University of Roehampton London

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

MA Special Educational Needs

Academic Year: 2015 – 2016 (SPRING TERM)

MODULE CODE: **EDU020L021S**

MODULE TITLE: **Independent Study: Project report**

TITLE:

The Village School "Marks of Intent" project: An exploratory study into the possibilities of developing and using the "Sounds of Intent" model as an assessment and curriculum framework for Art with PMLD children.

By Jenny Cooper

INTRODUCTION

When the government introduced the National Curriculum in 1988, (Education Reform Act, 1988), the only information for teachers of children with SEN (special educational needs) was in Section 18. It states, with no supporting guidance, that pupils may have the curriculum adapted, as specified in their statement of SEN. The launch of statutory "p-levels" in 2007 (QCA, 2007) signified the only (some would say tokenistic) attempt to include these children (Imray & Hinchcliffe, 2012).

When developing "Sounds of Intent", an alternative assessment and curriculum for music, Adam Ockelford found that the music p-levels had serious shortcomings; they were "founded on social constructs" and were conceptually flawed (Ockelford, 2008: 262). Other researchers have commented on the anachronistic nature of assessment programmes which do not take into account vast differences among individuals (Gardner, 1992), but little has been written on p-levels and there are few alternatives for children with profound and multiple learning disabilities (PMLD).

"Sounds of Intent" is such a successful alternative that Ofsted have held it up as an example of good practice (OFSTED, 2012: 51-52). There is now a proposal for an art-based "Marks of Intent" and Ockelford has suggested further research in this area (Ockelford, pending 2017).

As lead teacher in the large expressive arts department at The Village School, I have undertaken this short project to explore "Marks of Intent" with a sample of PMLD students to question its usefulness, appropriateness and accessibility. Could it improve on P-Levels as a way forward for art teachers of PMLD children?

CRITIQUE OF CURRENT LITERATURE

Ockelford (2008:47) highlights some "serious issues" with P-Levels. Assessment criteria is vague; P2 (i) states "accept and engage in co-active exploration" and P2 (ii) "they cooperate with shared exploration" (QCA, 2007). Vital aspects are missed; in music there is no mention of early vocalisation, a cornerstone of musical development (Ockelford, 2008). There are discrete subjects yet levels 1 to 3 are the same for all implying identical development across every domain. Music is assessed in non-musical terms:

> "this is precisely what the P-Levels for music do: confusing musical and extra-musical issues, and ultimately being clear about neither"
>
> (Ockelford, 2008:54)

Ockelford's preoccupation with domain-specific assessment goes to the heart of our beliefs about intelligence. I have witnessed profoundly disabled children with no formal language communicating and creating beautiful music. They may not reach P-Level 2(ii) in Literacy but can make outstanding progress using Ockelford's music-specific "Sounds of Intent".

Howard Gardner's "multiple intelligences" theory supports domain-specific assessment:

> "assessment must probe those abilities and concepts which are most central to the arts. Rather than crafting the curriculum to suit the assessment, we must devise assessments which do justice to what is most pivotal in an art form."
>
> (Gardner, 1989b:77)

Gardner describes society's inclination to consider most important those subjects that lend themselves easily to testing (1992). He does not believe that "children's competence in one cognitive sphere should predict the child's level of competence in other spheres" (Gardner, 1989b:73). Schirrmacher, likewise, (1986:5) says that art is an end in itself and of value to the child, "not merely as a springboard to the other basic (and often erroneously considered more important) curriculum areas".

The stage theorists disagree. Piaget's sensori-motor phase assumes lack of intelligence and thought where there is no language and each stage is a pre-requisite for the next:

> "in the absence of language or symbolic function, however, these constructions are made with the sole support of perceptions and movements and thus by means of a sensori-motor coordination of actions, without the intervention of representation or thought….there is a continuous progression from spontaneous movements and reflexes to acquired habits and from the latter to intelligence…"
>
> (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969:4-5)

Luquet (2001:85) presented sequential stages in children's drawing, starting with "fortuitous realism" and believed children needed an "internal model" in their minds from which to draw (Luquet, 2001:51-52). Only "mental laziness" in avoiding developing the model would cause a child not to draw. If they have the intellectual capacity for the model, they can draw.

Vygotsky contradicts Piaget, stating that "learning in one area has very little influence on overall development" (Vygotsky, 1978: 82). He describes the mind as containing specific, not general capabilities, each independent of the others.

Golomb (2002:11) also resents the dominance of Piaget whose endpoint in science is "logico-mathematical reasoning; in the visual arts it is optical realism". Seeing child art as deficient is outdated, Golomb says, because realism is shown through history not to be a "universal end point" in artistic endeavour (2002:4). Visual realism was a goal of the Renaissance, only one historical phase of art development, and is mistaken as "an intrinsic phase of human graphic development" (2002:46):

> "the artist's goal is to create a pictorial world imbued with meaning and feelings, to interpret some aspect of reality rather than to construct a faithful replica of it"
>
> (Golomb, 2002:48)

Golomb, along with Kandinsky, Klee, Miro and Matisse, believes in the aesthetic and expressive value of child art. Art in childhood, she says, is "spontaneous, playful and deeply satisfying" (2002:48). Schirrmacher agrees: "much of young children's art is private, egocentric, and not intended to look like something" (Schirrmacher, 1986:4).



(Miro, 1964)

Preoccupation with visual representation as an end-product is a big hurdle for teachers of PMLD children. Jolley (2010:274) reminds us that when schooling expanded to produce factory workers for the industrial revolution, "art" consisted of technical drawing of lines and outline shapes using measuring and rulers. Imagination in art was not recognised until after expressionism.

Current assessment frameworks continue to place much value on the end-product:

- "become proficient in drawing" (DFE, 2014:80)
- "know that paintings…have meaning. They use a growing art vocabulary" (QCA, 2007:6)
- "create simple representations of people" (NSEAD, 2014:7)

There is little educational literature on PMLD. Teachers look to Early Years pedagogy to find psychology and curriculum stripped down to basics. The Early Years Matters curriculum guidance for England encourages the valuing of child art stating that children should not have to copy someone else's drawing, however, the starting point is:

> "Children notice everything and closely observe the most ordinary things"
> (Early Years Matters, 2014)

This is beyond the reach of many PMLD children. Image projection to the retina is only one part of our visual perception process; the brain is the most crucial part (Arnheim, 1974).

Arnheim, in his analysis of "Art and Visual Perception" (1974:136), argues that we have moved on from art as exact replications of nature and should not merely tolerate alternative approaches but accept they can be considered "entirely lifelike" by their adherents. This is in direct contrast to Luquet (2001) who stated that he had never seen a child attempting to represent something at the fortuitous realism stage. Perhaps he did not understand what they were trying to represent; PMLD children have a different experience of the world so it follows that their art will be different also.

The belief that PMLD children can learn, think and achieve has led Imray and Hinchcliffe (2012) to call for pedagogies appropriate for PMLD children. They question the importance placed on literacy and numeracy over the arts underlining Ockelford's, Gardner's and Vygotsky's implications that we cannot use a one-size-fits-all sequential curriculum.

Children with learning disabilities "can achieve in the creative arts", he says, but will mostly work at or below the starting level of the curriculum. He says "there is no formal government document or reform which accepts and acknowledges that a different curriculum framework is needed". We are passively following an out-dated model and need one which specifically addresses PMLD (Imray & Hinchcliffe, 2012:154).

This project will look at the draft "Marks of Intent" (Ockelford, pending 2017) as a possible alternative art curriculum and assessment framework for these children and will take the form of an exploratory study.

THE PROJECT: METHODOLOGY

The project's "deliverables" (Cohen et al, 2011:107) were hard to define because it was expected that more questions than answers would be raised, this being an area with little previous research. Two professionals in the school (Head of Department and lead Art teacher) would use Levels 1 to 4 of the draft "Marks of Intent" framework over seven weeks as an exploratory observational study, finding out whether it seemed more useful, appropriate and accessible than the P-Levels.

Genre		(Fine) Arts [painting, drawing and sculpture]					
Domain		Reactive		Proactive		Interactive	
Level 1	C	Encounters things that could potentially be seen (but does not process visual or tactual information)		Unknowingly does things and is unaware that others see or feel them		Relates to other people unwittingly through vision or touch	
Level 2	I	Shows an emerging awareness of visual images and tactual sensations		Deliberately does things for others to see (*e.g.*, scribbles on paper, moulds clay)		Interacts with others using vision or touch (*e.g.*, eye points to gain shared attention)	
Level 3	R	**Abstract**	**Representational**	**Abstract**	**Representational**	**Abstract**	**Representational**
		Is aware of simple visual and tactual patterns (*e.g.*, repeated blobs of colour, balls of clay)*]*	Is aware of the imitation of simple features of an object in a representation of it (*e.g.*, colour, shape)	Creates simple patterns (*e.g.*, repeated blobs of colour, lines that are intentionally more or less straight)	Copies simple features of things (*e.g.*, blob of appropriate colour for tree, circle for face)	Engages with another to create simple visual patterns (through imitation)	Engages with another to imitate simple visual features of things
Level 4	C	**the beginnings of Gestalt perception**					
		Individual features of things are perceived together to form 'wholes' (*e.g.*, dots forming a line; approximate shapes become 'corrected' in memory)	Is aware that whole objects can be represented (symbolically)	Creates whole shapes from two or more simple elements (*e.g.*, a square comprising four straight lines)	Draws or sculpts entire objects (and can complete 'teapot with parts missing' puzzle and similar)	Engages with another to create simple visual or tactual wholes from parts	Engages with another to create representations of things visually or tactually

(The "Marks of Intent" table, Levels 1 to 4: Ockelford, pending 2017)

Quantitative and qualitative methods were used. Cohen et al (2011:22) state that "the world is not exclusively quantitative or qualitative; it is not an either/or world, but a mixed world". This is certainly true of special education. The results table (Appendix 1) quantifies numbers of children and incidents which were assessed as falling within different levels. As important as the numbers are discussions around how they were plotted.

PMLD children were filmed within art lessons (Appendix 2) each time they appeared to react, interact or were proactive, according to the framework. I was a "participant-as-observer" (Gold, 1958:217) having revealed myself as observer to the staff and with prior knowledge of the students within my own teaching area (music). This could add bias to my film selections as well as the analysis, however, observation is always "inevitably selective" (Cohen et al, 2011:459).

To mitigate against bias a protocol (Appendix 3) was used to guide both my analysis (Appendix 4) and the rater's analysis (Appendix 5) of the film clips in conjunction with the "Marks of Intent" framework. The rater observed just over 10% of the film clips, selected systematically.

Cohen et al (2011:474) suggest striving for 90% or more inter-rater reliability using his formula:

Number of times two observers agree

X100

Number of possible opportunities to agree

The results showed only 78% inter-rater reliability. This may be due to lack of detail on the draft framework. “Sounds of Intent” has scales indicating levels of engagement and consistency as well as four elements to each level adding further layers to the overall assessment. With “Marks of Intent” both observers looked for a best-fit assessment with room for interpretation.

PMLD children were filmed from two classes in Key Stages 2 and 3 which constitutes all PMLD children at the school between the ages of 7 and 14. Filming other Key Stages was impossible due to timetable and filming restrictions. The sample size of twelve children was small (Cohen et al, 2011:143-4), but reasonable in terms of sixty-three film clips. Sampling was not “purposive” (Cohen et al, 2011:156); children were not hand-picked for certain attributes. Every child that had PMLD that could be included was included.

There was a range of art activity; I asked the teacher to continue her usual lessons. This included clay, painting and wall projections.

The camera was not a fixed point; I moved to wherever the student was at the time; this was necessary to avoid students being obscured from view by their own wheelchairs. After initially selecting only the “best” clips for analysis in the end I included all to avoid bias. Certain clips were impossible to assess (Appendix 2: clips 52-60) and interestingly the second observer’s assessment difficulties matched my own.

ANALYSIS

Issues in teaching PMLD children were apparent immediately. The majority were assessed as levels 2-3 rather than 1 or 4. This is in line with expectations for PMLD children and anecdotal evidence from “Sounds of Intent” use, giving credibility to “Marks of Intent” as a meaningful developmental framework. The two clips (1 and 36) that were not agreed on by the second observer were adjusted into Level 2 from 1 and 3 which gave 100% inter-rater reliability on the majority being within levels 2-3.

Lessons were 45 minutes long and this was clearly too short bearing in mind the individual needs of the children. Time to respond and to develop ideas and skills was often not there (clips 17 and 41). Constant engagement and attentiveness from staff was needed and although good practice was seen (clips 8, 11, 13, 32 and 36), it was inconsistent (42).

The gulf between the child’s physical ability and what they intended to produce quickly became evident. Gardner (1989b:73) states that “in nearly every area, an individual’s perceptual or comprehension capacities develop well in advance of productive capacities”. This explains why more results were plotted in the Reactive than the Proactive domain; again similar to “Sounds of Intent”; Ockelford et al

(2011:178) found that “a child’s capacity for attending to sounds may well be more advanced than his or her ability to produce them”.

The representational art debate was apparent again when assessing the films. There were few examples of representational art; most appeared abstract or what Arnheim (1974:136) might encourage us to see as “entirely lifelike” to adherents of that genre. Despite this, children were seen intentionally producing and creating (clips 21, 33 and 43). Arnheim says this work should not be “regarded negatively as something below standard, something to be overcome, the sooner the better, on the road to ‘competent’ art” (1974:203). Schirrmacher (1986:4) adds that “early efforts at representation may not be recognisable to an adult”. I therefore question the “representational” and “abstract” strands on the “Marks of Intent” chart (Ockelford, pending 2017:49). Gardner (1989a) advocates that as long as art is representational, it can be got at by the censors. While PMLD children in England may not suffer the persecution of Ai Wei Wei in China, their art may be judged deficient by those looking for representation.

Interaction, one of the three domains in “Marks of Intent” and “Sounds of Intent”, became a central theme. I was sceptical as to whether interaction was as central to art as it is to music since art can be solitary. Interaction occurs when sharing one’s work through exhibiting or curating. Grayson Perry interacts with his audience regularly on Channel 4 but does he *need* to for his art to exist? Was Ockelford assessing art using music terms?

It soon became clear that interaction was crucial. Where there was quality interaction with staff, children progressed to higher levels. Art became a fun game through rhythmic banging with a paint roller on the wall (clips 34 and 51) and children responded proactively (clip 36, a few minutes later), imitating movements when staff demonstrated and engaged with them.

Vygotsky’s learning theories showed the importance of this interaction. His “Zone of Proximal Development” relies on adults or more capable peers guiding a child to their potential through interaction:

> “human learning presupposes a specific social nature and a process by which children grow into the intellectual life of those around them”
>
> (Vygotsky, 1978:84)

He stresses the importance of children’s ability to imitate. Even Piaget and Inhelder describe the necessity of “social interaction and transmission” (1969:156). Dissanayake (1992:173) said art was created not for its own sake but for communal bonding, “essential to group survival”. Althouse et al also found:

> “The mere availability of materials and tools in early childhood classrooms will not alone enhance children’s art expression. *Adult input* is as essential to young children’s artistic explorations”
>
> (Althouse et al, 2003:7)

Robson and Rowe (2012:362) found that “children showed much more involvement in an activity when they were playing in a group or pair than when they were playing

alone". PMLD children need adult assistance in order to "play" with their peers but the motivation and involvement described here was illustrated in clip 51.

Staff interaction and engagement was not always of the best quality to help the child. Imray and Hinchcliffe (2012:151) believe teachers of children with learning difficulties need to be "highly conversant with intensive interaction as an area of 'specific knowledge'". Intensive interaction, as defined by Nind (1999), helps develop communication in pre-speech individuals with learning difficulties. It can be used in the Interactive domains of both "Sounds of Intent" and "Marks of Intent". For music, intensive interaction closely mirrors the parent-child bonding relationship that develops through early babbling and vocalising. In art, mirroring of physical movements and brush-strokes (seen in clips 16, 31 and 50) are perhaps the equivalent.

This emphasis on movement and senses other than sight was another finding of the project. Ockelford mentions the proprioceptive sense (pending 2017:2) but identifies sight as the principal sense for art (pending 2017:9). For the PMLD children I observed, proprioception seemed to be as important as sight.

Montero believes that proprioception can be an active sense when appreciating art and gives as an example appreciation of the Mona Lisa's smile:

> "when we observe the smile we feel what it is like to smile in that way. If this is correct, there seems to be no reason to claim that visual experience is necessarily more fundamental than proprioceptive experience"
>
> (Montero, 2006:236)

Montero's claims are underpinned by recent discoveries of "mirror neurons" activated in the brain when one performs a task or sees a task being performed. Franklin (2010:161) describes mirror neurons as causing "carefully observed actions" to "fuse with the observer at subtle neural levels". He explains that because infants are pre-verbal, most attachment takes place through physical means, hence the importance of proprioception and mirror neurons in early art.

Arnheim (1974) predates mirror neurons but wrote extensively on balance, movement and dynamics in art, introducing the famous scenario whereby the child draws the circular motion that the lawn mower carries out rather than a picture of the mower itself. He questions the assumption that vision and hearing are top of the hierarchy of senses, arguing that a dancer develops her performance using mainly the kinaesthetic sense. He describes "a pattern of visual forces, whose impact is immediately felt" (1974:409).

Piaget, Luquet and the P-Levels all acknowledge how crucial the physical is in art development. Piaget presents the sensori-motor phase (1969). Luquet expects children to trace marks on whatever surface is to hand, whether this involves paper and pen or their own "rather grubby hands" (2001:86). The P-Levels suggest "scrunching paper…with fingers…manipulating and shaping malleable materials" (QCA, 2007:6). If stage theorists and their critics can agree on the importance of the proprioceptive sense there should perhaps be greater reference to proprioception in "Marks of Intent".

The final point arising from the observations was the importance of tools and materials to develop skills and give variety. Arnheim values the use of techniques and materials because it "keeps the attention of students alive" (1974:205). Gardner, having suggested that the Chinese place too much emphasis on skill development over creativity, admits it is necessary to get the balance right: "the child may end up without skills" (1989a:157). The P-Levels and the NSEAD levels include examples of tool use. "Marks of Intent" does not include this, so when the clips were analysed, use of new materials were not recorded as progress for the child (clips 3, 14, 23 and 26). It would seem appropriate to include tool and material use as a key element when the chart is developed further.

The lack of detail in the P-Levels was problematical in assessing PMLD children in art at The Village School. The children would progress perhaps two levels during their school career along a sequential curriculum designed with a questionable end point in mind. There was a tendency, therefore, towards an unreliable assessment which failed to recognise the achievement of outliers, because this carried the risk of no realistic progression from the point the child had reached.

One outlier was identified in the project, child AB (clip 43). He reached Level 4, including representational art, despite having PMLD. Using "Marks of Intent", he could develop further by working towards a "whole of a work of art" (Ockelford, pending 2017:49). Using P-Levels there are obstacles to subsequent stages because certain "materials" and "processes" cannot be carried out due to his physical limitations not art abilities. "Marks of Intent" seems more inclusive and less discriminatory in this case. Several students (see "EC" and "AKH", Appendix 1) featured at varying levels for different domains which seems to indicate a more honest assessment than one overall P-Level as well as giving an indication to the teacher about what to work on next.

The project revealed gaps in P-Level assessment; there is no assessment of interaction in art or of the development of the child's awareness of the multi-sensory context, such as the use of projections in the darkened room (clip 45) and the use of music (clip 20) which seemed to be effective as a means of developing the reactive domain.

"Marks of Intent" levels need to be broken down further to develop a sufficiently detailed assessment. The findings of this project could feed into this process. In "Sounds of Intent" these elements include "pure sound and music", "sound and music related to other things" and "technical elements" (imerc et al, 2016). For Art, the equivalents could be:

- "pure Art" : representation and abstraction could be here rather than on the main chart; also the widely recognised art elements such as form, shape, line, colour, composition (Schirrmacher, 1986)
- "art related to other things" (including proprioceptive development as well as use of other multi-sensory elements)
- "technical elements" (tools, techniques and materials could be here).

CONCLUSIONS

The project led to debates which should be explored further before fully endorsing any art curriculum and framework for PMLD children:

- art may be representational even when we do not recognise it as such
- the importance of interaction in art teaching with PMLD
- the importance of the proprioceptive sense in early art development
- the value of tools, techniques and materials
- the gulf between physical ability and production outcomes
- obstacles to art teaching in the real-life situation (timing, staffing etc.)
- the layers of detail needed for a true and detailed assessment

"Marks of Intent" seems a good starting point towards a meaningful art curriculum and assessment framework with more detail than P-Levels and acknowledging physical restrictions and abstract art as well as representational. The 63 film incidents fell across three domains and four levels, giving much scope for showing progress in PMLD children. Limitations on the current proposal could be overcome with more detail. This detail needs to acknowledge the significance of tools, techniques and materials and the importance of proprioceptive development in order to reflect the findings of this project.

The importance of materials, the hierarchy of senses and the nature of interaction in PMLD lessons suggests that further work should be done investigating the possibility of the broader "Multisensory Sounds of Intent" which has already been suggested by Ockelford (pending 2017). Indications can be seen in the film clips of art drawing on other senses (for example, 20, 27, 30 and 45) that it was often this that raised the child's progress.

Teaching of PMLD children is different from any other. Imray and Hinchcliffe (2012:156) believe "the case for needs-led, separate and distinct pedagogies for those with severe and profound learning difficulties as part of a national framework is strong, and we do not serve our children well if we continue to ignore it". Those of us on the quest to understand and liberate these children know that the boundaries of perception have to be altered:

> "We do not know what the art of the future will look like. No one particular style is art's final climax. Every style is but one valid way of looking at the world, one view of the holy mountain, which offers a different image from every place but can be seen as the same everywhere".
>
> (Arnheim, 1974:461)

REFERENCES

Althouse, R., Johnson, M.H. & Mitchell, S.T. (2003) *The Colors of Learning: Integrating the Visual Arts into the Early Childhood Curriculum.* New York, USA: Volume 85 Teachers College Press.

Arnheim, R. (1974) *Art and Visual Perception A Psychology of the Creative Eye.* (2nd) California, USA: University of California Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education.* (7th) Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Department for Education (2014) *The National Curriculum in England Key Stages 3 and 4 Framework Document.* London: The Stationery Office: DFE.

Dissanayake, E. (1992) Art for life's sake. *Art Therapy.* 9(4) pp.169-175.

Early Years Matters (2014) *Early Years (Under 5s) Foundation Stage Framework (EYFS).* Available at: http://earlyyearsmatters.co.uk/index.php/eyfs/learning-and-development/expressive-arts-and-design-ead/ (Accessed: 23/05/2016).

Franklin, M. (2010) Affect regulation, mirror neurons, and the third hand: Formulating mindful empathetic art interventions. *Art Therapy.* 27(4) pp.160-167.

Gardner, H. (1992) Assessment in context- the alternative to standardized testing. *Evaluation in Education and Human Services.* 30pp.77-119.

Gardner, H. (1989a) The key in the key slot: Creativity in a Chinese key. *Journal of Aesthetic Education.* 23(1) pp.141-158.

Gardner, H. (1989b) Zero-based arts education: An introduction to ARTS PROPEL. *Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research.* 30(2) pp.71-83.

Gold, R.L. (1958) Roles in sociological field observations. *Social Forces.* 36(3) pp.217-223.

Golomb, C. (2002) *Child Art in Context: A Cultural and Comparative Perspective.* Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Great Britain (1988) *Education Reform Act 1988. (Chapter 40).* London: The Stationery Office: Elizabeth II.

IMerc, University of Roehampton & UCL Institute of Education *Sounds of Intent (Detailed Framework).* Available at: http://soundsofintent.org/soi_dox/soi_exploded.pdf (Accessed: 24/05/2016).

Imray, P. & Hinchcliffe, V. (2012) Not fit for purpose: A call for separate and distinct pedagogies as part of a national framework for those with severe and profound learning difficulties. *Support for Learning.* 27(4) pp.150-156.

Jolley, R.P., (2010) *Children and Pictures: Drawing and Understanding.* Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Luquet, G. (2001) *Children's Drawings ('Le Dessin Enfantin').* London, England: Free Association Books.

Miro, J. (1964) *Untitled.* [Screen print on Paper]. London: Tate.

Montero, B. (2006) Proprioception as an aesthetic sense. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* 64(2) pp.231-242.

Nind, M. (1999) Intensive interaction and autism: A useful approach? *British Journal of Special Education.* 26(2) pp.96-102.

NSEAD Curriculum Writing Group (2014) *The National Curriculum for Art and Design Guidance: EYFS, Primary KS1-2.* Wiltshire, UK: The National Society for Education in Art and Design (NSEAD).

Ockelford, A. (pending 2017) *Extending the Sounds of Intent Model of Musical Development to Explore how People with Learning Difficulties Engage in Creative Multisensory Activities.* London, UK: Jessica Kingsley.

Ockelford, A. (2008) *Music for Children and Young People with Complex Needs.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Ockelford, A., Welch, G., Jewell-Gore, L., Cheng, E., Vogiatzoglou, A. & Himonides, E. (2011) Sounds of intent, phase 2: Gauging the music development of children with complex needs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education.* 26(2) pp.177-199.

Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1969) *The Psychology of the Child.* London, Great Britain: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2007) *.Performance P-Level Attainment Targets.* Great Britain. London: The Stationery Office.

Robson, S. & Rowe, V. (2012) Observing young children's creative thinking: Engagement, involvement and persistence. *International Journal of Early Years Education.* 20(4) pp.349-364.

Schirrmacher, R. (1986) Talking with young children about their art. *Young Children.* 41(5) pp.3-7.

The Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (2012) *Music in Schools: Wider Still, and Wider.* London: Great Britain.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society- the Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Harvard, USA: Harvard College.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

RESULTS TABLE

This table shows where film clips were plotted on the "Marks of Intent" chart after being observed using the observation protocol.

KEY: ***Red number****: total number of film clips in that section* ***Blue number****: number code for film clip* ***BLACK LETTERS****: initials of the child in the clip. (Brackets): rater disagreed with assessment Underlined: rater agreed with assessment*

Domain		Reactive		Proactive		Interactive	
Level 1	C	**4:** 3 FM, 5 TV, 6 MP, 7 MB		**1:** 4 HM		**3:** (1 AKH), 2 SAK, 3 FM	
Level 2	I	**15:** 9 AKH, 14 TS, 17 MP, 20 MB, 21 EC, 22 MB, 23 NS, 24 TS, 25 HM, 26 TS, 27 TV, 28 TV, 29 MP, 30 TV, 31 CS		**0**		**12:** 8 EC, 9 AKH, 10 AKH, 11 AKH, 12 EC, 13 EC, 14 TS, 15 AKH, 16 EC, 17 MP, 18 EC, 19 EC	
		Abstract	***Representational***	***Abstract***	***Representational***	***Abstract***	***Representational***
Level 3	R	**7:** 32 EC, 33 MP, 40 AB, 44 AB, 45 EC, 46 MP, 47 EC	**4:** 38 AKH, 48 AB, 49 AKH, 50 EC & AKH	**9:** 21 EC, 32 EC, 33 MP, (36 AKH), 38 AKH, 39 AB, 40 AB, 41 MB, 42 MP	**2:** 38 AKH, 43 AB	**6:** 32 EC, 33 MP, 34 AKH, 35 AB, 36 AKH, 37 MB	**2:** 32 EC, 38 AKH
Level 4	C	**0**	**1:** 43 AB	**0**	**1:** 43 AB	**1:** 51 EC & AKH	**0**

NOT ASSESSED*: 9:** 52, 53 SA, 54 AB, 55 EC, 56 EC, 57 AKH, 58 SA, 59 MB, 60 MP ***ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES OF MUSIC USED IN ART*: 5:** 20 MB, 27 TV, 61 MP, 62 EC, 63 TV ***RATED SAMPLES: 1, 9, 18, 27, 36, 45 and 54 **: Just over 10% of samples were rated. Inter-rater reliability was 78%.**

TOTALS: 63 film clips; 2 classes (one KS1; one KS2); 12 pupils

APPENDIX 2

63 FILM CLIPS FROM THE PROJECT

These have been collated and sent separately via Drop Box and also by post to Dr Adam Ockelford.

APPENDIX 3

OBSERVATIONAL PROTOCOL

Film clips taken in lessons will be observed by myself (JC) and a sample of these will also be observed by the Art teacher (DO) in school. Analysis of the clips will be in note form using the draft "Marks of Intent" chart as a reference. They will be observed and notes taken following this protocol:

- Watch the film clip and look at the "MOI" chart. Completed: **YES/NO**
- Complete this chart:

FILM CLIP NUMBER:

CHILD:

KEY STAGE:

NATURE OF ART ACTIVITY:

To ascertain which domain/s the child may be working within:

- Does the child seem to be reacting to a visual or tactual stimulus? **YES/NO**
- Does the child seem to be interacting with staff or other children? **YES/NO**
- Is the child proactively taking part in an activity, ie doing something physically to create art (in a broad sense)? **YES/NO**

To ascertain which level the child may be working within:

- Does the child seem to be aware of what they are doing or seeing? **YES/NO**
- Does the child interact with a person or people? **YES/NO**
- Are they imitating, copying or creating? **YES/NO**
- Do they seem to be deliberately doing/looking/interacting? **YES/NO**
- Are they working independently as opposed to co-actively? **YES/NO**

To ascertain any issues or additional information from the clips:

- Is music or some other multi-sensory input used? **YES/NO**
- Was there any difficulty in placing the child at a level and in a domain? **YES/NO**
- Were other issues highlighted not directly related to Marks of Intent?
  COMMENT:

State suggested level/s and domain/s of child within the clip:

APPENDIX 4

My completed protocols for analysing the 63 film clips- these have been sent by post to Dr Adam Ockelford.

APPENDIX 5

The second observer's completed protocols for analysing the 10% of the 63 film clips- these have been sent by post to Dr Adam Ockelford.