

#1

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, June 20, 2022 3:38:24 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, June 20, 2022 4:16:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:38:28  
**IP Address:** 203.62.28.2

---

Page 2

**Q1****Dickson College**

Which school are you from?

**Q2**

Shape Paper BackgroundThe background provides a clear sense of the disciplinary, systemic and national parameters under which the course will be written.

(no label)

**Agree**

Comment::

This seems like a fine outline of the background.



**Q3**

**COURSE GOALS** The "Aims of the Live Production and Services Curriculum" section is clear about the intended learning and priorities, yet allows for flexibility.

(no label)

Comment::

**Strongly Disagree**

Whilst very well written, I think that the aims section comes off as very theatre centric. There is a huge wide world of production outside of the theatre that could include: Live music, streaming services, corporate functions, artistic lighting (Enlighten, Vivid etc.) Setting it up to be as such limits students' interest and ability to work in other parts of the industry. I would be worried that we may deter certain students, and we may not be setting up students that do like theatre work for the reality beyond the theatre space. Being able to work in with a band's vision of their sound is just as important as a director's vision for their stage. There is a recurring reference to "theatre fast becoming a technical affair," I would argue we've already reached it. The fact theatre is so focused on lighting screams the inability to do without it now. I wouldn't be surprised to see more emphasis being put on sound design in future, however there seems to be a lack of wanting to understand audio from a theatre's perspective. Once again, production exists outside of a theatre, it would be good to have a balance of purpose here I would love to see a stronger emphasis put on here about working with clients too. My experience is that a production job is a customer service job first. We can't start designing and pulling off amazing experiences if we do not understand our client and what they want first.

**Q4**

The rationale for the course and unit structure is well-explained and well-justified

(no label)

Comments::

**Agree**

Once again, look at talking about Employer / Client expectations. These are some times at odds with each other, so balance is helpful. At the end of the day, if both of these parties are happy then I have succeeded. The other thing is that in a lot of cases your client is the only person you need to please, micromanaging isn't a great model in this industry.



**Q5**

The proposed units are conceptually distinct.

(no label)

Comments::

**Agree**

There seems to be a pretty good distinction between different units. This may need to be fleshed out a little more in the course document with some examples.

---

**Q6**

The unit descriptions are clear and and provide for innovative approaches.

(no label)

Comment::

**Disagree**

I feel like some of the wording in the units kind of point the reader in the direction of a theatre show as the answer: "Students interpret design and technical guidelines to understand form and purpose of the production." - For example, to hit this from a live bands sound perspective we may talk about a festival patch, however the depth that we could go into would be limited compared to something that has a creative design, rather than a logical system approach. I think this is okay, it might be worth looking at the differences between different areas, but it seems that emphasis on theatre skills is on display here. Why shouldn't we look at the planning, design and deployment of technical systems? It is done in the theatre with a lighting rig hanging, however to a muuuuch smaller degree compared to a live music event.

---

**Q7**

"Considerations", situates the course clearly in relation to curriculum priorities.

(no label)

**Agree**

---



**Q8**

This proposed course is distinct from other BSSS accredited courses.

(no label)

Comment::

**Agree**

I would love to see a T accreditation for this course. It has design, artistic and technical skills all rolled into the same course. It is similar to Media in this fashion, meaning that for a student to do well they need to be able to demonstrate all of these things. The course calls for critical thinking, evaluation of industry practices and process. These things are currently generally seen in the T courses, not as much the A courses. Having this as an A course will restrict which students will sign up to do it. Any T student that is interested in the area will be restricted as this will be their one course that won't count towards their ATAR. Meaning they need to have everything else perfect. The problem with this is that there are plenty of T students that are interested in doing this kind of course. In my R unit for Live Production 70% of them are T students.

**Q9**

The course should have a VET Component that provides the opportunity for students to achieve a Qualification or a Statement of Attainment towards vocational certification?

(no label)

Comment::

**Disagree**

The VET competency isn't recognised in the live production industry, it will not get them a job outcome. Some schools may find it a good option, but as someone who has (and still does) work in the industry, I cannot in good conscience sell students a promise that this will help them get a job, where largely it will not. Production companies are more interested in if a worker will show up, work hard and listen as they teach them. Encouraging students to have a learning nature is more important than VET in this industry. If the VET doesn't mesh well with the course it could be detrimental to the course taught at the other Accreditation levels. This has been my experience with the IT VET component in the past.