms. They do not specify how to aggregate the achievement levels of each Learning Outcome in each Arts form to equal an overall CSF Level. A research project could attempt to ascertain the criteria needed
for a teacher to collate a number of different achievement levels - with and across the Arts - to equal an overall CSF Level in each Arts form.

17. The results of the last two recommendations may well indicate the development of a structure which accommodates multiple entry points for the Arts standards. A structure similar to that used in the Victorian CSF Languages other than English (LOTE), where prior learning is recognised, could be developed and trialed for the Arts.

18. This study did not investigate in depth the place of Instrumental Music in the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. Further research is needed to discover if the problems discussed in relation to Instrumental Music and the Victorian Arts CSF are also perceived to be issues in the other Australian States and Territories. This, in turn, could support a study that investigates further the relationship between Instrumental and Classroom Music throughout Australia.

19. It is clear from this study that Instrumental Music teaching is deserving of a separate strand in the Victorian Arts CSF. Accordingly, further research is needed to develop a separate strand for Instrumental Music using the Music strand of the Arts CSF as a basis. The research would need to investigate if the terminology used in the Music strand is adequate, and if not, devise one that is suitable. The research would need to formulate the appropriate standards for an Instrumental Music strand taking into account the variety of ages when students commence and the variation in technical difficulty of instruments.

20. The conclusions of this study have acknowledged that the discipline of Music (Classroom and Instrumental) would be enhanced by accepting and accommodating all the attributes of the Victorian Arts CSF, namely, Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past and Present Contexts. This is in contrast to a traditional focus on Making and Performing. An investigation is needed to determine whether it is a practical possibility for the specialist area of Instrumental Music to teach
all five Learning Outcomes of the Victorian Arts CSF in a substantial way rather than continue a traditional focus on the elements of Making and Performing. Composition in Instrumental Music teaching has a connection with Making and Performing and cannot be ignored.

21. There is a need to investigate the extent to which the Victorian Certificate of Education has facilitated or restricted the teaching of Music as it is presented in the Victorian Arts CSF.

22. The Victorian Arts CSF is accompanied by a collection of additional publications designed to support and assist its implementation. The publications represent general information and material specific to Key Learning Areas. A research study is required to ascertain the use, influence, value and benefits of these documents for Music teachers.

This study has attempted to investigate the issues involved in the design and development of the Victorian Arts CSF Music strand. The study has recognised that Music is now placed in an Arts Learning Area and has drawn on Australian and overseas Arts curricula to identify if the Victorian Arts CSF provides the best environment for the development of a Music curriculum. In the process it has identified a series of issues which could be addressed by future researchers.
APPENDIX ONE

Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia

In 1989 the Australian Education Council (AEC) endorsed the Hobart Declaration on Schooling. The declaration set out 10 common and agreed national goals for all State schools in Australia.

The national goals for Schooling, for the first time, provided a framework for cooperation between schools, States and Territories and the Commonwealth. The goals are intended to assist schools and systems to develop specific objectives and strategies, particularly in the areas of curriculum and assessment.

The agreed national goals for schooling included the following aims:

1. To provide an excellent education for all young people, being one which develops their talents and capacities to full potential, and is relevant to the social, cultural and economic needs of the nation.

2. To enable all students to achieve high standards of learning and to develop self-confidence, optimism, high self-esteem, respect for others, and achievement of personal excellence.

3. To promote equality of educational opportunities, and to provide for groups with special learning requirements.

4. To respond to the current and emerging economic and social needs of the nation, and to provide those skills which will allow students maximum flexibility and adaptability in their future employment and other aspects of life.

5. To provide a foundation for further education and training, in terms of knowledge and skills, respect for learning and positive attitudes for life-long education.

6. To develop in students:
   - skills in English literacy, including skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing;
   - skills in numeracy, and other mathematical skills;
   - skills of analysis and problem-solving;
   - skills of information processing and computing;
• an understanding of the role of science and technology in society, together with scientific and technological skills;

• a knowledge and appreciation of Australia's historical and geographical context;

• a knowledge of languages other than English;

• an appreciation of and understanding of, and confidence to participate in, the creative arts;

• an understanding of, and concern for, balanced development of the global environment; and

• a capacity to exercise judgement of morality, ethics and social justice.

7. To develop knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which will enable students to participate as active and informed citizens in our democratic Australian society within an international context.

8. To provide students with an understanding and respect for our cultural heritage including the particular cultural background of Aboriginal and ethnic groups.

9. To provide for the physical development and personal health and fitness of students, and for the creative use of leisure time.

10. To provide appropriate career education and knowledge of the world of work, including an understanding of the nature and place of work in our society.

*Arts Education* (1995: 218-219) Report by the Australian Senate Environment, Recreation, Communications and the Arts References Committee
APPENDIX TWO

Questionnaires were circulated to 25 member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and 22 countries affiliated with the International Society for Music Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Countries: OECD</th>
<th>Affiliated Countries: ISME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia (excluded from questionnaire)</td>
<td>Australia (excluded from questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>The Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen of the countries surveyed were both members of the OECD and affiliates of ISME. South Africa was included and Australia excluded.
APPENDIX THREE

Ms Amanda Watson

EXPLANATORY NOTES

This questionnaire is designed to assist with gathering data for a research project that looks at music as part of the “national curriculum”. The study focuses on the interpretation of Australia's “national curriculum” by the State of Victoria. (Each Australian State has flexibility in implementing the “national curriculum”)

The research is being conducted for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree from the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University, Australia.

Although not a central focus of the research, I am interested in placing developments in Australia within a broader, international context. It is for this reason that I am seeking your input with respect to your own country.

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In Australia, the “national curriculum” resulted from a nationwide consultation process with the intent of minimising unnecessary differences in curricula between the 6 States and 2 Territories. The Australian Constitution does not permit a compulsory or mandated “national curriculum” as education is the responsibility of each State and Territory Government.

Australia's equivalent of a “national curriculum” covers the compulsory years of schooling - Year 1 to Year 10 (ages 5-15 approximately). Each State and Territory has adapted the “national curriculum” to suit local conditions. The “national curriculum” does not cover the last 2 years of schooling; a separate system exists in each State and Territory for these 2 years.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate how other countries have structured and implemented their “national curriculum”. Although it is understood that the term “national curriculum” may not be entirely correct, it is used in the wording of the questions for consistency. The substance of the present study, however, is a focus on Australian conditions; at the same time reference will be made to developments in other countries.

To assist you in answering the questions, I have provided responses with reference to the State of Victoria as an example of how the Australian “national curriculum” has been implemented in this Australian State.
Name of Country

1. Is your country's "national curriculum" compulsory  Yes No

2. For what levels (or school years) is it compulsory?

3. What subjects are included in your country's "national curriculum"?

4. What were the reasons for choosing the ARTS subjects that are included in your country's "national curriculum"? (If there are any "non-traditional" ARTS subjects included, please explain the rationale for this)

   In Victoria, the Arts subjects chosen were Dance, Drama, Media, Music, Visual Arts. These are also the subjects that traditionally have been most commonly taught in schools.

5. What were the reasons for including or not including a "Multi-Arts" or "Integrated Arts" approach in your country's "national curriculum"?

   In Victoria, "Multi-Arts" as a separate Arts subject was considered at the planning stage of the "national curriculum". In the end, lack of time prevented discussion and hence inclusion of "Multi-Arts" as a subject.

6. Does the "national curriculum" in your country set "standards" in terms of what students should know and be able to do or achieve in each subject?

   Yes No
In the State of Victoria, the national curriculum has been used as a compulsory curriculum to set standards that indicate what students should know and be able to do or achieve at specific school year levels.

7. How do teachers decide on the “standard” achieved by a student in **Music**?

In Victoria, teachers arrive at a decision by making an “on balance” judgement based on (i) multiple sources of evidence (work samples, audio and visual recordings, checklists, student portfolios) and (ii) recording that a student has demonstrated the same standard on a number of occasions in a variety of ways.

8. How do teachers describe or report the “standard” achieved by students in **Music**?

In Victoria, a reporting scale has been devised for each standard:

(i) “not shown”
(ii) “beginning”
(iii) “consolidating”
(iv) “established”.

This scale indicates the degree of skill and knowledge development demonstrated by a student at a particular standard.
### APPENDIX FOUR

Overseas respondents to survey questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Aguilera (1997)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Arnusch (1997)</td>
<td>Saskatchewan, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bresson (1997)</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Bontink (1997)</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Cintra Gomes (1996)</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Ireland, Canberra, (1997)</td>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Consulate Office for Education, Melbourne (1997)</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Gruhn (1997)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Haussila (1997)</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Bradley (1997)</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Hentschke (1997)</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Knight (1996)</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Koedinger (1997)</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Korkuvi-MacPalm (1997)</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Leduc (1997)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lehman (1997)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mocsenyine Taller (1996)</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Nierman (1996)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Oku (1996)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Overmars (1997)</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Parsons (1996)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ryan (1997)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Sandberg (1997)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Smetáčková (1997)</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Solbu (1997)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stephens (1997)</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tafuri (1997)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tejada (1996)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Tercan (1997)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Thirup (1997)</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Thorisson (1996)</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Tortorella (1997)</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Van den Borre (1997)</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. van Niekerk (1997)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Personnel involved in the development of the Australian Arts Curriculum Documents (classified by number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Arts Writers</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Associate Arts Writers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Contributing Writers (Music)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel involved in the development of the Victorian Arts Curriculum Documents (classified by number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework Writers</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Arts Course Advice Writers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consisting of one representative for each of the following groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts Writer and Drama Levels 1-7, Media 1-4, Dance 5-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Levels 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Levels 5-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts Levels 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts Level 5-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Communication Levels 5-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Levels 5-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Levels 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Arts Course Advice Reference Group</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consisting of one representative from each of the following groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary discipline (Graphics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary educator (Secondary, Drama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary educator (Primary, Music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (Secondary, Drama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (Primary, Media)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Association (Secondary, Visual Arts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Association (Primary, Drama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (Primary, Visual Arts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (Secondary, Graphics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies (Arts KLA Manager)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts KLAC (Convenor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special expertise (Dance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special expertise (Media)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special expertise (Music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Independent Schools of Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Education Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooric Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Arts Expert Panel - total</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consisting of the following representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts Key Learning Area Committee</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including 4 with Music expertise)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consisting of the following representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLAC Convenor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLAC Deputy Convenor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-4 Working Party including a Convenor</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Working Party including a Convenor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF Music Working Party</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(members drawn from KLAC, P-4 and 5-10 working parties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF Dance, Drama, Graphic Communication, Media and Visual Arts Working Parties constituted similarly to Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies Arts Key Learning Area Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Board of Studies Arts Key Learning Area Project Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX SIX

Interview Questions for Australian and Victorian Participants

1. As an observer of the design and development of the Arts Statement and Profile in the Australian States and Territories, what modifications would you make to the Arts documents if the opportunity for review was available, either nationally or at the state level? Are there specific alterations you would make to the Music strand?

2. What Arts forms would include in an Australian Arts curriculum and why?

3. Multi-Arts or Integrated Arts are not included in the Arts Profile. If Multi-Arts was included, would it sit comfortably in the present structure of learning outcome statements and the learning processes of Creating, Making and Presenting, Arts Criticism and Aesthetics, and Past and Present Contexts? What contribution could Music make to a Multi-Arts approach?

4. England and the United States of America have established ranked performance outcomes (standards) to validate the content of their Music “national curriculum”. England has provided work samples on CD ROM at 4 levels of achievement (working towards, achieving, working beyond, exceptional) for each Key Stage. The USA has produced written performance standards at 3 levels (basic, proficient, advanced) for each cluster of grades. Is this an appropriate trend for Australia to follow and how would it affect teaching and learning as well as assessment in the Music strand?
APPENDIX SEVEN

RESEARCH PROJECT INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

Please note: This is a prescribed form. It is a requirement of the RMIT Human Research Ethics Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, PROFESSIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

FACULTY OF EDUCATION, LANGUAGE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Prescribed Consent Form For Persons Participating In Research Projects Involving Interviews, Questionnaires or Disclosure of Personal Information

Name of participant:

Project Title: An investigation into the Arts Key Learning Area, with a specific focus on Music, in the Victorian Curriculum and Standards Framework in a national and international context.

Name of investigator: Ms Amanda Watson

1. I consent to participate in the above project, the particulars of which - including details of interviews or questionnaires - have been explained to me and are appended hereto.

2. I authorise the investigator or his or her assistant to interview me or administer a questionnaire.

3. I acknowledge that:

   (a) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied;

   (b) The project is for the purpose of research and/or teaching and not for treatment;

   (c) I have read and retained a copy of the Plain Language Statement, and agree to the general purpose, methods and demands of the study;

   (d) The project may not be of direct benefit to me;

   (e) My involvement entails completing an interview which will take approximately 30 minutes. I give/do not give my permission to be audiotaped;

   (f) I request/do not request complete anonymity;

      I am/am not happy to be named;

      I am/am not happy for my position to be mentioned;
(g) Confidentiality is assured. However, should information of a confidential nature need to be disclosed for moral, clinical or legal reasons, I will be given an opportunity to negotiate the terms of this disclosure;

(h) The security of the data obtained is assured following completion of the study;

(i) The research data collected during the study may be published and a report/thesis of the project outcomes will be provided to RMIT University Library.

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________

(Participant)

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________

(Witness)

Any queries or complaints about your participation in this project may be directed to the Secretary, RMIT Human Research Ethics Committee, RMIT, 124 La Trobe Street, Melbourne 3000. The telephone number is (03) 9660 1745.
Research Topic: An investigation into the Arts Key Learning Area, with a specific focus on Music, in the Victorian *Curriculum and Standards Framework* in a national and international context.

Name of principal investigator: Ms Amanda Watson

This research is being conducted to fulfil the requirements of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT University).

My research aim is to identify and critically analyse the issues and debate involved in the design and development of the Arts Key Learning Area and specifically Music in the *Curriculum and Standards Framework* (Victoria).

The purpose of my research is to investigate how the Arts and specifically Music are being implemented in Victoria in light of the development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile. Given that the Arts have been brought together for the first time in an Australian curriculum document, there is a need to consider the whole Arts document and place it in an international context.

My research procedures are to identify issues in selected overseas Arts “national curriculum” documents; as well as in past and current Australian and Victorian Arts curriculum documents. A questionnaire will be forwarded to all member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and those countries where the professional Music association is affiliated with the International Society for Music Education (ISME), to gather further information about their Arts/Music “national curricula”. Twenty-one interviews with Australian Arts/Music “national curriculum” writers will take place.

You are invited to participate in an interview that will last for approximately 30 minutes. The interview questions will be made available before the interview. The aim of the interview is to seek your opinions about the design and development of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile and related issues of standards and selection of Arts disciplines. Permission is requested to audiotape the interview. I would also like to ask for your consent to being identified in the final report and in any papers written and published prior to the production of the final report. Alternatively it is requested that you agree to be acknowledged according to the position you hold.

No foreseeable problems are expected in conducting the interview. The advantage of your participation in the interview allows for the gathering of reliable first-hand data. Your involvement is being sought as a professional figure and key participant in the writing or development process of the Australian Arts Statement and Profile.

Participation in the interview is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the project at any time and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied.

The confidentiality of the data will be assured. Two copies of the transcript arising from the interview will be made, one to be held by the researcher and one to be returned to you. The data or information you provide will be used as supporting evidence for the issues identified in the analysis of the literature review, questionnaires from selected overseas countries and Australian curriculum documents.

This research meets the requirements of and has the approval of the RMIT University Ethics Committee. You are invited to ask for clarification at any time of any aspects of the project.
Any queries or complaints about your participation in this project may be directed to the Secretary, RMIT Human Research Ethics Committee, RMIT University 124 La Trobe Street, Melbourne 3000. The telephone number is (03) 9660 1745.

Qualifications: Diploma of Teaching (Early Childhood), Graduate Diploma of Music Education, Bachelor of Education (Primary, Special Education), Master of Education.
APPENDIX EIGHT

*Code of Conduct for the Victorian Public Sector (1995)*

The following clauses from the *Code of Conduct for the Victorian Public Sector (1995: 6-8)* directly affect the gathering of data for this study. Some of the personnel interviewed for this study are bound by this Victorian Government Act. They were involved in writing the *Arts CSF* and participated on the committees and working parties associated with the development of the *Arts CSF*.

Use and release of information

*Can I make public comment?*

17 Public comment includes public speaking engagements, comments on radio and television and expressing views in letters to the newspapers or in books, journal or notices where it might be expected that the publication or circulation of the comment will spread to the community at large.

18 As a member of the community, you have the right to make public comment and enter into public debate on political and social issues. However, section 95(1) of the *Victorian Constitution Act 1975* prevents you from making public comment on the administration of any State department. There are additional circumstances in which public comment is inappropriate, unless specifically authorised by your chief executive officer. These include circumstances where:

- the implication of that public comment, although made in a private capacity, is some way an official comment on Government policy or programs; and
- you are directly involved in advising or directing the implementation or administration of Government policy, and the public comment would compromise your ability to do so.

*How should I handle official information?*

19 You must not use or communicate official information for other than official purposes without the permission of your chief executive officer (except where such information has
already been made available officially to the public). This includes leaking information to the media. You must not take improper advantage of any information gained in the course of your employment. You may disclose official disclosure official information that is normally given to members of the public seeking that information. If releasing information under the Victorian Freedom of information Act 1982, you are protected against legislation under sections 62 and 63 of that Act.

20 Only disclose other official information or documents acquired in the course of your public employment when required to do so by law, in the course of duty, when called to give evidence in court, or when proper authority has been given. In such cases your comments should be confined to factual information and should not express opinion on official policy or practice.
APPENDIX NINE

Summary of compulsory and non-compulsory “national curricula” and national standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National Curriculum</th>
<th>National Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Saskatchewan)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the approach taken to the grouping of subjects in school curricula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Subject Groupings</th>
<th>Single Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Key Learning Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Arts Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Saskatchewan)</td>
<td>Required Areas of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Areas of Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Cultural Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Essential Learning Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Areas of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Main Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Curriculum Areas (Primary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Modes (Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Learning Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Areas of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Groups of Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Arts Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX ELEVEN

Summary of countries that include cross-curricula themes as part of a “national curriculum”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Education Skills</th>
<th>Types of Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Themes</td>
<td>• Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Career and Work Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Literacy and Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Saskatchewan)</td>
<td>Common Essential Learnings</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical and Creative Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Independent Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal and Social Values and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technological Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Themes</td>
<td>• Economic and Industrial Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Careers Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education for Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Elements of Learning</td>
<td>Outcomes of Learning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Common Objectives</td>
<td>• Integration into Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Homeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Career Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Physical and Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration into the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Groups of Essential Skills</td>
<td>• Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Problem-Solving Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-Management and Competitive Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social and Cooperative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Physical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work and Study Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Themes</td>
<td>• Education for Mutual Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Careers Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Cross-Curricula Aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enterprise Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• European Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Cross-Curricula Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic and Industrial Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Careers Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education for Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TWELVE

Summary of Arts subjects offered in school curricula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Graphic Comm.</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Visual Art</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (Victoria)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Sask’wan)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Thematic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Wood/Metalwork Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Film, Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Film, Video, Multi-Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Literature, Multi-Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Design, Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Design, Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Handicrafts, Film, Photography, Multi-Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Craft, Calligraphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Textiles, Handicrafts, Design, Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Oratory, Film, Video, Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Craft, Multi-Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Subject 1</td>
<td>Subject 2</td>
<td>Subject 3</td>
<td>Subject 4</td>
<td>Subject 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Multi-Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Domestic Science Physical Education Craft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Multi-Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX THIRTEEN

Summary of countries that structure the Arts forms in a “national curriculum” according to common learning processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description of Common Learning Processes across the Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Australia                    | • Creating, Making and Presenting  
                                 | • Arts Criticism and Aesthetics  
                                 | • Past and Present Contexts |
| Canada (Saskatchewan)        | • Creative/Productive Component  
                                 | • Cultural/Historical Component  
                                 | • Critical/Responsive Component |
| Japan                        | • Acquiring active knowledge of materials and media  
                                 | • Inquiring how to make and to appreciate Art works  
                                 | • Realising communication through images |
| Scotland                     | • “Using” materials, techniques, skills and media  
                                 | • “Expressing” feeling, ideas, thoughts and solutions  
                                 | • “Evaluating” and “Appreciating” |
| Spain                        | • Image made through classic or technological media  
                                 | • (a) Perception and representation  
                                 | • (b) Expression of feelings and ideas  
                                 | • Understanding different meanings and aesthetic values |
| United States of America     | • Creating and Performing  
                                 | • Perceiving and Analysing  
                                 | • Understanding Cultural and Historical Contexts |
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