

## Question 1 Pages 19-20

**The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO:** We just heard evidence that experts and academics have been cited in the evidence base for the new syllabuses. They're saying that they don't agree with the new syllabuses and that they're essentially being misrepresented in the evidence base that's being presented in the drafts. How does that happen? How is that a process that people can be confident in?

**PAUL MARTIN:** The arguments presented are quite general. I'd be interested to know which parts are being represented. We're happy to take that on notice. Having said that, the consultation and the expert advice we get is over a range of issues, not all of which is synonymous with each other—it's not all in agreement. Experts provide us with advice across a range of the issues in a syllabus.

**The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO:** But these people are saying specifically that they have been cited and they don't agree with what has been presented and that they're being misrepresented.

**PAUL MARTIN:** Presumably, the citing in a syllabus—NESA is not a dishonest agency. We make sure that all of the work we do is firmly founded in advice and consultation and research. I'd be interested as to which parts of the syllabus that they say they're quoted on or researched in relation to being misrepresented.

**The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO:** We just heard from Dr Christine Hatton, for example.

**PAUL MARTIN:** I would love to go to the specifics of that because that would be completely inappropriate if we misrepresent advice as if it agrees with the syllabus and it doesn't. Without having knowledge of the specifics of her evidence and also the question, we can't come back to you until we have seen that on notice

## Question 1 ANSWER:

All NESA syllabuses are based upon a wide range of academic scholarship which forms a key element of the evidence base. As with many academic disciplines, scholars in the Creative Arts do not necessarily align with one another when it comes to elements of a Drama or Music education. NESA engages with a wide range of academic scholarship and adopts the elements appropriate for the development of the syllabuses.

Scholarship is also considered alongside NESA principles and. Citation in the evidence base does not necessarily imply a wholesale adoption of an academic's work, but acknowledgement that NESA has been informed, at least in part, by the work of the relevant academic.

During the writing of the concept paper and the drafting of the Drama 11-12 syllabus, some of the scholarship of Christine Hatton was consulted. Specifically, material from "Schooling the imagination in the 21st century ... (or why playbuilding matters)" and *Young at art: classroom playbuilding in action* informed elements of the syllabus. This includes the idea that "[t]he 'live' experience of making, performing and appreciating the drama work is critical to building students' foundational understandings of the subject". In addition, Hatton's discussion of the ways students generate ideas in collaboration during playbuilding, learning through metaxis (both real and imagined worlds), and the essential links to models of 21st century learning aligns to the explicit learning of drama and theatre throughout the syllabus document.

### Question 2a Pages 22-23

**Mr KEVIN ANDERSON:** Mr Cahill, thanks for your time. I'm wondering if the TAG received a copy of the draft syllabus or assessment before it was published on 28 October?

**PAUL CAHILL:** I'd have to take that specifically on notice, because they would have, at different iterations, seen copies of the syllabus

**Mr KEVIN ANDERSON:** I'm talking about the draft, Mr Cahill. I'm talking about the final draft before it was published.

**PAUL CAHILL:** The final draft—again I'd take that on notice. As Mr Martin said, the process is taking advice from a range of people. The TAG is one group, assessment group is another, some critical friends that we use—we're getting multiple voices, and we form the draft. So at which point the TAG actually saw the final syllabus, I don't know. It may not have been the one that has gone out for consultation completely. But, as I say, I'll take that on notice.

**The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO:** Can that be music and drama that you take on notice please?

**PAUL CAHILL:** Yes, absolutely.

**Mr KEVIN ANDERSON:** Mr Martin, do you have an answer to that?

**PAUL MARTIN:** No, if Dr Cahill has taken that on notice. The number of people who have had input into the syllabus, including TAGs, is broader than it has been in previous syllabus iterations. That's deliberate. I will take it on notice, as Dr Cahill has indicated.

### Question 2a ANSWER

NESA consults the TAG throughout the project to ensure syllabuses reflect evidence-based research and best practice.

To ensure a diverse range of perspectives on the Draft syllabuses, a range of concurrent targeted reviews are conducted by:

- **Content and pedagogy experts** (including TAG)
- **Diverse learning experts** focusing on accessibility, inclusivity and diverse representations
- **Aboriginal Education stakeholders** focusing on appropriateness and cultural safety
- **Assessment experts** focusing on the assessability of outcomes and content
- **Practising teachers** (where relevant) focusing on clarity

NESA refines the draft syllabus based on the feedback from the targeted review and releases this version of the draft syllabus for consultation.

The Music TAG members were sent draft syllabuses for Music 1, 2, Life Skills and Extension on 26 August. NESA convened a meeting to discuss the drafts 29 August and TAG members were given until 5 September to submit written feedback. Changes were made to draft syllabuses between 6 September and publication on 28 October in reflection of TAG feedback. TAG members were sent draft syllabuses 28 October to provide feedback on during the public consultation period.

The Drama TAG members were sent draft syllabuses for Drama and Life Skills on 8 August NESA convened a meeting to discuss the drafts 15 August. Changes were made to draft syllabuses between 16 August and publication on 28 October in reflection of TAG feedback. TAG members were sent draft syllabuses 28 October to provide feedback on during the public consultation period.

## Question 2b Pages 22-23

**Dr JOE McGIRR:** Mr Martin, we've received some feedback that the Music 1 written examination will double in length and nearly double in value. If I've got this correct, you made the contention that the performance assessment process will move from external to internal, but won't change in value or percentage contribution. Is that correct? Because that seems to run contrary to that advice that we've received about the value and length of the written

**PAUL MARTIN:** I'm going to refer the specificity of some of your question to Dr Cahill but, in relation to internal versus external assessment of group performance in drama, there is still a judgement of the assessment of group performance, but it becomes part of the internal school-based assessment. That may change the length and the nature of the external written HSC, but the balance of performance to written, in terms of fifty-fifty, as far as I understand it, doesn't change. But I will confirm that with Dr Cahill and on notice as required.

## Question 2b ANSWER

### Music 1

- The current HSC Music 1 written exam is 1 hour 5 minutes including reading time. The proposed exam is 2 hours including reading time.
- The proposed HSC written examination will be worth 50 marks (50% of the total exam weighting). The current written exam is worth 30 marks.
- The proposed practical examination would be worth 50 marks (50% of the total exam weighting).
- The proposed practical exam has double the number of mandated performance items (25 marks each). Currently only one performance is mandated.
- It is proposed that the current practical exam electives in performing and composing are moved to school-based assessment which forms 60% of the total school-based assessment mark.

### Drama

- The proposed examination specifications have a written paper worth 50 marks and an individual project worth 50 marks.
- The current exam specifications have a written exam worth 40 marks and an individual project worth 30 marks and a group performance worth 30 marks.
- It is proposed to move the current externally examined group performance to school-based assessment.