



Review of the Australian Qualifications Framework

Discussion Paper

DECEMBER 2018

The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Review Panel wishes to draw on the considerable expertise and experience that has developed across a broad range of organisations and individuals in relation to the Review's [Terms of Reference](#).

In its discussion paper, the Panel has opted to provide to organisations and individuals some of the Panel's initial thinking about the case for change to the AQF, but invites differing analysis, conclusions and proposals.

To make a submission to the Review, please email this form to AQFReview@education.gov.au by **15 March 2019**.

Please note that the Australian Government Department of Education and Training will not treat a submission as confidential unless requested that the whole submission, or part of the submission, be treated as such.

Please limit your response to no more than 3000 words.

Respondent name

Penny Griggs, CEO

Respondent organisation (where relevant)

Adelaide Central School of Art

1. In what ways is the AQF fit, or not fit, for purpose?

The AQF is valuable in providing a consistent framework for the specification of higher education qualifications. The requirement that higher education institutions clarify and publicise course structures, aims and outcomes has been very beneficial. While the specifications are necessarily broad to enable the Framework to encompass the very diverse range of higher education programs available, some fine-tuning appears desirable.

2. Where the AQF is not fit for purpose, what reforms should be made to it and what are the most urgent priorities? Please be specific, having regard to the possible approaches suggested in the discussion paper and other approaches.

We support the recognition of a wider range of courses, especially short courses and intensives, so that these can be counted, where desired, towards degree programs. We also support a more flexible approach to the specification of volume of learning.

Short courses and intensives have an important role to play in foundation programs, bridging programs and continuing education and are especially valuable in visual arts training as they enable artists to build their skills and techniques progressively. It is not necessary to possess a formal qualification to become a visual artist. However, those wishing to become artists benefit greatly from training in art schools, particularly training with lecturers who are themselves practising artists. Students should have the option of undertaking immersive degree programs full-time or developing their skills and knowledge part-time while simultaneously gaining experience as artists. They also need to update their skills and knowledge continually. Art schools thus need to be flexible in their course design and delivery methods.

The specification of the volume of learning also needs to be more flexible. Not all students require the same amount of time to acquire particular skills. Additionally, a visual art student, especially a higher level student, might spend much time thinking about the nature and design of a particular artwork before commencing the creation of the artwork, while the execution of the artwork itself may take comparatively little time. Such informal creative thinking is a characteristic of the arts generally. What is crucial is the assessment of competencies at the conclusion of study and the teaching and student support provided during study to enable those competencies to be developed. Volume of learning specifications can potentially place constraints on curriculum design. We note that the AQF specifies the "typical" volume of learning, and that 1200 hours is taken to equate to a year, but we suggest that a range be specified instead.

3. In relation to approaches suggested by the Panel or proposed in submissions or through consultations, what are the major implementation issues the Review should consider? Please consider regulatory and other impacts.

In relation to the possible accreditation of short courses and intensives, we note the potential difficulties of establishing frameworks for the specification of, and processes of accreditation for, such courses, but we encourage the consideration of the possible approaches set out on p18 of the AQF's Discussion Paper.

Other

--