

EDUC6775 Assessment 1b - Jamie Gabriel

Lesson Plan: Year 8 Topic: Graphic Notation (GN) (Repertoire: Art Music)

QTM Coding Sheet Results

| Element | Evidence: Coding notes | Score |
|-------------------------------|---|-------|
| 1.1 Deep knowledge | Understanding developed of both what GN is and how it relates to music concepts. | 4 |
| 1.2 Deep understanding | Exploration of GN in different settings to build understanding. | 4 |
| 1.3 Problematic knowledge | Discussion of limitations of GN (end of lesson however). | 3 |
| 1.4 Higher-order thinking | Students engaged in interpreting, comparing, creating, synthesising GN information. | 3 |
| 1.5 Metalanguage | Music concepts named and discussed. | 4 |
| 1.6 Substantive communication | Opportunities to explain answers and engage in discussion. | 4 |
| 2.1 Explicit quality criteria | Meaning of GN clarified with multiple examples. | 4 |
| 2.3 High expectations | Hands on activities using increasingly complex textures and flash cards to provide challenging collaborative opportunities. | 4 |
| 2.6 Student direction | Student choice available (card use), able to create interpretations and experience autonomy over learning. | 4 |
| 3.1 Background knowledge | Building on prior understanding, (through little relationship to electronic music unit). | 2 |
| 3.2 Cultural knowledge | Music drawn from different contexts and settings. | 3 |
| 3.3 Knowledge integration | Integrating performance, composition, aural skills, music concept understanding. | 4 |
| 3.5 Connectedness | Linking to real world practice with examples of graphic scores. | 4 |
| 3.6 Narrative | Example of thunderstorm invites imagination and story building. | 3 |

Written feedback on strengths and weaknesses of this lesson

I believe this is a fairly strong lesson plan that demonstrates use of the constructive alignment design principles. It provides an inventive way to introduce and consolidate musical elements that are explicitly linked to syllabus outcomes in listening, performing, composing, while also developing music literacy. While it is difficult to apply some frameworks from the literature (such as WHERE TO (NSW Department of Education, n.d.), principles) without viewing the broader curriculum implementation, there is still strong evidence of a backward design approach being followed (Monash University, n.d.). The lesson also includes strategies for managing differentiation and mechanisms to allow evidence collection by the teacher.

I felt that although there was a good balance between syllabus demands and student needs, time management might be a potential issue (noted as a possible pitfall by Killen and O'Toole, 2022) due to the somewhat open-ended nature of the activities. While it is not completely clear how the lesson accounts for diverse learning styles, the learning process has been well-sequenced, encourages active learning, supports differentiated instruction, and provides mechanisms for formative assessment. The lesson plan also reflects navigating complex and sometimes competing priorities between educational frameworks (seen both in the content of Bloom's revised taxonomy (Kratwohl, 2002) and backward design principles (McTighe & Thomas, 2003).

I gave mostly scores of 4, reflecting the high quality of the lesson plan, while acknowledging the limits of evaluating it without broader context. I did, however, assign four scores of 3 and one score of 2. My reasons for the scores of 3 are:

- 1.3: Limitations of graphic notation are not fully explored until the end, which may affect engagement.
- 1.4: There may be too many elements introduced, making it hard to focus on core musical concepts.
- 3.2: Although a range of musical styles is used, there could be more integration of Indigenous music which this topic lends itself to.
- 3.6: Links to narrative could be expanded and their constructive use could be strengthened, allowing a further exploration of 3.2.

For the score of 2:

- 3.1: Leveraging the previous unit, the use of electronic music provides an ideal way to explore alternative methods of visualising music data, by analysing things like Piano Roll, EQ Spectrograms etc. and this feels like a missed opportunity.

References

Killen, R., & O'Toole, M. (2022). *Planning for quality teaching and learning* (Chapter 5, pp. 111–142). In R. Killen & M. O'Toole, *Effective teaching strategies: Lessons from research and practice* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Kratwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 212–218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2

McTighe, J., & Thomas, R. S. (2003). Backward design for forward action. *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 52–55.

Monash University. (n.d.). *Constructive alignment*. Teach HQ. <https://www.monash.edu/learning-teaching/teachhq/Teaching-practices/learning-outcomes/how-to/constructive-alignment>

NSW Department of Education. (n.d.). *Backward design model*. <https://education.nsw.gov.au/teaching-and-learning/professional-learning/teacher-quality-and-accreditation/strong-start-great-teachers/refining-practice/planning-a-sequence-of-lessons/backward-design-model>