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ABSTRACT


In 1995, two major factors were highlighted, in relation to the state of arts education in Australia by the Senate, Environment, Recreation, Communications and Arts Reference Committee inquiry. First, it was confirmed that arts education in primary and secondary schools was still a largely neglected area, and second, the two previous major Commonwealth initiatives established to improve this situation, had failed to achieve their desired outcomes.

This enquiry analyses the policy process of one of these federal initiatives: the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy. The implementation of this policy is examined in detail, investigating the events that preceded its formulation and those that followed. Factors are thus recognised which impeded the success of the implementation of this as well as other initiatives. These factors are still at play today and left unattended are likely to maintain the poor status of art education in Australian schools.

This enquiry is both comparative and diachronic. It investigates the policy process across bureaucratic settings, between organisations and inter-governmental departments, both at the federal and state level. It focuses on the implementation process as it occurred in time from the formulation in 1984, through to the publishing of its final outcomes in 1991.

The enquiry adopts a theoretical framework appropriate to the study of policy implementation. It applies a framework or model integrating implementation theory developed by Winter (1990) and Goggin, Bowman, Lester and O'Toole (1990), to examine inter-governmental policy implementation.

A constructivist methodology is employed for this enquiry based on qualitative research methods. The research methodology applies multiple methods of data collection, through elite unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews and document analysis.

The results of this study support existing policy research and importantly, highlight a number of neglected factors or variables which may influence the policy process.

This enquiry is significant in that it makes a contribution to the field of policy studies. It also provides insights into advocacy issues appropriate to arts education.
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INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT OF THE ENQUIRY

In the past twenty years, like many other areas in education, aspects of arts education have been under review at both the federal and state level. These reviews have highlighted both strengths and weaknesses and made numerous recommendations for the improvement of arts education.

Three federal initiatives can be identified which have significantly impacted upon the development of arts education policy as separate from classroom practice; namely, the Education and the Arts study (1977), the Task Force on Education and the Arts (1985) and more recently, the report by the Senate, Environment, Recreation, Communications and Arts References Committee (1994).

The present enquiry considers the outcome of these initiatives at the classroom level as ascertained by the national enquiries and seeks answers to the question why there has been so little of it observed.

In 1977, a national joint study was commissioned by the Commonwealth Schools Commission1 and the Australia Council2, to

---

1The Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC) was established at the Commonwealth level, by the Labor government in 1973. The role of the twelve person commission of independent experts, was to examine and determine the needs of students in government and non-government primary, secondary and technical schools and recommend grants which the Commonwealth should make to the States on the basis of needs and priorities. It was abolished in 1987 as the result of the establishment of new advisory structures, the National Board of Employment, Education and Training (NBEET).

2The Australia Council was established at the Commonwealth level in 1975, as a statutory authority. The Council assumed the role of the Commonwealth government's primary arts funding and advisory body; and also implements the Commonwealth government's arts policy; as well, it provides support for research and advocacy for the arts.
strengthen educational aspects of arts in education. A National Steering Committee, including representatives from State governments was established which convened study groups in each State and Territory. This was the first attempt, at the national level, to co-ordinate and develop a comprehensive arts education policy for primary and secondary schools. The results of the study painted a bleak picture of Australia's experiences of arts in education. To improve the situation the national report proposed a number of specific action strategies or recommendations.

Six years later in 1983, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs\(^3\) recognised that many of the recommendations from the 1977 report had not been implemented and that the arts in primary and secondary schools was still a largely neglected area of education. The Minister established a national Task Force on education and the arts. Its aim was to develop options for a strategy of joint Commonwealth\(^4\)/State initiatives which would, yet again, try to advance or improve the arts education situation. Unlike the 1977 study, this Task Force operated at the Commonwealth level only.

After eighteen months of deliberations, the Task Force submitted a report which made a large number of recommendations. The report adopted the same title as the 1977 report, *Education and the Arts*. Recommendations proposed possible Commonwealth initiatives

---

\(^3\) Susan Ryan became the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs when the Hawke Labor government won the March 1983 election. Labor was re-elected in 1985 and again in July 1987, but Susan Ryan was moved out of the Education portfolio and replaced by John Dawkins. Within six months of the election she resigned from parliament.

\(^4\) In this study the term 'Commonwealth' is interchangeable with the term 'federal'. It refers to the federation of Australian six states (NSW, SA, WA, Vic., Qld, Tasmania) and two territories (NT, ACT). In an Australian context federal departments or organisations are often referred to as Commonwealth organisations. e.g. the Commonwealth Department of Education and Youth Affairs or the Commonwealth Schools Commission.
which would promote education and the arts, with a particular emphasis on youth, inside and outside the formal school system. It was intended that the formulation and subsequent implementation of the report would close the gap between youth which had access to the arts and those without. It was hoped that through the implementation, this policy would make an important contribution to the resurgence of the arts in Australia.

Just over a decade later, however, this hope was still found wanting. In 1994, the Senate, one of the two houses of parliament, referred the matter of arts and cultural education to its Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts. Again, a federal inquiry received submissions and produced a report\(^5\) which made a number of recommendations for arts education. Once more, the report stated that there was still a 'cycle of neglect' affecting arts education in Australia. The Committee stated that the submissions received were unanimous: 'nothing much had changed since 1985'.

These three national inquiries aimed at impacting upon and informing the development of arts education policy in Australia. Most of what each study achieved, however, was to clearly recognise the lack of success of the previous study in meeting its desired outcomes.

Surely, anyone interested in arts education would be justified in asking: why?

\(^5\)The report was titled Report by the Senate, Environment, Recreation, Communications and Arts References Committee, (October, 1995). The recommendations made by this inquiry can be found in Appendix A.
Yet, this rather obvious question appears to have been overlooked by researchers. This enquiry aims at remedying this 'gap' in our knowledge and understanding.

ENQUIRY IN OUTLINE

Purpose
The purpose of this enquiry is to examine one of the three federally initiated inquiries into arts education: the Education and the Arts (1985) Task Force report. It is the researcher's position, that a detailed analysis of the implementation process of this report, provides some key understanding of the lack of improvement or progress in arts education observed over the past two decades.

The implementation process is examined in detail, as it has emerged as an important focus and as a distinct phenomenon in the policy process, affecting policy outcomes. When analysing the implementation of the Education and the Arts (1985) report, this enquiry investigates both the events that preceded it and those that followed, thus recognising its position as a 'bridge' between the other two federal initiatives. The Education and the Arts (1985) report was chosen as the basis for this enquiry, as it was widely perceived by arts educators and bureaucrats as the initiative which would really make a difference. It was seen as a significant means to make a concerted effort to advance the arts in education.

Therefore, this enquiry is both comparative and diachronic. First, it is comparative as it investigates the implementation process across bureaucratic settings, between organisations and inter-governmental
departments, both at the federal level and at the state and territory level.

Second, it is diachronic, as it focuses on the implementation process as it occurred in time, from the formulation of the report's recommendations in 1984, through their implementation, up to the publishing of the final outcomes in 1991.

**Theoretical framework**

This enquiry has chosen a theoretical framework appropriate to the study of policy implementation, a process marked by a high degree of complexity.

Winter (1990), provides such a framework or model by integrating implementation theory built over more than a decade by various researchers.

As this enquiry analyses the implementation of a federally developed policy, which was implemented at the state level, the Winter model is in turn integrated with another model, developed by Goggin, Bowman, Lester and O'Toole (1990), which examines inter-governmental policy implementation. Other factors and variables highlighted from earlier policy studies, such as, Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981), are also applied as deemed appropriate.

**Significance of the enquiry**

Results from this enquiry are critical to fill the current gap in our understanding of the poor position of arts education in our schools. The knowledge could also prove invaluable in mounting more
effective advocacy for art education. In addition, results from this enquiry could make a significant contribution to the field of policy studies. Policy making in education in Australia has existed ever since organised education has existed, but educational policy studies as a field of systematic inquiry is a relatively new phenomenon. As Fasano and Walker (1994:5) acknowledge

'current educational policy curricula in Australia are as much fragmented as the observed constellation of researchers, an aggregate of idiosyncratic elements from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds'.

Enquiry into arts education policy development would allow a greater understanding, not only of arts education in Australia, but the policy implementation process in public policy, as well. This enquiry could contribute significantly to expanding current literature and educational debate towards developing a theory of implementation, at both the national and international level.

**Methodology**

The research tradition adopted points to the need to examine the motive and meaning of those involved in the policy process, as well as the interplay between various government agencies. To gain understanding, a constructivist methodology is employed based on qualitative research methods.

The research methodology applies multiple methods of data collection, through elite unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews and document analysis.
STRUCTURE OF THE ENQUIRY

The enquiry is presented through a series of Chapters, as follows.

Chapter One: Overview of Arts Education Policy
Developments in Australia to 1983

Chapter One provides a brief overview of the historical events leading to the establishment of the Task Force on Education and the Arts in 1983. It identifies the Education and the Arts study as the specific focus for the enquiry and justifies this decision.

Chapter Two: The Policy Process in the Research Literature

This chapter reviews the literature which informs the study. In this chapter the research tradition is identified which is taken from the policy studies literature and applied to the enquiry. Policy and the policy process is defined. The parameters of any policy field, that is, the policy space is outlined. As this study is predominantly an analysis of the policy process, the area of policy analysis is also explored. This enquiry identifies the variables which may effect the implementation process and adopts a model developed by Winter (1990) which integrates various strands of theory and identifies possible variables which affect implementation. This model is further enhanced by integrating it with the dynamic framework of analysis proposed by Goggin, Bowman, Lester and O'Toole (1990) to understand federal/state relationships. This literature provides a foundation for the establishment of a conceptual framework which is applied to the implementation process of the Education and the Arts (1985) report between 1984-1988 in Australia. This chapter identifies six broad research questions and a number of related questions drawn from the conceptual framework.
Chapter Three: Research methodology

This chapter outlines the development of the methodology used in the enquiry. It justifies the choice of a constructivist and qualitative approach. More specifically, this chapter outlines the methods used to gather the necessary data, which includes interviewing, the sampling methods chosen and the use of written texts and artefacts. This chapter also outlines the processes or methods used in analysing and validating the data, such as coding, data reduction, data categorisation, analytic induction, explanation and content analysis.

Chapter Four: Education and the Arts Policy Process:
The Formulation Phase

This chapter examines the formulation process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy, from the establishment of the Task Force in 1983 by the Commonwealth Minister of Education, through to the presentation of its recommendations by the Task Force in November 1984. In focusing on the formulation phase the chapter operationalises the first of Winter's (1990) socio-economic processes or conditions, 'Policy Formation'.

Chapter Five: Education and the Arts Policy Process:
Implementation responses from the State/Territory level

During 1984 a small number of recommendations of the interim or progress report of the Task Force on education and the arts had been implemented at the federal and state level prior to the submission of the final report. This chapter examines implementation at the state level by analysing responses by the State and Territory organisations.
The responses are examined in relation to the second of Winter's (1990) socio-political processes or conditions 'Organisational or Inter-organisational Implementation Behaviour'.

Chapter Six: Education and the Arts Policy Process: Implementation responses from the Commonwealth/federal level

This chapter presents and analyses data which again relates to the second of Winter's (1990) socio-political processes or conditions 'Organisational or Inter-organisational Implementation Behaviour'. This time the focus is on the Commonwealth/Federal level. Government agencies included are the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, the Commonwealth Schools Commission, and within it, the Curriculum Development Centre. Responses by these organisations are analysed.

Chapter Seven: Outcomes/outputs as a result of the Policy Process: Advocating the Arts national seminar, the National Arts in Australian Schools project and the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers

This chapter outlines the next phase of the policy process, the implementation of the policy recommendations. Three major outcomes, as a result of direct and indirect recommendations made by the Education and the Arts (1985) policy are evident. They are the Advocating the Arts national seminar, the National Arts in Australian Schools Project (NAAS) and the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers (JCCEM). In this chapter each of the outcomes is
detailed, research and related questions are applied, research findings presented and conclusions drawn.

Chapter Eight Conclusions
The concluding chapter has a number of purposes. It summarises and restates the main questions and findings of the enquiry; it examines the methodological approach used as a result of the enquiry; it provides answers to the final research question, relating to policy theory; it discusses the implications of the enquiry for arts education and proposes areas for further research.

The thesis concludes with a reference list of written documentation used to gather data for the enquiry (outlining the coding system adopted for ease of reference), a bibliography (listing the sources used to develop the theoretical framework and research methodology adopted for the enquiry) and seventeen appendices (which includes a list of interview informants, as well as information relating to the arts education policies examined in this enquiry).
CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW OF ARTS EDUCATION POLICY
DEVELOPMENTS IN AUSTRALIA TO 1983

To gain an understanding of the Education and the Arts, 1985 report, it is important to contextualise the state of arts education policy development in Australia, prior to its policy formulation and implementation phases, that is, the relevant and major historical and chronological events prior to 1983. It is by examining this context that the merit of a 'policy studies' framework for the analysis becomes apparent.

It appears that very little literature exists in Australia which clearly outlines, in a chronological nature, the development of arts education policy. Indeed, one has to turn to the 1985 Commonwealth Task Force report titled, Education and the Arts, 1985, to find information. The 1985 Task Force made use of informative material, obtained from education and the arts authorities in the States and Territories, which was provided for the 1977 Education and the Arts national study and not published as part of that study. It is important to note that no additional information gathering was undertaken for the 1985 Task Force report.

According to the Task Force report, in 1983, arts education, like other aspects of education in Australia, did not have an 'adequate data base
for informed policy making in the detail that policy makers would find helpful'. (Education and the Arts, 1985:27)

It is interesting to note that, after many unsuccessful yet exhaustive searches of literature by the researcher on Australian art education policy development, it appears the situation has not improved greatly since that time.

OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

The history of arts education in Australia shares with the rest of education the boundaries and constraints imposed by the Constitution on the allocation of power and responsibilities between the federal and state governments.

According to McKinnon (1991:29), the constitutional bases of Australian education at the State level were established before the Commonwealth government came into being. The Commonwealth government was established through the Commonwealth of Australia Act in 1900, which came into force on 1 January 1901. The Act preserved the constitutions and constitutional powers of the States. McKinnon contended (1991:29) that education was never proposed by the founders of the Commonwealth as a potential federal power. Constitutionally, the Commonwealth government has no rights on education in Australia. Still today, education is the responsibility of States and Territories. For the first fifty years of organised education in Australia the States bore the complete cost of financing public education although, the financial power of the Commonwealth has, historically, allowed it to
be a major player in determining educational policy at times. In the post Second World War era, for a number of reasons, it appears that while the States had constitutional responsibilities for education, the Commonwealth controlled most of the financial resources. (Dudley and Vidovich, 1995). While the States and Territories have resisted quite vigorously the demands by the Commonwealth to take a greater role in setting educational priorities, they have not resisted the urge to tap into Commonwealth financial resources, which has weakened their power to resist pressure. The resulting shift in the balance of power between the States and the Commonwealth cannot be underestimated when analysing education policy making. McKinnon states

the Australian Constitution has not proved to be the instrument of preservation of state rights in education policy-making it was thought to be. Much initiative has passed to the federal government, scarcely inhibited by constitutional provisions. The balance of power is partly the eternal jockeying for position of power seekers and power brokers, but in large it is the outcome of the dynamic forces reshaping Australian society. (McKinnon, 1991:38)

It is important to keep this context in mind when examining the development of arts education policy in Australia.

According to the 1985 Education and the Arts report, the arts have always been present in Australian education in some form. It was pointed out that, throughout the 19th century music, drawing and painting were included in a 'refined education' as part of the school curriculum. The main players then were non-government schools, which were seen as establishing 'traditions' and 'strengths' in one or more of the arts.
At the beginning of the 20th century teachers' colleges were established (Melbourne Teachers College in 1900, Sydney Teachers' College in 1905 and Brisbane Training College in 1914), which 'took the arts seriously and established themselves as institutions'. Previously, only at technical schools, gallery schools and conservatoires of music, could post-school arts education be gained. Prior to the 1950's, it was only at the pre-school level that arts education held a central place in the curriculum. Even though every child in both government and non-government schools experienced some exposure to the arts, it was exceptional for a school to make arts education a speciality and publicise it. (Education and the Arts, Task Force report, 1985)

During the 1950's, something of a 'revolution' in arts education occurred; creativity in the curriculum was well supported and, by the middle of the century, virtually every child experienced some exposure to the arts. It is important to note that, while some exposure occurred, it was only partial and often scarce. Although there was a new emphasis on creativity in the visual arts, this emphasis did not move to other art forms. The arts education curriculum was influenced heavily by international standards and reforms, as a result of scholarly input provided by the teachers colleges. Given the lack of influence and interest at the Commonwealth level, individual states were left alone to set policy direction and curriculum content in arts education.

The fifties saw an important factor in relation to policy formation and direction in arts education policy at the state level: the establishment of teacher and subject associations for arts education. For example, in the visual arts area, the Art and Crafts Teachers Association of Victoria was
established in the mid fifties which was a powerful influence on state visual arts education policy at the time.

In Victoria, the Institute of Art Education was established, later to evolve into the powerful national body, the Australian Institute of Art Education (AIAE). The first visual arts national association, the Australian Association for Tertiary Art and Design Education (AATADE) was formed. There also existed a combined arts group, which was established in 1974, the Australian Society for Education through the Arts, which held biennial national conferences, and in particular was involved with a national conference in 1978 in Adelaide.

At this time professional associations were being formed in all art forms. The Australian Society for Music Education (ASME) was established in August 1969, while the Australian Association for Dance Education (AADE) was formed in 1977. The Australian Association for Drama in Education (NADIE) and the Council of Australian Media Organisations (CAMEO) were also established during the seventies. According to Kendall at the end of the seventies various visual arts people were attempting to develop Australia-wide organisations such as the Australian Tertiary Art and Design Association (now defunct) and the Institute of Art Education (Kendall, 1986:6)

The Australian Institute of Art Education (AIAE) is a prime example of where policy development in the arts during the seventies was moving from the state to the national level. Although this wealth of associate activity was happening at the tertiary sphere, there appears little impact at the classroom or target group level.
At both the primary and secondary levels arts subjects were sometimes taught by teachers untrained in the arts. Fortunately, such teachers were enthusiasts who made an important contribution, commencing valuable initiatives, such as media studies.

Not only were arts subjects competing for time and resources with an ever increasing 'crowded' curriculum of subject areas, they were also facing 'internal' competition among the different art forms that constituted 'the arts'. It is important to note, that generally in the seventies arts education was accorded a minor place in most educational institutions and there appeared a 'pecking order' of subject importance within the art forms. That is, the traditional 'arts', such as the visual arts, craft and music had a good measure of acceptance within schools. Drama was not usually regarded as a subject in its own right, and dance/movement was poorly represented at all schooling levels above the pre-school. (Education and the Arts, Task Force report, 1985)

According to the Education and the Arts, 1985 report in the early 1970's arts education in primary and secondary schools was a largely neglected area of education, although, some crucial developments did occur. For example, some tertiary institutions had developed strong visual arts and music programs. As well, two national enquiries, the Post Secondary Education Committee enquiry and the National Enquiry into the Expressive Arts, were undertaken in the early seventies in education which, although not focused on arts education as such, would impact on it substantially. These enquiries provided a forum for
arts education to justify its place in the curriculum, therefore, strengthening its position.

The role of the Commonwealth government also impacted upon the development of arts education. Historically, the States had resisted the notion of the Commonwealth government playing a major role in education. As early as 1936, the Australian Education Council\(^1\) had sought Commonwealth funding for State education while still resisting Commonwealth involvement. The sixties and early seventies saw the development of new dimensions to Commonwealth/State educational relations. As Spaull acknowledged, the States were in a dilemma concerning the increasing influence of the Commonwealth. He stated

Unlike considerations in the previous period, the pattern of interest and activity [of the AEC] was how best to respond to an emerging Commonwealth influence in state education responsibilities. The AEC found itself in an awkward position with the Commonwealth government: on the one hand it welcomed the growing number of Commonwealth initiatives, on the other hand it was uneasy about their implementation in the state systems. This ambivalence was accentuated by the AEC difficulties in anticipating, and responding to, the Commonwealth's patchwork, but authoritarian, approach to education policy, and its lack of basic consultation with the States in the formulation and implementation of such policy. (Spaull, 1987: 133)

An important development at the beginning of the seventies impacted greatly on these strained relations. The McMahon\(^2\) government made an early bid before the December 1972 elections, announcing that it

---

\(^1\)The Australian Education Council (AEC) is one of the oldest Ministerial Councils in Australia. This Council consisted originally of the State and Territory Ministers for Education. It was formed in 1936 and established its own Secretariat in 1978.

\(^2\)The McMahon government was a Coalition government elected in 1968.
would provide unmatched capital grants for state primary and secondary schools. The Commonwealth government recognised the general needs of the States' education systems by again providing grants. As a result of this inducement provided by the Commonwealth government, the AEC accepted and welcomed the Commonwealth Minister for Education to its Council, an act it had resisted since the thirties. This action inevitably changed the face of Commonwealth/State relations in the education policy arena, which ultimately lead to the increased role of the Commonwealth in State education policy development.

What impact did this increased Commonwealth influence have on arts education? The early seventies saw a change of government at the Commonwealth level. The Whitlam Labor Government coming into power in 1972, marked a period in Australian politics which saw education as a greater priority. This change in initiative by the Whitlam government resulted from 'years of concern about the parlous state of education and the lack of educational resources available to Australian schools'. (Dudley and Vidovich, 1995). The arts in education was also to feel the effects of these ideological and economic changes. The Whitlam era saw an increase in community interest in such areas as 'quality of life' and a 'growing awareness of Australia as a culturally pluralistic society' (1985:28). A new interest in an Australian cultural identity 'swept the nation' resulting in increased research in a wide range of cultural and social issues, including the arts.

3 The Commonwealth government had previously provided grants to the States (1963) in the form of provision of science blocks to schools.
The establishment by the Whitlam government of the Commonwealth Schools Commission, the Australia Council and the Curriculum Development Centre, resulted in increased funding and resources which contributed and impacted on arts education policy.

The Schools Commission was established in 1973. A Commonwealth body, the Commission provided advice to the Commonwealth Government concerning the provision of recurrent and capital grants to Australian schools. The Commission focused its attention on areas within education that needed upgrading nationally, which included arts education. The Schools Commission reflected the ideology of the day characterised by the 'child-centred' model. As Dudley and Vidovich argued, it was the era where person rights, the needs and rights of the individual, were considered central. It was not the 'rational, utility-maximising self interested male individual ('economic man') of economic theory; rather, it is the human individual, the individual as a social being. (Dudley and Vidovich, 1995:3)

According to Dudley and Vidovich (1995:3) the policy documents of the Commonwealth Schools Commission were 'discourses of social democracy, democratic citizenship and empowerment'. For many years arts education became a major focus of the Commonwealth Schools Commission, providing funding and policy direction.

The establishment in 1975 of the Curriculum Development Centre also impacted on arts education. The Centre was developed to assist in the development of curricula across Australia. It is interesting to note

4The CDC was initially established as an independent statutory authority. It was shut down by the Fraser government in 1981 and reactivated in 1983 by the first Hawke government as part of the Commonwealth Schools Commission.
that among its first initiatives was a multi-arts project which was started in 1976. In this project, the traditional subject specific approach was questioned and various disciplines such as music, drama and the visual arts were treated in an integrated way. The project involved New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria.

Another important innovation, which was developed at the Commonwealth level, was the Australia Council which was established in 1975 as a statutory authority. The Council assumed the role of the Commonwealth government's primary arts funding and advisory body and had a primary role as a grant making body for the arts. The Council's mandate included also the implementation of Commonwealth government's arts policy, as well as provision of support for research and advocacy of the arts. Though the Australia Council does not fund arts education in schools, it maintains an advisory role on arts education issues.

According to Serle (1987:215) the federal government support for the arts in the early seventies was of major importance. For example, the Whitlam government vote to the Australian Council for the arts in 1972 was $8.4 million, which rose dramatically to $22 million in 1974.

Another major relevant event of this period, which affected the policy development of arts education, was the joint study of education and the arts by the Schools Commission and the Australia Council in 1977. It is significant as this was the first initiative in arts education policy development at the national level.
The impetus for this 1977 study was a belief expounded by the Australia Council, that the educational aspects of its activities may need to be strengthened. The Commonwealth Schools Commission supported the study by acknowledging that there might be special needs in relation to the arts but argued that arts resources for schools had never been greater. However, there was still a general consensus in arts education forums at the time that arts in education was accorded a low priority.

The terms of reference included in the study (1977:v), were the consultation with education authorities on the place of the arts within the education system both at the Commonwealth and State levels; an investigation of the opportunities available to experience the arts; an investigation of the opportunities to recognise and develop individual talents; investigation of provisions for professional training in the arts and the study of existing and possible roles of the media in informing and educating people in the arts.

A national steering committee was formed and chaired by Dr Ken McKinnon, who was the Chairman of the Schools Commission and deputy Chairman of the Australia Council. The Steering Committee consisted of members of the Australia Council, tertiary institutions and senior officers of the NSW Department of Education. (See Appendix B for the composition of the National Steering Committee, Education and the Arts - 1977)

The Steering Committee concluded that there were multiple perspectives on priorities and organisations among people working in
the arts. As a result the Committee wanted effective communication from people with different perspectives, such as, teachers, principals, administrators, professional artists, media and community bodies. Extensive discussions with education authorities, government and non-government in each state, in mid-1976, led to the formation of State and Territory Steering Committees. Each State and Territory Study or Steering Committee consisted of representatives from tertiary institutions, education departments and artist or community representatives. Study groups were established to seek views and submissions.

The usual procedure in each state was that the Committee would meet on a number of occasions; submissions were invited from institutions, groups and individuals; questionnaires were sent to primary and secondary government and non-government schools; research assistants were engaged to seek and collate information; the Committee would meet and compile a draft report which was forwarded to the National Steering Committee; the draft report was made public inviting responses; then the final report was written and submitted to the National Steering Committee.

Nine reports were developed, one from all states and territories as well as a national report. The National Report summarised the issues of 'national importance'. The eight state and territory reports described the provisions existing for arts education, clarified concepts towards a

5Each report was titled *Education and the Arts, A Joint Study of the Schools Commission and the Australia Council*. Reports were received from New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Australian Capital Territory, Queensland, Australian Capital Territory, Northern Territory, Tasmania, Western Australia.

6The national report was titled *Education and the Arts, A Joint Study of the Schools Commission and the Australia Council National Report*. 
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comprehensive and more co-ordinated arts education policy and articulated priority recommendations for development. The arts included in the study were visual arts, crafts, music, drama, dance, film, television, radio and creative writing.

The *Education and the Arts, 1985* document contended that the state and territory reports from the 1977 national study painted a bleak picture of Australian's experiences of arts in education: there were inadequate facilities for the arts, not enough teachers to teach the arts competently; pressure to devote effort and resources to the 'basic' subjects; many teachers did not have rewarding experiences of the arts during their own education; and some principals had little experience of and less confidence in the arts.

The *Education and the Arts* (1977:8) report pointed out that arts education in the late seventies was inhibited by inadequate facilities for the arts, by the lack in teaching services of sufficient competent teachers of the arts, by teacher turnover, by insufficient resources and by the attitudes of those who determine school programs.

Importantly, the 1977 National Report stated that pressures to devote effort and resources to the 'basic subjects' had continued to "relegate the arts to the margin of attention where they are seen as essentially leisure activities".

The 1977 National Report stated that due to the importance attached to the arts in education it was necessary to define national objectives for arts education programs. The objectives stated were Access; Participation; Confidence and Commitment; and Excellence. It was the
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committee's belief that satisfactory programs depended on an adequate understanding of the 'purposes, possibilities and processes' of the arts in education. (Education and the Arts, final report, 1977:3)

In the report the committee made a large number of recommendations, which included the establishment of an Arts Education Advisory Committee and the development of Regional Arts Education Councils, which would link State arts agencies with education departments. In the area of curriculum it was recommended that education authorities give high priority to the development of appropriate curriculum materials and support. Emphasis or effort should be made to produce appropriate curricula for the under-presented fields such as dance, film, television and ethnic arts. (Education and the Arts, final report, 1977:8)

The committee recommended an increase in the numbers of art advisers and that planning in the education systems be based on ensuring the availability of arts expertise. The development of non-traditional approaches where education systems, teacher organisation and parent groups collaborate to bring into schools artists as instructors and supply sufficient resources was also recommended. (Education and the Arts, final report, 1977:9)

In the area of school organisation, it was recommended that schools ensure career opportunities for arts teachers in secondary schools, while at the primary level twenty per cent of teaching time should be devoted to the arts. An important recommendation was that the range of art forms afforded equivalence in assessments for matriculation be increased. (Education and the Arts, final report, 1977:19)
Further recommendations were made to provide provisions and cater for special groups within the education system including the talented, the migrant culture, handicapped, as well as country or isolated students. As well, personnel, physical resources were also considered. It was recommended by the committee that the Schools Commission provide guidance on design and standards to schools and education authorities in respect to arts facilities as well as providing funds to develop pilot arts facilities which reflect desirable design features. Schools were obliged to provide adequate space and resources for arts education which could include modifying existing space. (Education and the Arts, final report, 1977:20)

OUTCOMES OF THE 1977 REPORT

The Education and the Arts, 1985 Task Force report recognised that the joint 1977 project of the Schools Commission and the Australia Council represented a 'significant landmark in Australian arts education'. It stated that the 1977 report was the first document that 'reflected a national concern and commitment to the arts as a recognised and important part of the curriculum of schools'. The report (1985:31) stated that the outcomes of the 1977 project were discernible at a general level, as well as within education systems.

The Arts in Education (1985) report identified a number of general outcomes as a result of the 1977 report which included the growing exchange of information and sharing of ideas concerning arts education; networking across Australia; growth in enthusiasm and advocacy and the effectiveness of the emerging arts lobby. Tangible
projects were cited to support these statements of outcomes, namely, in October 1978, an international arts conference was held in Adelaide, the International Society for Education through the Arts (INSEA), in conjunction with Australian arts education bodies and the Biennial Assembly of the Australian Society for Education through the Arts; a major national conference in April 1980 which reviewed progress in arts education since 1977; in November 1982, a national conference of arts administrators; in June 1983, another conference, the Dance Debate, was held to develop a national contemporary dance entrepreneurial organisation; and in 1983, the national Task Force on Education and the Arts was established. (Kendall. 1986:6)

The initial outcomes of the 1977 report were very encouraging. The report appeared to be the impetus for many projects and advocacy for the arts in the period following the report's release. On the other hand, it appears that many of the long term major recommendations, that the 1977 report had aimed for, were not realised. In the keynote address to the 4th Annual Institute of Art Education Conference in May 1984, Ken McKinnon, former Chairman of the 1977 Education and the Arts study, stated that although the were several key policies from the 1977 report still relevant in 1984, he believed 'if anything, we have made negative progress since then'.

The 1985 Task Force stated that the 1977 report had made a number of recommendations which 'had they been implemented' would have 'broken new ground in the arts and education in Australia'. (Education and the Arts, 1985:1)
The 1985 Task Force acknowledged

there are ample indications that following the major impetus generated in 1977 the arts in education are in need of and ready for significant enhancement (Education and the Arts, 1985:38)

What was happening to arts in education at the Commonwealth and State level, in the period after the release of the 1977 report, is relevant to understanding the process of the formation of the 1985 *Education and the Arts* report.

**STATE OF ARTS EDUCATION AFTER 1977**

In the late seventies state governments were according an explicit and higher priority to arts activities. The results of an Australia Council commissioned study supported this. The Australia Council commissioned research in 1980, in the form of a survey, which found that interest levels by the community exceeded 50 per cent for traditional Australian paintings, crafts, photography, prints and drawings. Two out of three Australians expressed interests in plays and the survey showed that Australians thought the arts were for everyone and rejected elitist notions that the arts were divorced from the people. (Education and the Arts, 1985)

At the state level the following examples were cited by the Arts in Education (1985) report which supported the notion that there was an increased support for the arts. The report identified three major celebrations in South Australia where youth arts would achieve a high profile. They were International Youth Year (1985), the 150th Jubilee of the State's foundation (1986), the Australian Bicentenary (1988) and the
biennial Come Out festival. In NSW, the South Western Regional Arts Development Committee, established as a result of the 1977 report, doubled the funding for the arts from 1982 to 1983.

At the Commonwealth level, the 1985 report acknowledged that the Commonwealth Schools Commission had funded a significant number of projects related to arts in education. Under the Innovations Program, grants had amounted to $2.8 million in the period of 1976-1981, while under the Projects of National Significance Program, the Commission had made available $364 000 for arts education.

It is important to note, that the Task Force acknowledged that the impetus generated in 1977 varied within education systems and that there were indications that in some State education systems various initiatives had run into difficulties. As an overview of the state and territory education authorities at the time, evaluative comments provided to the Task Force provided the basis for the following condensed state reports:

• South Australia reported that the 1977 recommendations provided impetus to continue to carry out the objectives of arts education as well as to use the report as a spring board for innovation. Overall, the South Australian commitment to arts in education is continuing to be given a high priority.

• Western Australia indicated that since 1977 many of the goals set at the time have been reached although not all the recommendations of the original report have been achieved. It is noted that there is now a greater acceptance of the place of the arts by the community.

• Victoria reported that the main objectives of the 1977 report - access, participation, confidence and commitment, and excellence - had gained very wide support from art educators in the State but, in general,
the recommendations had not been acted on. Problem areas remained but new administrative structures now provided the opportunity for the co-ordination of individual arts areas.

- Tasmania informed that, although a number of initiatives have been taken since 1977, there was no evidence of a concerted attempt to implement the recommendations of either the State or the national report. However, there was no doubt that the reports have both directly and indirectly influenced recent activities. The efforts to promote arts education are seen as gradually having assumed a more important and more visible role in the Tasmanian community, but development tends to be spasmodic and uncoordinated. The resources needed to bring about major curriculum change and to underpin significant community development with careful planning have not been, and are still not, available.

- The ACT Schools Authority considered the 1977 report as both challenging and provocative. The report was seen to contain many recommendations with significant resource implications, particularly in relation to teaching and research staff. At the time it was difficult to foresee the implementation of such recommendations because of the prevailing economic climate and imposed resource constraints. Since then, the economic climate has, if anything, deteriorated and resource constraints have become even more pronounced.

- The responses received from Queensland and Northern Territory do not include general evaluative comments. It would appear that Queensland received some impetus in 1977 and that subsequent efforts are still influencing development in that State.

- The Northern Territory, which became a separate education system in 1979, appears to accord high priority to arts education and is implementing a number of significant initiatives.

- In NSW the concepts developed in the 1977 report are still being explored although financial constraints have hampered progress. The local committee, set up in 1977, deliberated on the costs involved in pursuing the recommendations of the report, and considered structures to better co-ordinate arts resources and improve delivery of educational services. In
preparation of major initiatives in 1984 and 1985, considerable attention has been given to curriculum development in the arts. (Education and the Arts, 1985:pp.32-34)

During the development of the state and territory reports, non-government school authorities were unable to provide information requested. The non-government authorities claimed that the time available was too limited. The Education and the Arts, 1985 report acknowledged that this was a serious omission to the 1977 study, as very large numbers of children attended non-government institutions and that anecdotal evidence suggested that there were 'great variations in attitudes and provisions between schools'.

**ARTS EDUCATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT:1977-1984**

With regard to policy development at the state level between 1977 and 1985, it appeared that State government policy evolution and implementation for the arts was at varying stages. The 1985 report described two major trends in this period. First, there had been a quickening of interest in developing more adequate policy statements and the pressure to evolve a national policy was steadily growing. Second, there was a gathering momentum to spell out the policies in finer detail and implement them. The report (1985) cites the 1982 United Kingdom report, *The Arts in Schools*, supported by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, as having considerable impact on Australian thought.

It was acknowledged by the Task Force that, during the late seventies and early eighties, research on the arts in education was being
hampered by both limited financial resources and the lack of a general theoretical base. In summary, the report states that arts education policies were at different stages of development, clarification and implementation and that further development was hampered by an absence of hard statistical data. (Education and the Arts, 1985: 37)

As a result of the 1977 joint Australia Council and Commonwealth Schools Commission study, state committees were set up to implement the report's recommendations. By 1983, according to Education and the Arts, 1985 report, many of the committees were no longer active and the Australia Council and the Commonwealth Schools Commission had ceased their co-operative activities at the national level. The 1985 report contended that there was 'growing uncertainty about what was happening across the nation in arts education'.

The 1977 Education and the Arts study was the first initiative in arts education policy development at the national level. After a few years of discernible action the impetus of the initiative waned, providing little change, apart from placing arts education on the educational agenda and stimulating thinking on arts education.

Seven years after the 1977 study, the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, recognised the initiative's lack of achievement and established another national Task Force on Education and the Arts.

**TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION AND THE ARTS (1985)**

The formulation of this Task Force report, (which made thirty four recommendations) and the process of its implementation was chosen
as the focus for this enquiry. The complex process of the formulation and implementation of this national study is discussed in detail in later chapters. (Education and the Arts, 1985)

The significance of the 1985 study was that it was the second major national study designed to improve the status and education of the arts in Australia. The national study Education and the Arts was chosen as the focus of the enquiry because of the pivotal role it set itself to play in the development of art education policy. The in-depth examination of this role has allowed this enquiry to map and unravel the complex interplay of personal, political and administrative factors that shaped its own limited outcome and which can be identified in the continuing 'lack of success' of arts education in Australia.

CONCLUSION

This chapter contextualised the state of arts education in Australia prior to 1984. The period from the mid seventies to the mid eighties was an active period for arts education policy in Australia. According to Kendall

The past decade reflects exceptional activity at the national level in the area of the arts. Since the State and Territory reports which formed the basis of the 1977 Education and the Arts Report, State Education Departments and State arts organisations have continued the debate culminating in various policy statements and curriculum initiatives concerning the arts (Kendall, 1986:7)

This enquiry focuses on one of these policy statements referred to by Kendall: the Education and the Arts, 1985 report.
When examining the complex and multi-layered issues surrounding its policy process, the choice of a policy studies paradigm appears as logic and justified. Details of this choice are outlined in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER TWO

THE POLICY PROCESS IN THE RESEARCH LITERATURE

OVERVIEW

The enquiry focuses on the report *Education and the Arts, 1985*, identifies it as a policy and examines its implementation, in a view of understanding why the arts in education situation in Australia had not improved a decade later. The terms 'policy' and 'implementation' belong to common parlance. To justify the usage in a research context, it is important to clarify their meanings in relation to a specific research tradition. A research tradition defines both observational variables and the analytical tools used to give them meaning. Such clarification justifies the kind of research questions established to guide this enquiry.

This chapter outlines the literature relating to policy studies, providing definitions and examples of policy, policy processes, policy analysis, the 'policy space' heuristic, including current theories of policy implementation. The review focuses on two implementation models (Winter, 1990; Goggin et al, 1990), which were chosen for this enquiry as a means of identifying the possible factors which may have influenced the implementation of recommendations from the *Education and the Arts, 1985* report.
The research literature relating to the complex policy process illuminates, guides and informs this study. This literature provides a foundation for the establishment of a conceptual framework that is applied to the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* report between 1984-1988 in Australia.

**DEFINITION OF POLICY**

As stated at the outset of this chapter, the terms 'policy' and 'implementation' belong to common parlance. In terms of supporting the research paradigm\(^1\) chosen for this study and justification for calling the *Education and the Arts, 1985* report, a 'policy,' definition is necessary.

The term 'policy' tends to be an elusive one. Ham and Hill (1985: 11) argue that the definitional problems posed by the concept of 'policy' suggest that it is difficult to treat it as if it is related to a very specific, concrete and clearly outlined phenomenon.

Guba offers several definitions of policy, not mutually exclusive:

- policy is an assertion of intents or goals
- policy is the accumulated standing decision of a governing body
- policy is a guide to discretionary action
- policy is a strategy
- policy is sanctioned behaviour
- policy is a norm of conduct
- policy is the output of the policy-making system

\(^1\)The definition of 'paradigm' adopted here is the one given by Thomas Kuhn (1974:pp. 10-47): paradigms serve to define legitimate problems and methods of a research field. They guide research through direct modelling. This enquiry does not enter into any debate on the uniqueness of such definition of paradigm as raised, for instance, by Masterman (1976). The reader wishing to follow-up on the issue is referred to the specialised literature.
Hogwood and Gunn (1983:23) define public policy as a 'series of patterns of related decisions to which many circumstances and personal, group and organisational influences have contributed' and for a policy regarded as 'public policy' it must to some degree have been 'generated or at least processed within the framework of governmental procedures, influences and organisations'.

Dye (1987:324) chooses to describe public policy as whatever governments choose to do or not to do. Dye focuses on the important issue of both government actions, as well as government inaction.

Placing policy in an Australian education context, Winder, a long time practitioner at educational policy making, defines policy as

indirect reflections of the views, or philosophies, of the political party or parties now forming the government, particularly at the level of managerial and financial control over the education institutions... some policies are an amalgam of the views of the present government and of past governments, as only some aspects of policy are changed and can be changed in the time frame of the life of most governments (Winder, 1991:4)

Policies developed at the national, state or regional level may be the result of interaction by many people and organisations. Sometimes policies reflect the views of a minority group, a government or even past governments. Some policies are direct outcomes of the election platforms of political parties; some policies are the personal expression of an oligarchy of one, perhaps the Minister of Education; some
education policies are the outcome of policy objectives developed by major interest groups; some policies are developed by a bureaucracy; some policies are the outcomes of various interventionists agencies which could be government agencies established outside of a particular policy arena; policies could reflect the outcomes of media interests while others could be the expression of needs and values sometimes termed umbrella policies. (Winder 1991).

Accepting these broad definitions of policy, the Education and the Arts, 1985 report, used as the basis for this enquiry, is defined as 'public policy'. On close inspection it is identified as a guide to action, instigated and sanctioned by the Commonwealth government and developed by its bureaucracy. It consists of a series of intentions, goals and recommendations that, if implemented successfully, would affect the outcomes of the target group it was designed for. Therefore, from this point on the Education and the Arts, 1985 report is referred to as 'policy'.

Not only is the term 'policy' elusive in nature, the understanding of how policies evolve is also complex. Hogwood and Gunn (1983:15) contend that when attempting to define policy, a distinction needs to be made between policy and decision. They argue that a policy is 'larger than a decision.' It involves a series of specific decisions, identified in a rational sequence. They state that the development of a policy is a complex process, which is generated by interactions among many 'consciously related decisions'. Hogwood and Gunn (1983:25) contend that the study of policy involves the 'tracing of multiple interactions' among individuals, groups and organisations. In the enquiry, the
analysis of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy also involved the complex tracing of multiple interactions.

Factors such as chronological events and the identification of the influences within the process, from inside as well as outside a particular policy arena, are important to its development. Hogwood and Gunn (1983) use the analogy of a policy being likened to a continuous film as opposed to a still photograph; they argue that any process framework of policy development is dynamic.

An important consideration in defining policy, is the understanding that the development of policy is a 'process' which is designed to implement some type of change or to solve a particular problem. Hogwood and Gunn (1983) contend that when analysing policy it is more profitable to focus on the policy process itself, as a 'process model' assists in identifying various processes occurring within a system or discipline.

**THE POLICY PROCESS**

According to Rist, policy making is both 'multi-dimensional' and 'multi-faceted' and the emphasis on policy making being a process is deliberate. Rist argues that a policy

> evolves through cycles, with each cycle more or less bounded, more or less constrained by time, funds, political support, and other events. (Rist, 1994:546)

Brewer and deLeon (1983:17) argue that the policy process can be visualised in several ways but proposed one simple scheme that features 'six basic phases through which policies and programs pass
The six phases proposed by Brewer and deLeon is *initiation, estimation, selection, implementation, evaluation* and *termination.* The concept of 'phases' making up a 'process' is also endorsed by Hogwood and Gunn (1983:24). They acknowledge that the process can be conceptualised as a framework and argue that any process framework is 'dynamic in nature.' That is, at any stage of the framework, as well as 'forward movements,' there is the opportunity for feedback, redefinition of the problem or modification of the original objectives.

Hogwood and Gunn provide a broad framework, which includes nine issues to describe the policy process:

1. Deciding to decide (issue search or agenda setting)
2. Deciding how to decide (or issue filtration)
3. Issue definition
4. Forecasting
5. Setting objectives and priorities
6. Options analysis
7. Policy implementation, monitoring and control
8. Evaluation and review
9. Policy maintenance, succession, or termination. 

(Hogwood and Gunn, 1983:68)

Hogwood and Gunn (1983:24) acknowledge that the process framework is closely related to political system models; that is, the framework lends itself to the identification and study of interaction of the various stages in the process, as well as the various participating organisations.

Dye provides a process model that identifies various sub-processes occurring within the political system, as in the United States. They are:
• the identification of policy problems through public demands for government action;
• the formulation of policy proposals through the initiation and development of policy proposals by policy planning organisations; interest groups, government bureaucracies, and the president and Congress;
• the legitimation of policies through political actions by parties, interest groups, the president, and Congress;
• the implementation of policies through organised bureaucracies, public expenditures, and the activities of executive agencies;
• the evaluation of policies by government agencies themselves, outside consultants, the press, and the public. (Dye, 1987:326)

Dye stresses that the process does not always occur in such a logical order.

Rist (1994:547) offers a more simplistic policy process or cycle, with only three phases: policy formulation, policy implementation and policy accountability. Rist argues that each of these phases has its own order and logic, its own information requirements and its own policy actors. The three phases are outlined in more detail.

The first phase of Rist's cycle referred to policy formulation. Rist (1994:549) acknowledges that the major activity in the formulation stage is the 'selection of the most appropriate policy strategy to achieve the desired objective.'

In the second phase of the policy process, Rist purports that the implementation phase is when

the policy initiatives and goals established during policy formulation are transformed into programs, procedures and regulations (Rist, 1994:550)
According to Rist (1994:551) the third phase of the policy process is when the policy or program is 'sufficiently mature that one can address questions of accountability, impacts, or outcomes.'

Nakamura (1987) warns that a 'textbook' understanding and definition of the policy process as exemplified by the above authors can be problematic. He argues (1987:144) that the policy process is viewed as a paradigm and contends that this is incorrect. According to Nakamura the key concepts such as policy formulation, implementation and evaluation may have different meanings for the different sets of actors using them. Indeed, the same words can have different meanings. Nakamura argues

the 'textbook' description of the policy process is widespread, it is incorporated into the theoretical and practical world of policy in a variety of ways, and the degree of coherence or sense of common enterprise it provides is overstated by the extent of the diffusion of the words themselves. (Nakamura, 1987:145)

Accepting Nakamura’s criticism, it is the researcher's belief that it is equally important to this enquiry to use terminology that is accepted widely by the policy research field when describing the policy process. The vocabulary used in this enquiry has widespread usage in policy study's literature (Nagel, 1994). The definitions of policy formulation and implementation phases provided by Rist (1994) are adopted as a starting point for this enquiry. They are further expanded by drawing on implementation literature as discussed below. Nakamura’s criticism has been kept in mind throughout the enquiry, and indeed found appropriate to describe the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy at specific points in time.
At the initial stages of this enquiry a mapping exercise was necessary to understand the complex nature of the actions and interactions that occurred at all phases of the policy process and to understand the governmental and inter-governmental activity and involvement. The heuristic below identified as the 'policy space' was extremely helpful in allowing the researcher to better understand the inclusive nature of the policy process.

THE POLICY SPACE

The 'policy space' heuristic provides a way for a researcher or analyst to explore causal relationships within the process.

Hogwood and Gunn (1983:13) argued that the 'policy space' is an 'abstract but useful concept' to illustrate policy fields. This is referred to by Hogwood and Gunn as being the 'fields of governmental activity and involvement to describe complex interventions or interactions'.

The heuristic is further developed by Fasano when she states the construct of 'policy space' allows a systematic identification of the components, actors and factors inherent to the formulation of policy and its outcomes... Simply put, the construct of 'policy space' is an heuristic, providing guidance to the exploration of causal and correlational events undergirding a situation addressed by policy... Typically, the use of this construct entails the identification of the agents and agencies relevant to the policy in question, the nature, extent and purpose of decision-making activities engaged in by these agents, and the boundaries and constraints (e.g. resources, information, legislation, values, other policies) to possible action by all those concerned. (Fasano, 1993:31)
The policy space can be applied at national, state and regional levels. The policy space heuristic can be used to map out the conditions where a policy can be successfully designed and implemented. The heuristic can be used across policies and also across research traditions and theoretical frameworks such as political sciences, management studies, economic approaches and sociological models (Fasano 1993, Mahoney 1995).

In practice, the policy space heuristic allowed the researcher to understand the complexity of the policy process, the interactions that had occurred and select the most appropriate theoretical framework that described the particular situation or orientation. In this case, the research literature on policy processes has lead to the focus on research frameworks that concentrated on organisations, communications and inter-governmental relations as detailed below.

To analyse a policy it is important to understand the policy process. To understand the process, it is important to explore fully the phases of that process. During the preliminary phase of this enquiry it became clear that the implementation phase of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy played a vital role in the degree of success in achieving its outcomes. To better comprehend it a review of the 'implementation' literature in policy studies became necessary.

Over the past two decades, according to Palumbo and Calista (1990:xi), public policy analysis has witnessed the 'emergence of implementation as a new subfield.' They acknowledge the contribution that implementation research has made to a major reconsideration of the field of public policy analysis.
Brewer and deLeon (1983:19) argue that implementation has lately been accepted as a 'distinctive phase of the policy process, having its own participants, rules, methods and procedures'.

To comprehend the emergence of this new sub-field Goggin, Bowman, Lester and O'Toole (1900) provide a framework, which outlines three distinct generations of implementation research.

THREE GENERATIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION RESEARCH

First-generation Research
According to Lester, Bowman, Goggin and O'Toole (1987:201), in the early 70's, there was very little research available on the subject of public policy implementation. Goggin et al., (1990:13) identify implementation studies deemed first generation to be detailed accounts of how a single authoritative decision was carried out, either at a single location or at multiple sites.

Early studies concentrated on analysis of the formulation of public policies, as policy implementation was generally undertaken by administrators and therefore thought of as belonging to the separate discipline area of public administration.

The disciplinary distinction between policy formulation and implementation was challenged in a study by Pressman and Wildavsky. In analysing the Economic Development Administration program in Oakland, the authors found that the implementation process was dynamic and complex and concluded that
the study of implementation requires understanding that apparently simple sequences of events depend on complex chains of reciprocal interaction. The separation of policy design from implementation is fatal. (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1980:xxiii)

Ham and Hill (1985:95) argue that although there was an absence of theory and literature on policy implementation before the study by Pressman and Wildavsky (1973), there were *de facto* organisational studies concerned with the implementation phenomenon. For example, studies by Bardach (1977, 1979) recognised that the implementation process had an independent effect on policy outcomes, in that the bureaucracy was recognised as having an important contribution to the implementation of public policies. Bardach (1977) suggests that the work of Pressman and Wildavsky did not go far enough and used a metaphor of "games" to describe the implementation process. Bardach (1977:57) defines implementation as a process of assembling elements required to produce a particular outcome and the playing out of a number of loosely interrelated games, where some elements are withheld or delivered to the program assembly process, on particular terms.

According to Bardach

the idea of "games," therefore, will serve principally as a master metaphor that directs attention and stimulates insight. It directs us to look at the players, what they regard as the stakes, their strategies and tactics, their resources for playing, the rules of play (which stipulate the conditions for winning), the rules of "fair" play (which stipulate the boundaries beyond which fraud or illegitimacy), the nature of the communications (or lack of them) among the players, and the degree of uncertainty surrounding the possible outcomes. (Bardach, 1977:56)
During the seventies, numbers of implementation studies steadily grew and literature on policy implementation increased. Although many studies were concerned with the implementation phenomena Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981:xi) contend that during the early eighties there was little consensus concerning the emergence of an appropriate framework in which to conduct implementation research or even the decision of which were appropriate variables to be included. It was acknowledged at that time implementation studies were not cumulative, although policy analysis did reflect a 'growing sophistication and understanding of the implementation process'.

Goggin et al., (1990:pp13-14) identify a number of criticisms of first generation studies. They suggest that the studies were atheoretical, case-specific, non-cumulative and pessimistic. On the other hand, they admit these studies served a number of valuable purposes. The first generation studies demonstrated the complex and dynamic nature of the implementation process while emphasising the importance of a policy sub-system and stating the difficulties that a sub-system creates for co-ordination and control.

Second-generation research

Second generation research built upon earlier policy studies work. According to Goggin et al., (1990), second generation studies' main contribution was the development of analytical frameworks which guided research on the complex phenomenon of policy implementation.

Although the broad categories of variables differed, second generation studies tended to focus on the same predictor variables, such as, the
form and content of policy, the organisations and their resources and
the people involved.

The major approaches found in the literature concerning these studies
have, traditionally been categorised as 'top-down studies' (Van Meter
& Van Horn 1975; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1981) or 'bottom-up
studies' (Weatherly and Lipsky, 1977; Hjern & Porter, 1981; Elmore,
1982) Top-down versions of implementation emphasises the role of
implementation in policy-making. Goggin et al, (1990:11) argue that
'top-down' studies show 'how a federal mandate structures choice at
the level of state and local government'.

According to Winter, the top-down approach

largely restricts its attention to actors that are formally
involved in the implementation of a specific program... the analyses start at the top and do not always reach the
delivery-level actors. (Winter, 1990:28)

According to Palumbo and Calista (1990:xiii), the 'bottom-up' approach
to implementation takes the view that the actions and conditions of
street-level bureaucrats and client behaviours are incorporated into
policy making. Goggin, et al, (1990:11) state that 'bottom-up' studies
show how local communities or school districts negotiate with federal,
regional and state agency personnel, elected representatives and the
environment to 'arrive at a mutually satisfying policy.'

Winter argues that the bottom-up approach

begins with the definition of a certain problem in society and proceeds with the identifications of actors
that affect this problem. Just as the 'top-down' approach favors actors at or near the top of the
implementation system, the 'bottom-up' approach,
resting on the assumptions that delivery-level activities are the most important in determining policy results, favors what happens at or close to the delivery level. (Winter, 1990:28)

A significant 'bottom-up' study involved research relating to the implementation of the Comprehensive Special Education Law of Massachusetts, Chapter 766. Here, Weatherley and Lipsky (1977) identified the important role played by the street-level bureaucrats in the implementation process. Street-level bureaucrats are identified as personnel such as teachers, police officers or welfare workers, who interact directly with citizens in the course of their work. It was discovered that they had substantial discretion in the implementation process.

According to Weatherley and Lipsky (1977: 172), street-level bureaucrats have a large number of service demands placed upon them, while personal and organisational resources are generally severely and chronically limited. To accomplish these demands the street-level bureaucrats employ a number of procedures to 'cope.' These could include procedures such as routinizing, modifying goals, rationing services, asserting priorities and limiting or controlling clientele.

Weatherley and Lipsky (1977: 172) specify these accommodations as 'coping mechanisms' and found that the street-level bureaucrats developed identifiable patterns of behaviour when delivering government programs to the public. By employing coping mechanisms the street-level bureaucrats, in turn, modified the intentions or objectives of the policies. These modifications to the policy intentions affected the policy implementation.
Due to the significant impact the street-level bureaucrats have on the process of policy implementation, Weatherley and Lipsky argue that, in a significant sense, the street-level bureaucrats are seen as the 'policy makers'.

Lester, et al (1987:204) argue that the 'bottom-up' approach received a great deal of criticism for assuming that policy implementation occurred or could occur in a decentralised policy making environment.

From the literature a number of influencing factors have been identified as either 'top-down' (Bardach 1977, Sabatier and Mazmanian, 1979; Gunn, 1978; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1981) or 'bottom-up' (Weatherly and Lipsky 1977; Lipsky, 1980, Winter, 1986), while Winter acknowledges that some studies have attempted to integrate the top-down and bottom-up approaches (Sabatier, 1986; Hull and Hjern, 1987). Winter argues that these studies demand more data-collection and analysis that can normally be done within one study, and sets of variables that hardly are enough to explain the implementation outcomes in a satisfactory way. (Winter, 1990:20)

Goggin et al, argue that both the 'top-down' and bottom-up' approaches can develop significant weaknesses. Goggin et al, contended that each tends to ignore the portion of implementation reality explained by the other, and neither addresses the question of relative influence of these different sorts of variables on policy as it is converted into action. Neither conceptualises the process in a fashion that is likely to explain clearly how these different factors
interactively affect implementation in a dynamic fashion. (Goggin et al, 1990:12)

Lester et al (1987) acknowledge that while these frameworks described the barriers to effective implementation they did not result in the development of useful theory about policy implementation. The analytical frameworks identified the factors that contributed to the realisation or non-realisation of the policy objectives. Goggin et al., note studies by Van Horn (1979), as singling out the "decision-making environments" as "conditioning", if not determining implementation and its results.

Goggin et al., (1990:14) highlight a number of major contributions of second generation studies. These studies contained evidence that implementation varies over time, across policies, and from one state to the next. The second generation studies specify the possible factors that could explain the variation in the implementation process. According to Goggin et al., the studies confronted the many difficult problems accompanying the process of systematic empirical implementation research.

According to Goggin et al., (1990), another major contribution of second generation research was that it identifies the importance of time periods; that is, at what point in history implementation occurs and over what period of time.

On the other hand, Goggin et al., (1990) propose a number of criticisms of second generation studies. For example, they cite the Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) study that was only able to illustrate the framework with six non-standardised case studies that could not be replicated,
where no attention was paid to interstate variations in implementation and where the model failed to highlight which variables were more important than others. Goggin et al., (1990:15) point out that no study that they found had been able to validate the propositions that are derived from the earlier frameworks or from a synthesis of perspectives. Therefore, few subsequent researchers have conducted studies that could be replicated by other scholars.

Another important notion that could not be overlooked for this enquiry was Palumbo and Calista's (1990:4) view that early implementation studies, (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973, Bardach 1978, Williams 1980) highlights most government programs failed because of the role of the bureaucrats in the implementation process. They claim that these studies focused on implementation at the point of delivering a policy, resulting in blame being placed with the bureaucrats responsible for delivery.

According to Palumbo and Calista (1990:pp4-5) by the late 1980's researchers discovered that the earlier views of the blame being placed with the bureaucrats was wrong. They proposed three reasons why this was the case.

First, they contend that the researchers assumed that policy implementation could be separated from formulation and design of the policy. It is now accepted that the opposite is rather true, that is, the implementation phase is not separable from the formulation phase.

Second, the researchers assumed that problem definition and policy design are usually clear and unambiguous. According to Palumbo and
Calista (1990:5) this is rarely the case. Problem definition and policy design are 'political activities,' which are 'products of conflict that results in bargaining and compromise.' Therefore, it is not possible to identify correctly the causes of the social problem the policy seeks to solve. Palumbo and Calista (1990:5) contend that 'what is identified as a cause of a social problem depends on the ideology of the person or groups doing the identifying.'

And finally, Palumbo and Calista claim that the definition of implementation was too narrow in most studies. Implementation involves more than just the governmental agencies officially responsible for carrying out the implementation. According to Palumbo and Calista (1990:5) other organisations such as, private agencies and target groups, and socioeconomic, cultural and political conditions should be considered.

Goggin (1986:328) also argues that early policy studies concerning the implementation of policies, 'painted a picture of inevitable failure.' He contended that implementation should be conceptualised as a complex and dynamic process. The implementation process is 'characterised by a variety of participants, with a wide range of perspectives.' According to Goggin, when participants interpret and operationalise policy decisions, this inevitably leads to multiple interpretations and results and the results may or may not be anticipated.

Bowman (1987) views the implementation process as complex and difficult to understand because of several formidable and methodological problems, such as, the use of too many variables and a lack of attention to the development of measures.
According to Yanow, most implementation research consists of case studies that have focused on organisations or individuals acting within organisations. Yanow argued that these case studies may be grouped as having been developed through four "lenses":

1. The human relations lens, which looks at the behaviour of individual actors within organisations and traits of interpersonal behaviour;
2. The political lens, which examines dynamics within groups and relations between and among groups;
3. The structural lens, which focuses on the organisation itself as a designed set of behavioural rules;
4. The systems lens, which targets organisations as they relate to one another in a particular environment.

(Yanow, 1990:214)

Yanow (1990:216) contended that the four lenses are 'fully distinct, chiefly, in an analytic sense' but are often used 'in various combinations.' For example, implementation analyses that have focused on inter-governmental relations amalgamate elements from the systems, political and structural lenses.

The lenses identified by Yanow are important to this study as the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy involved communication and behaviour of both individuals and organisations operating with governmental and inter-governmental levels.

According to Goggin (1986), while both first and second generation implementation research have added much to our knowledge of the implementation process, it has been much less helpful in differentiating among types of implementation outcomes or specifying the causal pattern associated with these outcomes. Also, in relation to
the frequency with which these patterns occur and the relative importance and effects of the various independent variables on the policy outcomes. These criticisms have lead to the development of a third-generation of implementation studies.

**Third-generation research**

Third-generation research is proposed by Goggin et al, (1990) as a new alternative in implementation studies. Goggin et al., contend that the principal aim of third-generation research is to shed new light on implementation studies by explaining why the organisational behaviour varies across time, policies and units of government. They argue that third-generation research could overcome the conceptual and methodological problems that many scholars agree have impeded progress in implementation studies.

Goggin et al., (1990:19) argue that the 'unique trait of third generation research is its research design.' The research design provides an explicit theoretical model; operational definition of concepts; a search for reliable indicators of implementation and predictor variables; and specification of theoretically derived hypotheses, with analyses of data.

The third-generation study, as proposed by Goggin et al, is the development of a model of the implementation process that integrates the major concerns and variables of top-down and bottom-up research traditions within a single framework. A framework of this kind was applied to the analysis of the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy in this study. The framework is discussed in detail later in this chapter.
Whether it is first, second or third generation studies of policy implementation studies, researchers have attempted to identify those factors that may influence the complex phenomenon of policy implementation or factors that may account for programmatic results. Researchers have strived through time for the development of an implementation theory.

Winter (1990) suggests that during the late seventies and eighties, there had been some development of a theory. He cites studies by Lipsky (1980), Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981), Hjern and Porter (1981), Elmore (1982) and Yanow (1987), as having contributed to the development of an implementation theory. While acknowledging the major impact of these studies concerns the understanding of the complex nature of policy implementation, he argues that there was little accumulation in implementation theory. He argues that there was substantial theoretical pluralism, derived from the various perspectives, research strategies and theoretical findings but little overall accumulation in the knowledge of the implementation process.

Therefore, Winter suggests a model which accumulates the implementation theory by identifying the most promising theoretical elements drawn from earlier implementation studies.

Before outlining the Winter model (1990) which is used extensively in this enquiry, it is important to briefly explore one of these earlier studies. That is, a model proposed by Mazmanian and Sabatier a decade earlier, which identifies factors that could influence the implementation of policy.
FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY
Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981:6) propose that a substantial portion of the outcomes, that is, the degree of effectiveness of any major implementation process, can be explained by a finite number of variables and these could be organised within a conceptual framework. Importantly, they propose a number of conceptual possibilities for implementation. Firstly, they state that it was possible to outline the general stages of the implementation process between enactment and the impact of the program. Secondly, it was possible to identify the principal set of variables and the value each must take for successful implementation. Thirdly, it was possible to examine empirically the relative importance of the policy variables within and across policy domains. According to Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983:6), the implementation process runs through a number of identifiable stages beginning with the passage of the basic statute, followed by policy outputs or decisions of the implementation agencies, the compliance of the target groups, actual impacts (both intended and unintended), perceived impacts of agency decisions and finally attempted revisions to the basic statute.

During the implementation analysis the variables that affect the achievement of the objectives should be identified. Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983:22) offer three broad categories of possible independent variables; that is, the tractability of the problems being addressed, the ability of the statute to structure the implementation process and the net effect of the variety of political variables on the policy objectives which impact on the stages or dependent variables in the implementation process.
The analytical framework proposed by Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) was criticised by Lester et al (1987:204) for failing to identify which variables were likely to be more important and under what circumstances. Another criticism posed, is that the 'top-downers', such as Mazmanian and Sabatier assume that the framers of the policy decision are the key actors and that others are basically impediments.

An alternative model was then proposed by Winter, who attempts to combine the theoretical elements of both the top-down approach of Mazmanian and Sabatier and other colleagues over the years, with elements from the bottom-up approach. Winter's model also includes other neglected variables which are nonetheless deemed important.
According to Winter (1990:20) the key factors that determine implementation outcome are found in four main socio-political processes or conditions:

1. the character of the policy formation process prior to the law or decision to be implemented
2. the organisational and inter-organisational implementation behaviour
3. the street-level bureaucratic behaviour
4. the response by target groups and other changes in society.

Winter argues, that the model is relatively simple with only four sets of key variables to explain implementation outcomes, but acknowledged that it becomes more complicated when each of the four variables is analysed separately. Winter suggests that the model is intended to have a general applicability across different countries and
policy areas but that it does not offer itself as a synthesizing research strategy or methodological recipe.

The four socio-political processes or conditions are now discussed in detail, as well as the evaluation standard: output/outcomes.

**Policy formation**

According to Winter there has been an increased interest in policy design as a variable that affects the implementation outcome. Winter (1990:pp.24-25) derives a set of hypotheses, acknowledging that, from three conflicting models of policy making: the rational decision-making model, the conflict-bargaining model and the garbage-can model, citing the work of Olsen (1972) and March and Olsen (1985), there is an absence of theory, concerning the effect of policy formation on implementation.

The hypotheses derived by Winter are

1. successful implementation is likely to be negatively related to the degree of conflict in the policy formation phase
2. successful implementation is more likely if the policy proponents in the policy-formation process have based their decisions on a valid causal theory about the problematic behaviour to be regulated by the policy and the relationship between the policy instruments and that behaviour
3. implementation success is unlikely if the policy was adopted for symbolic reasons
4. successful implementation is likely to be positively related to the level of attention by the policy proponents in the policy-formation process. (Winter, 1990:25)

**Organisational and inter-organisational implementation**

The second variable that could influence policy outcomes is the way organisations alone, or inter-organisational relationships, respond to
policy mandates. Often participants in the implementation of policy objectives can influence the policy process, for example, by giving priority to goals that conflict with the policy. This variable closely aligns to the work by Bardach (1977). Winter (1990:27) cites case studies in the United States and Europe where problems arose in implementation from lack of co-ordinated action among federal, state and local governments. Winter proposes that the common core of the argument is that implementation output and outcomes are affected by organisational interests and incentives of the organisation or organisations, that participate in the implementation process. Therefore, policy outputs and outcomes are determined by the interests and resources of the participants.

**Street-level bureaucratic behaviour**

The third variable, identified by Winter, relates closely to the work of Michael Lipsky (1980). According to Winter (1990:31) it was Lipsky’s work which "turned the policy making process on its head" when he suggested that street-level bureaucrats were the "real policy makers." Winter acknowledges that laws and programs are nothing but statements and have no social existence until they are translated into action and that street-level bureaucrats are public officials who, in their work, interact directly with members of the target groups, and who have considerable discretionary powers.

Winter (1990:31) argues that street-level bureaucrats employ a number of conscious or subconscious coping mechanisms and tend to give priority to easy, programmed routine cases at the expense of more complicated, non-programmed and time-consuming cases. Winter acknowledges the work of Lipsky, by stating that he has shown that the
street-level bureaucrats are perhaps the most important actors in the policy process. On the other hand, Winter (1990:32) warns that the street-level bureaucracy theory is too narrow to be satisfactory alone. He suggests that if the coping behaviour is related to perceptions and attitudes then understanding could be improved by introducing organisational culture as an explanatory variable. He argues that if coping behaviour is rooted in organisational culture then a logical strategy would be to change the organisational culture.

**Target group behaviour**

According to Winter (1990:33), implementation is very much affected by the way in which the target groups respond to the policy. Other conditions, such as changing socio-economic conditions may also affect the policy. Winter suggests that most implementation research has paid very little systematic attention to how target group behaviour and societal changes' impact on implementation.

Winter (1990:38) proposes that inter-relationships exist among the four independent implementation variables. According to Winter, the most important relationship appears to be the impact of the policy formation process on all three other variables, the impact of organisational and inter-organisational implementation behaviour on both street-level bureaucratic and target group behaviour, and the impact of street-level bureaucracy on target group response.

**Evaluation standard: output/outcome**

According to Winter, it is not always clear what the dependent variable is and there is 'little agreement about the proper standard of
evaluation' for the purpose of deciding whether the implementation was a success or failure.

Winter identifies three main kinds of behaviour when looking for an evaluation standard: process, output and outcome/impact or changes in society. Most implementation evaluation studies compare behaviour with the official policy goals. Winter (1990:22) argues that the identification of policy goals represents a major problem in policy evaluation and implementation analyses as goals can be vague and conflicting or real goals may be different to the official goals.

Winter suggests two strategies to use in order to identify an evaluation standard: firstly, the use of goals or interests of the various actors in the implementation process or the interests of all actors involved in the formation of the policy, which is a notion that draws on the 'stakeholder' work of Hjern, Hanf and Porter (1978), Hjern and Porter (1981), Premfors (1981) and Saetren (1983). Another strategy is to avoid policy goals and focus on problem solving. The evaluation criterion is not goal achievement but the extent to which implementation structures contribute to the solving of problems in society.

Winter suggests that output and outcome are the most relevant variables, as neither process nor output compliance can assure goal achievement. He suggests that the official goals are used as the evaluation standard for outputs and outcomes.

In the preliminary stages of the enquiry it appeared that the implementation process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy involving federal and state organisations, could be analysed effectively
through Winter's model. Its second socio-political process or condition: 'organisational and inter-organisational implementation' appeared to be particularly relevant to the task. On close scrutiny, however, the model appeared to be too generic.

The Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was formulated at the Commonwealth or national level by a Task Force. The majority of recommendations were to be implemented at the State level. The degree of success of the implementation relied on the co-operation and action of the state organisations in a context of constitutional jurisdiction. Winter's model does not differentiate between different levels of government, therefore an additional framework (Goggin et al 1990) was applied to the enquiry to explain the dynamic and complex nature of inter-governmental policy implementation.

**Dynamic Framework of Analysis**

Goggin et al., (1990:20) present a dynamic framework of analysis to explain the implementation process at the inter-governmental level within a federal system. According to Goggin et al., (1990) a framework of analysis can be conceptualised as a "candidate" theory that relates to the work of Eckstein (1975). That is,

A tentative set of related propositions capable of predicting and explaining state-level implementation processes, outputs, and outcomes and specifying the conditions under which various state implementation behaviours are likely to occur. (Goggin et al., 1990)

Goggin et al., (1990:31) offer a model called either the 'Conceptual Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation' or the 'Communications Model of Inter-governmental Policy
Implementation' or the 'Dynamic Model of the Implementation Process.' The authors, explain how they have used a 'middle range' communications theory derived from Merton 1949, (cited by Goggin et al., 1990:33) to help link the pieces of their model together.

Goggin et al, argue that the Communications Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation conceptualises

the implementation process at the state level, as well as its product (outputs and outcomes), resulting from choices made by the state. State policy decisions depend on external government influences as well as intrastate influences. State implementation behaviour is a function of inducements and constraints provided to or imposed on the states from elsewhere in the federal system -above or below the state level -as well as of the state's own propensity to act and its capacity to effectuate preferences. (Goggin et al, 1990:31)

The authors acknowledge that inducements are factors, conditions and actions that stimulate implementation and that constraints have the opposite effect. The Communications Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation is outlined in Figure 2.3 and described in detail hereafter.
Figure 2.3 Communications model of inter-governmental policy implementation (Goggin et al, 1990)

Goggin et al contend that state implementation is a process. The model conceptualises the implementation process at the state level, as well as its product (outputs and outcomes), as a result of choices made by the state. The approach is based on the notion that

no single factor can explain differences in implementation and that the decision made at the
federal level will affect the behaviour and choices of those responsible for its execution.

Goggin et al., contend that states are discrete units with their own policy agendas and that the state response to federal inducements and constraints will vary depending on the preferences of the key participants. They purport that state responses are also influenced by the state's capacity to act.

In Goggin's Conceptual Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation, three clusters of variables are identified which affect state implementation; they are, the inducements and constraints from the 'top' (the federal level), inducements and constraints from the 'bottom' (the state and local levels) and finally the state decisional outcomes and capacity. Goggin et al., (1990:33) argue that at any given time the interaction of the three clusters determines the course the implementation will take and that the decisions and actions taken at this level are a result of bargaining among various interests as each interest has its own expectations, goals, resources, stakes and power. Further, bargained joint decisions derived in this manner are constrained by the political, cultural, and economic environment, and the capacity of local organisations to act on the state's collective choices.

Goggin et al., propose that the implementation experience sets in motion a feedback process in which agents (sub-national politicians and administrators) transmit messages to principals (federal-level policy makers). The result of this feedback process is that policy redesign may result.
The authors also suggest that the variability of the implementation process is due to the interpretation between the state and federal level implementors. That is,

State level implementors form the nexus for the communications channels. These implementors are the targets of implementation-related messages transmitted from both federal-level and local-level senders. As recipients, state-level implementors must interpret a barrage of messages. The potential for distortion exists. Interpretation is a function of context. (Goggin et al., 1990:33)

Goggin et al., argue that inter-governmental policy implementation is an exceedingly complex process and that their Conceptual Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation allows a means of synthesising the "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches.

Goggin et al., (1990:34) differentiate between outputs and outcomes. Outputs refers to the extent to which programmatic goals have been satisfied while outcomes are the changes in the larger societal problem that the program is intended to rectify. They argue that given the dynamic nature of implementation, the outputs and the outcomes, are the only means of accurately portraying implementation. As a result of implementation, the outputs and outcome will vary considerably, therefore Goggin et al., rejected the dichotomous conceptualisation that implementation can be simply either a success or a failure.

Goggin et al., acknowledge that variables which may affect state implementation includes the legitimacy and credibility of officials and agencies.

Decision makers at the state level are positioned in a pivotal role. Goggin et al., suggest that they are the receivers of streams of
information flowing from federal, state and local government levels. They argue that even if objective conditions in two states are identical the implementation decision may vary.

Goggin et al., (1990:38) contend that this variance at the state level is the function of the manner in which decision makers interpret the information that they are receiving. They argue that even under optimal circumstances "in which there is perfect congruence between information from the top and the bottom", two conditions must exist before implementation will occur. First, a decision by the state to proceed or implement must be made. According to Goggin et al. (1990:38), 'without the decision to proceed, implementation stalls'. The decision not to proceed, according to Goggin et al., is a function of the manner in which state decision makers interpret information, The interpretation is related to factors internally, such as the decision makers psychological disposition, and externally, such as interpersonal relations among politicians and representatives of organised interests. Secondly, the state's capacity to act must exist before implementation will occur. According to Goggin et al., state actions regarding implementation are influenced not only by federal level and state/local level preferences but also by the organisational and ecological capacity to act. Goggin et al. (1990:38), argue that organisational capacity refers to the institution's 'ability to take purposeful action', which is a function of the structural, personnel and resource characteristics of state agencies. Ecological capacity pertains to the "contextual environment" in which the state government operates.

Goggin et al., argue that state capacity is a function of organisational capacity because implementation within a state involves bureaucratic
organisations. They identify three elements which they suggest are paramount in their Conceptual Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation's organisational setting in determining behaviour. They are organisational structure, personnel and financial resources.

Goggin et al., contended that the constraints and inducements at the national and sub-national levels of government vary from program to program and from state to state and it is this dissatisfaction with the existing policies which may lead to the eventual redesign of some policies. For this reason a feedback loop has been included in the Conceptual Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation (Figure 2.3). Goggin et al., explain the policy redesign component of the model reflects the 'fluidity inherent in inter-governmental policy implementation'.

The authors argue also that the Conceptual Model of Inter-governmental Policy Implementation resists the temptation to emphasise either a top-down or bottom-up approach but instead synthesises both approaches into a more comprehensive vision of inter-governmental policy implementation. (Goggin et al., 1990:40)

**IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS MODEL**

The literature reviewed in this chapter highlights the role of implementation in the policy process, links it firmly to policy formulation and identifies the factors or variables which may influence both. Among the more recent model builders, Winter (1990), identifies the most 'promising theoretical elements' that contribute to the formulation and implementation process. Elements influencing
implementation are grouped in four socio-political processes or conditions. Goggin et al, (1990) develop a more detailed and dynamic framework for analysis, titled the Conceptual Model of Intergovernmental Policy Implementation which conceptualised the implementation process at the state level within a federal system.

A synthesis of the Winter model and the Goggin et al model has been applied to this study to explain the implementation process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy and identify factors which may have effected the degree of success of the implementation.

The synthesis of the two models, as developed for this study follows (Figure 2.4). In the synthesis, the Goggin's model has been introduced to better articulate the nature of Winter's organisational and inter-organisational variables.
The Synthesis Model of Implementation Process outlined in Figure 2.4 provides the analytic framework to describe and explain the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

The framework when applied to the enquiry:
1. provides a description of the policy process (including the formulation and implementation phases)
2. identifies the outcomes and outputs as a result of the implementation process
3. identifies the possible factors/variables which affected the degree of success of the implementation process.

The remaining section of this chapter identifies six broad research questions and related questions drawn from this framework.

The related questions apply to the four socio-economic conditions or processes identified by Winter (1990) and further developed by Goggin et al (1990), in relation to the federal/state system.

Research question one was applied to the formulation phase.
Research question two was applied to the State/Territory implementation phase.
Research question three was applied to the Commonwealth/federal implementation phase.
Research questions four, five and six were applied generally to the policy process.

Research Question One:

What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy at the formulation phase? And to what extent did it affect the degree of success of the implementation?

Socio-political condition one:

Policy Formation Process

Related questions:
1.1 Conflict:
• Was there conflict among the Task Force members?

1.2 Self interest:
• Did the Task Force members follow their own interests during the formulation phase?
1.3 **Commitment:**
- Was there lack of commitment by the Task Force members during the formulation phase?

1.4 **Lack of consensus:**
- Was there lack of consensus by the Task Force members concerning the main objectives when formulating the policy?

1.5 **Coalitions:**
- Were coalitions formed by the Task Force members during the formulation phase?

1.6 **Valid causal theory:**
- Was the policy based on a valid causal theory?

1.7 **Symbolic reasoning?**
- Was the policy adopted for symbolic reasons?

1.8 **Level of attention:**
- Did competing issues affect the level of attention afforded by the Task Force members?

---

**Research Question Two:**

What factors or variables affected the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy at the implementation phase at the State/Territory level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

**Socio-political condition two:**

**Organisational and inter-organisational implementation behaviour**

**Related questions:**

2.1 **Conflicting interests/incentives:**
- Did the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy have conflicting interests or incentives to the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?
2.2 Goal priority:
• Did the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy give priority to goals which competed with the policy?

2.3 Co-ordination:
• Were there any problems with co-ordination between the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy and the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

2.4 Delays:
• Were there any delays by the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy with the implementation of the policy recommendations?

2.5 Inducements:
• Were any inducements provided by Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy to the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy?

2.6 Constraints:
• Were any constraints placed on the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy by the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

2.7 Capacity and propensity to act:
• Was there variation in the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy capacity and propensity to act on the policy recommendations?
Research Question Three:
What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy at the implementation phase at the Commonwealth/Federal level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

Socio-political condition two:
Organisational and inter-organisational implementation behaviour

Related questions:
3.1 Conflicting interests/incentives:
• Did the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy have conflicting interests or incentives to the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

3.2 Goal priority:
• Did the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy give priority to goals which competed with the policy?

3.3 Co-ordination:
• Were there any problems with co-ordination between the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy and the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

3.4 Delays:
• Were there any delays by the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy with the implementation of the policy recommendations?

3.5 Inducements:
• Were any inducements provided by Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy to the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy?
3.6 **Constraints:**
• Were any constraints placed on the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy by the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

3.7 **Capacity and propensity to act:**
• Was there variation in the Commonwealth organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy capacity and propensity to act on the policy recommendations?

Research Question Four:

**Did street level bureaucrats affect the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?**

Socio-political condition three:

**Street-level bureaucrats**

Related questions:

4.1 **Coping strategies**
• Did the street-level bureaucrats employ any sub-conscious or conscious coping strategies when implementing the policy recommendations?

4.2 **Objectives**
• Did the street-level bureaucrats vary the main objectives of the policy?
Research Question Five:

Did target group behaviour or socio-economic conditions affect the policy process of the *Education and the Arts* (1985) policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

Socio-political condition four:

**Target group behaviour/ socio-economic conditions**

Related questions:

5.1 *Modification of target group*

- Was the behaviour of the target group modified as a result of the policy implementation?

5.2 *Education/social background*

- Did the implementation process vary depending on the education and social background of the target group?

5.3 *Societal changes*

- Were there any unexpected societal changes which affected the implementation process?

This enquiry also addresses the final issue of increasing current research in policy studies.

Implementation theory is a relatively new field of research within the policy studies area. Only lately has it been accepted as a 'distinctive' phase of the policy process closely linked to the others. As research studies unfold the complex and dynamic nature of implementation analysis also clarifies. Arts education policy development and implementation in Australia is not an exception to the rule. It too is complex, dynamic consisting of numerous layers and levels of exploration. Therefore, this enquiry attempts to answer the following:
Research Question Six:

*What does the implementation process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy tell us about policy theory?*

Seeking answers to these questions has provided data upon which some conclusions have been reached on the general thrust of the enquiry: why was there such a lack of improvement or progress in arts education in Australia over the past two decades even after a major policy had been formulated and implemented? And what contribution will this enquiry make to the fields of arts education and policy studies?
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this enquiry is to investigate why the situation in arts education in Australia has not improved with the implementation of a major policy, *Education and the Arts, 1985* over two decades. This chapter outlines the research methodology chosen for seeking answers to the specific research questions established in the previous chapter.

Research methods housed predominantly in a qualitative research paradigm are used in this enquiry, employing multiple methods of data collection. These include document analysis, elite unstructured interviews and semi-structured interviews. This chapter outlines the reasons why the research methodology employed in this enquiry is considered to be justified and relevant. It does so by providing a broad outline of qualitative research methods, while supporting the selection of a constructivist methodology.

More specifically, this chapter outlines the methods used to gather the necessary data, which includes interviewing, the sampling methods chosen and the use of written texts and artefacts. This chapter also outlines the processes or methods used in analysing and validating the data, such as coding, data reduction, data categorisation, analytic
induction, explanation and content analysis. A description and justification for the choice follows.

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

According to Marshall (1989), qualitative research methods have become increasingly important modes of inquiry for the social sciences. Qualitative research methods are appropriate for studies which need to delve in-depth into complexities and processes of a phenomenon in order to research and explore where and why policy, folk wisdom and practice work or do not work. This is often the case in the analysis of policy processes. Qualitative researchers tend to study things in their natural settings and attempt to make sense of, or interpret, particular phenomenon. As this enquiry relies on securing an in-depth understanding of a particular phenomena, that is, the implementation process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, a qualitative paradigm was chosen as being the most useful for the enquiry.

According to Guba and Lincoln (1994:107) a qualitative paradigm may be viewed as 'a set of basic beliefs or metaphysics that deals with ultimates or first principles'. Denzin and Lincoln (1994:2) argue that qualitative research is multi-method in focus which involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach to its subject matter.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994:5) argue that the use of quantitative positivist methods and assumptions has been rejected by a new generation of qualitative researchers, who are attached to post-structural, post-modern sensibilities. They identify the qualitative research process as inter-connected, generic activities which can be
defined as including theory, methodology, analysis and ontology and epistemology. Denzin and Lincoln contend that the gendered, multiculturally situated researcher approaches the world with a set of ideas, a framework (theory and ontology) that specifies a set of questions (epistemology) that are then examined (methodology and analysis) in specific ways.

Early models of qualitative research are presented by Guba and Lincoln as 'naturalistic inquiry' that they claim are appropriate to examine field based situations in 'natural' settings. Later, Guba and Lincoln (1989:19) propose the term 'constructivism' is a more appropriate reference to a methodology which acknowledges that a 'construct of reality is in the minds of the individuals'. They assume the researcher should not and cannot, be neatly disentangled from the observed in the activity of inquiring into 'constructions'. This enquiry was conducted in a setting where the researcher could not be 'disentangled'. The policy processes involved revealing the actions, motives and decisions of many actors. The researcher has always been a strong advocate for arts education. The results of this enquiry are perceived by the researcher as important for a number of reasons. Besides the obvious scholarly contribution to the field of implementation research, results are potentially important in the improvement of arts education in Australia. Increased knowledge of the policy process in arts education will benefit the field allowing more effective advocacy roles to be played in the future.

**CONSTRUCTIVISM**

According to Schwandt (1994:118) 'constructivist', 'constructivism', 'interpretivist' and 'interpretivism' are terms that routinely appear in
the lexicon of social science methodologists. The world of 'lived reality' and 'situation specific meanings' is thought to be constructed by social actors. Some social science researchers contend that actors fashion meaning out of events and phenomena, through prolonged complex processes of social interaction. Constructivists or interpretivists believe that to understand the world of meaning, one must interpret from both a personal and social view. Schwandt argues that the researcher, when examining a social setting, must elucidate or construct a 'process of meaning' by clarifying what and how the meanings are embodied in the language and actions of social actors.

Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell and Alexander (1990:6) purport that qualitative methodology allows the researcher to uncover the thoughts, perceptions and feelings that are experienced by the informants. Therefore, methods employed qualitatively allow the researcher to gain access to the motives, meanings, actions and reactions of the informants.

According to Huberman and Miles (1994:434), qualitative studies are especially well suited to finding causal relationships. Qualitative studies can 'look directly and longitudinally at the local processes underlying a temporal series of events or states'. Huberman and Miles (1994:434) argue for the importance of causality in a study, by claiming that causality brings in the question of time as part of an explanation and that prior events are assumed to have a connection with later events. Causality is an important aspect of this enquiry, which is diachronic in nature.
This enquiry deemed a constructivist methodology as the most appropriate for the theoretical framework, as there was a need to examine closely the motives, meanings, actions and reactions of key actors in the arts policy making arena. The methods for gathering data on these motives and actions is discussed in detail below.

**DATA GATHERING METHODS**

A variety of methods drawn from a qualitative paradigm were chosen to gather data for this enquiry. They are document analysis (written text and artefacts), elite unstructured interviews, and semi-structured interviews. Initially, documents were gathered and analysed which allowed for the identification of interviewees. Each methodology will be explained in detail.

**DOCUMENT ANALYSIS**

**Written texts and artefacts**

The Education and the Arts, 1985 final report was the first artefact used in this study. It was able to provide the necessary information to map or track the preliminary stages of the policy process. It provided the researcher with the names of the main players in the process as well as the 'official' federal government account of the proceedings and the recommendations of the Task Force. The written report proved to be invaluable in the preliminary stages for 'deconstructing' the policy process and 'reconstructing' the events.

According to Hodder (1994:393) written evidence, unlike the spoken word, endures physically and can be separated across space and time
from its author, producer or user. Written texts can be considered as arising either from firsthand experience or as a secondary source. Texts can be solicited or unsolicited, edited or unedited, anonymous or signed. Hodder (1994:394) argues the value of written text as evidence, as words have practical and social impact as well as a communication function. He points out that written texts can have multiple reinterpretations each time the artefact is read. To address this issue, the researcher used a number of interview informants to confirm his interpretations. Interpretation of written texts were clarified by triangulating the information with other sources of written documents.

Lincoln and Guba argue that documents and records are

a stable, rich and rewarding resource. They provide a base from which any subsequent inquirers can work and thus lend stability to further inquiry. (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:232)

Importantly, documents and records represent a 'natural source of information'. They are an 'in context' source of information. Lincoln and Guba (1985:232) contend that documents and records 'arise from the context and exist in it'. Written texts are non-reactive and are a useful source of information.

Lincoln and Guba (1985:277) make a distinction between documents and records on the basis of whether the text was prepared in order to attest to some formal transaction, such as certificates, licenses or contracts or whether the text was prepared for personal rather than official reasons, such as diaries, memos (personal), letters and field
notes. In this enquiry the researcher accessed both records and documents.

According to Hodder (1994:393), written texts which are closer to speech require more contextualised interpretation. Hodder contends that texts are of importance for qualitative research because access is easy and at low cost. Hodder concludes that information found in written texts may not be available in spoken form and that text tends to endure over time, giving historical insight.

Hodder (1994:394) warns the researcher that the meaning of a text can vary depending on who is reading or writing it and, unlike a response in an interview, cannot be clarified for meaning. Therefore, as the text is reread in different contexts it is given new meanings, sometimes contradictory. Texts can only be understood in the context of the reader, as text is always socially embedded; further, texts should be understood in the context of their production. For example, text which is read by a researcher with little knowledge or understanding of the terminology of a particular field, will be read or interpreted differently from a researcher who is intimate or currently working in the field of inquiry.

Caulley (1981: pp 4-6) outlines a number of advantages and disadvantages in using document analysis (written texts and artefacts) as a data collection and analysis tool. Caulley points to the advantage of efficiency of collection of data, in that, information obtained from documents is often more credible than information obtained via observation and interviewing. Caulley proposes that some information may only be obtained in this manner. Documents are convenient to use and are often available at no-cost or low-cost. Caulley contends that
generally documents are non-reactive, can provide continual feed-in of information and can constitute a legally unassailable base.

On the other hand, Caulley (1981), claims there are also disadvantages with document analysis as a collection tool, in that, documents can be misleading. Some documents may rely on the memory of the writer, others can lack detail, they may reflect clerical errors, agency records could be out of date, while some definitions and categories could be inappropriate. Caulley (1981:6) argues, documentary facts can be 'refracted through the recorder' and documents may provide unrepresentative samples.

Guba and Lincoln purport that document and record analysis serves an additional grounding function, in that it,

   helps the inquirer to maintain interest in the context and helps to ensure that research is not removed from its social, historical and political frame of reference. (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:234)

Guba and Lincoln (1981:237) argue that people who use written texts and artefacts are primarily interested in 'tracking' because it lends clarity to understanding the research setting. Written texts were used extensively in this enquiry as a method of data collection. Initially, the written texts were used, as Guba and Lincoln contend, in the process of tracking the phases of the policy process. As stated earlier, using *Action: Education and the Arts, an illustrated edition of the Report of the Task Force on Education and the Arts to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs* (1985), as a starting point, the researcher acquired an extensive and varied range of documents and records relating to the formulation and implementation phases of the policy. The Task Force report provided the researcher with not only a list of major
recommendations, but a comprehensive list of organisations who had been given the responsibility for implementation.

By following the formal channels of acquiring Commonwealth government documentation, which required written application and approval, the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) in Canberra released quite an extensive array of files\(^1\) relating to the formulation and implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. Documentation included any files still in existence, except the personal files of the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs. The files obtained consisted of letters, official memorandum, personal memos, official responses, requests, detailed agendas of meetings (including times and dates), contracts, finance details, draft responses relating to the governmental, inter-governmental and organisations involved in the formulation and the implementation of the policy. These files were copied with the permission of the DEET archives department and provided the basis for further inquiry concerning the key players in the implementation process.

As the enquiry progressed further documents were acquired from state Departments and Ministries of Education and personal artefacts from 'players' involved in the process. Written permission was sought and gained from each of the government departments, both state and Commonwealth, to access files relating to the formulation and implementation of the recommendations made by the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

\(^1\)See ‘Reference List of Written Documentation’ (p. 280)
The major constraint in acquiring written texts and artefacts relating to the enquiry was the time involved in the organisations giving permission for access. Due to the bureaucratic nature of government departments both at the State and Commonwealth level there tended to be a time delay for the approval for access. For example, the time lapse between applying for the DEET documentation and acquiring the information was between three to four months. This time delay was not due to the sensitive nature of the material requested or inability to locate the information; it was due to the vast number of committees, organisations and departments which were required to approve a single request. Once permission was given, the organisations and intergovernmental departments were very obliging in providing access to the documents. Often photocopiers and allocation of suitable space and time were provided for the researcher.

Other written documents, such as newspaper clippings, editorials and information concerning professional associations were acquired by data bank searches: on-line, micro-fiche and 'hand-searches'.

Extensive data was gathered and collected from a variety of written texts and artefacts. The advantages and disadvantages of this data gathering source have been outlined in detail. In summary, the advantages of written texts and artefacts are that as a source they are accessible, non-reactive, cost little and tend to be a useful in providing information. Some disadvantages highlighted were that they could have multiple re-interpretations, they needed to be understood in the context of their production and could be misleading. The researcher overcame many of these issues by confirming interpretations with interview informants. Also, many of the written texts used were
official records rather than personal letters, therefore, the text was less misleading and problems with lack of detail or memory was minimised. The way this data was analysed is described in detail below.

**PROCESSES IN DATA ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN TEXTS**

Minichiello et al, (1990:285) claims that 'the central feature of data analysis is conceptualising data into theory'. The aim of data analysis, according to Minichiello et al, (1990:285) is to find meaning in the information collected. Data analysis is the process of systematically arranging and presenting information in order to search for ideas. Data analysis processes involve data reduction, data categorisation, analytic induction and explanation. For the data to become meaningful for analysis, the researcher must identify issues and common themes inherent in the data which may link together to form the structure or components of a theory. The identification of common themes grounds the data analysis in the informants understanding as distinct from the researchers understanding.

Guba and Lincoln (1981:231) identify analytic tools for both records and documents. According to Guba and Lincoln, the appropriate analytic tools for records and document analysis in a qualitative paradigm are 'content analysis', 'case-study aggregation' and 'tracking'.

Guba and Lincoln argued that in order to define document analysis it is necessary to analyse communication in terms of 'who says what to whom, how and with what effect and why'. That is, the key words are

- who (conceptualised as the *sender*);
- why (conceptualised as the *encoding process*);
- how (conceptualised as the *channel*);
- what (conceptualised as
the message, which may address either what or how; with what effect (conceptualised as the receiver's reaction or, to use a more abstract term, the decoding process); and to whom (conceptualised as the recipient). (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:337)

The form of document analysis concerned with the 'what' or 'message' portion of the communication is called 'content analysis'.

Marshall and Rossman add to the definition

Content analysis is a technique that allows examination of data to determine whether or not the data supports an hypothesis. It allows the researcher to obtain an "objective", and quantitative description" (Berelson, 1952, p. 18) of the content of communications. (Marshall and Rossman, 1989:98)

They contend that content analysis is a technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages. According to Marshall and Rossman (1989:98), the first step in planning a content analysis is to establish specific objectives to be achieved or hypotheses to be tested. Content analysis usually aims at producing descriptive information, cross-validating research findings or testing hypotheses. The researcher finds relationships between the objectives of the enquiry and the data. The researcher can use a coding or classification system for analysing the content. In this enquiry the categories identified from the Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990) models, used in the formulation of the research questions and related questions were applied to the data gathered\(^2\).

\(^2\) See Synthesis Model of the Implementation Process for categories used. (Ch. 2 p. 70)
Marshall and Rossman (1989:100) purport that the greatest strength of the content analysis method is that it is 'unobtrusive and nonreactive'. It can be conducted without disturbing the setting in any way.

Another method of document analysis is case study aggregation analysis. Examination of multiple documents, according to Guba and Lincoln (1981:238), which deal with different instances of the same or like phenomenon is referred to as 'case-study aggregation analysis': that is, when multiple documents contain information that is common to a number of settings but cannot be aggregated or integrated to provide a body of common understandings.

Tracking allows the researcher to track, through documents and records, a reconstruction of events and causal connections. Guba (1981:254) indicates that tracking allows the researcher the ability to keep the task manageable, provide direction and know when sufficient material has been investigated. According to Guba, the researcher would generate a series of working hypotheses concerning what is happening on site and seek records to confirm or disconfirm these hypotheses. Guba contends that the researcher is searching for evidence of relatedness in a controlled fashion.

Tracking was the analytical tool used predominantly in the early stages of the enquiry in the analysis of written documents and artefacts. Tracking allowed the researcher to define the research boundaries of the enquiry and identify the key actors.

Huberman and Miles (1994:428) highlight the importance of data management and analysis in a research study and they contend that
when analysing data the researcher should discover emerging themes or patterns. Recurring patterns, themes or gestalts should be displayed which enables the researcher to cluster together a variety of data. Emergent themes can be tested against additional data. In this enquiry as themes would emerge the researcher would test for confirmation by checking other written sources or with the interview data. For example, 'conflict' emerged as an important factor in the formulation phase of the policy process. Minutes from the Task Force meetings alluded to to some tension or conflict within the group. This was confirmed by the researcher through interview analysis and the examination of other written documentation, such as, personal memoranda.

Another important aspect of data analysis is the physical management of the data. Huberman and Miles (1994:428) define data management as the 'operations needed for a systematic, coherent, process of data collection, storage and retrieval'. Their definition of data analysis contains three linked sub-processes: 'data reduction' (where data is organised and compressed for ease of conclusion drawing), 'data display' (where data is systematically displayed in one location) and 'conclusion drawing or verification' (the interpreting or drawing of meaning from data).

According to Huberman and Miles, 'data reduction' is when the collected data is reduced in an 'anticipatory way'. Huberman and Miles (1994:432), argued that valid analysis is immensely aided by 'data reduction' which they define as a stage when the data is organised and compressed and which permits the researcher to draw conclusions and/or take action. The next logical phase according to Huberman and
Miles (1994) is 'data display'. That is, where the data (which has been reduced) is displayed and viewed in one location. The data is systematically arranged to answer the research questions. Once data was reduced, data displays were developed by the researcher for this enquiry. Huberman and Miles (1994:432), hold that analysis should be sequential and interactive. As the displayed data and the emerging written text of the researchers' conclusions will influence each other, the data should be displayed so the researcher can easily see the emerging patterns. Huberman and Miles (1994) defined 'conclusion drawing' as a stage where verification involves the researcher in interpretation, that is, drawing meaning from displayed data.

Once the data was displayed, it was necessary for this enquiry to code the written texts and artefacts by source, for ease of reference. The source of the written texts could be categorised into three source areas, namely, Commonwealth government sources, State and Territory sources and Parliamentary papers. The section at the conclusion of the thesis, titled 'Reference List of Written Documentation', outlines in detail the coding system adopted for this enquiry.

According to Huberman and Miles (1994:432), data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing can be applied during data collection, as interim and early analyses are carried out, as well as after data collection when final products are approached and completed. This process of ongoing data analysis facilitates the generation of hypotheses or questions embedded in the data.

According to Huberman and Miles, most qualitative procedures call for the use of analytic induction. Analytic induction occurs when the
researcher uncovers a construct by using an iterative procedure. That is, the researcher poses

a succession of question-and-answer cycles - that entails examining a given set of cases and then refining or modifying those cases on the basis of subsequent ones. Traditionally, the resulting inferences are deemed "valid" in the relaxed sense that they are probable, reasonable, or likely to be true. (Huberman and Miles, 1994:431)

Inductive reasoning is important in data analysis as qualitative studies tend to describe and explain a pattern of relationships. However, Huberman and Miles point out that the researcher starts with a set of 'conceptually specified analytic categories' and that starting with them ('deductively') or getting to them gradually ('inductively') are both legitimate.

In order to identify themes or patterns in data, which could suggest a theory, Huberman and Miles (1994:429) propose that the aim of the researcher is to 'transcend the process of analysis by carefully constructing explanations in a plausible way'. This calls for both causal explanation and for evidence to show that each entity or event is an instance of that explanation. Huberman and Miles contend that there is a need not only for a causal explanatory structure but also for a descriptive account of each particular configuration that supports the explanatory structure identified.

Analysis of data can provide two levels of understanding. Bernard (1988) and Draper (1988) contend that the first level of understanding in the data analysis is descriptive, while the second level of understanding is explanatory. Descriptive analysis makes complicated things understandable by reducing them to their component parts,
while explanation analyses includes providing requested information, justifying an action, giving reasons, supporting a claim or making a causal statement.

However, Kaplan (1964:pp.390-392) suggests that explanations presented from data analyses are always condition and context dependent, partial, inconclusive and indeterminately applicable. He argues that every value judgement is contextual. That is, a value judgement made in a certain context is 'grounded in facts, established with the help of values, which are not problematic in the same context'. He contends that while 'statements' only affirm how something seems under certain conditions, it is 'judgements' that affirm how it is. Throughout this enquiry judgements have been made. These judgements have been confirmed through the use of multiple methods of data gathering and analysis.

A number of analytical categories, from a variety of authors have been presented to support the choice of research methodology used in this enquiry. An overlap between analytical categories occurs, as meaning from the information collected is analysed. In this enquiry, data was gathered and reduced through the identification of categories. The categories were developed from policy process research by Winter 1990 and Goggin et al 1990, which was used in the development of the enquiry research questions. Issues and common themes were highlighted which allowed cross-validating of the research findings. This analytic process allowed the researcher to produce descriptive information and track the policy process from the written texts used.
Written texts and artefacts not only provided valuable information concerning the policy process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy but it also provided the names of the key players in that process. From these names it was possible for the researcher to identify key players to interview.

**INTERVIEWING**

According to Guba and Lincoln (1981), interviewing is the most common form of information gathering for data collection in naturalistic or constructivist research studies. Interviewing has a wide variety of forms and multiplicity of uses. In-depth interviews can be structured, semi-structured and unstructured. It is necessary to examine in detail a number of different forms of interview techniques to understand why 'elite unstructured' interviews were chosen as the most appropriate method for this study.

This enquiry is more than a mere description of a process. From early on in the enquiry it was necessary to understand the relationships, communications and reasons for both action and inaction by key players in the policy process. Interview techniques allowed for this information to be gathered and analysed.

In-depth interviewing is a data collection technique used quite extensively by qualitative researchers. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982:135), interviews are purposeful conversation, usually between two people (but sometimes involving more) that is directed by one person in order to get information from others. Guba and Lincoln
(1981:154) claim that interviewing, particularly the unstructured interview, is the 'backbone of field and naturalistic research'.

In-depth interviewing can vary depending on the degree of structure applied to the interview. Minichiello et al, (1990:96) purport that in-depth interviews are used to gain access and understanding of activities and events which cannot be observed directly by the researcher. The purpose of the interview is to obtain valid and reliable information. The strength of interviews is that they can retrieve large amounts of data quickly which allows for immediate follow-up through clarification questions.

The weaknesses of interviews as a research methodology are that they require personal interaction, in which questions may be inappropriate and/or the interviewee may not be truthful. As Marshall (1989:83) points out, when interviews are used alone, distortions in data are more likely as interviewers may interject personal biases. Guba and Lincoln (1981:187) acknowledge weaknesses in the use of interviews by identifying that often the materials are difficult or impossible to pre-test; the results are unpredictable and may be non-aggregatable or non-equivalent and that generalizability of results is moot because of the size of the samples; and that interviews are impossible to standardise and replicate.

Interviewing is often referred to as a conversation with a purpose. (Dexter, 1970; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Cohen and Manion (1989:309) contend that there are four kinds of interview that may be used specifically as research tools: the structured interview; the unstructured interview; the non-directive interview; and the focused interview.
Guba and Lincoln (1981:155) argue that structured interviews are often referred to as a 'focused' interviews, while unstructured interviews may be referred to as 'depth', 'clinical', 'elite', 'specialised' or 'exploratory'.

Guba and Lincoln state that in the structured interview,

the problem is defined by the researcher before the interview. The questions have been formulated ahead of time, and the respondent is expected to answer in terms of the interviewer's framework and definition of the problem. (Guba and Lincoln, 1981: 155)

Structured interviews are used in inquiries where representative samples are asked identical questions. All respondents are perceived by the inquirer as being of equal importance.

Guba and Lincoln state that in the unstructured interview

the format is non-standardised and the interviewer does not seek normative responses. (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:155)

That is, the 'problem of interest' is expected to develop from the respondent's reaction to the broad issues raised by the inquirer. The unstructured or 'elite' interview is concerned with 'the unique, the idiosyncratic and wholly individual viewpoint'(Guba and Lincoln, 1981). While unstructured interviews provide a greater breadth of information because of the qualitative nature of the method, Fontana and Frey (1994:363) warn that the researchers must be aware of a need to gain access to the interview setting, understand the language and culture of the respondent and establish rapport.
While both types of interviews have both strengths and weaknesses, Bogdan and Biklen (1982), contend that with semi-structured interviews the researcher is confident of getting comparable data across subjects. They argued that 'different types of interviews can be employed at different stages of the same study'. Good interviews, according to Bogdan and Biklen, produce rich data which can fill transcripts. An interviewer can ask for clarification, probe for specificity, ask for examples and develop probing questions that require exploration.

Guba and Lincoln (1981:156) identify a relationship between unstructured interviews and naturalistic inquiry. They contend that naturalistic inquiry 'presupposes that social settings have developed a pluralistic set of values which may cause conflict in the management of social enterprises' and in order to understand the values and where they conflict it is necessary to 'ground the inquiry in the multiple perspectives' held by the participants. Guba and Lincoln argue that the use of unstructured interviews takes into account these multiple world views while standardised interviews or survey methods assume value consensus.

The non-directive interview referred to by Cohen and Manion is characterised by

a situation in which the respondent is responsible for initiating and directing the course of the encounter and for the attitudes he (sic) expresses in it. (Cohen and Manion, 1985:324)

Originating from the psychiatric and therapeutic fields, the non-directive interview, according to Cohen and Manion, gets at the deeper
attitudes and perceptions of the informant in a way that leaves them free from interviewer bias.

Cohen and Manion (1985:326) argue that the focused interview resulted from the non-directed interview where the researcher requires more interviewer control in the interview situation. The distinctive feature of the focused interview is the prior analysis by the researcher of the situation in which the subjects have been involved. In the focused interview the actual interview is focused on the subjective experiences of the persons that have been exposed to a particular situation.

According to Guba and Lincoln (1981:156), when a respondent is chosen for an interview because he/she has a singular view according to expertise, position or insight, or is central to the situation because of holding this unique position, the interview is referred to as an elite interview. Guba and Lincoln (1981:156) argue that the elite interview allows the respondent's belief system to emerge.

Guba and Lincoln (1981:156) purport that it is the 'elite interview' that most readily allows the informant's belief systems to emerge and this allows the inquirer the opportunity to 'record and systematise them so they can be arrayed against each other'. Elite interviews allow the inquirer to perceive relationships to the area of inquiry and search for meaning. Guba and Lincoln argue that

this search for meaning is a search for multiple realities, truths and perceptions. Those multiple realities are contained in the unique, the singular, the idiosyncratic, the deviant, the exceptional, the unusual, the divergent perceptions of individuals as they live or lived the experience. (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:157)
Therefore, the elite interview is an attempt to reach the non-normative. Guba and Lincoln cite a number of research circumstances where the use of elite interviewing can be applied (p.166). These include studies where the subjects have special status or knowledge; when the researcher is interested in pursuing some subject in depth; when the researcher wants to discover rather than verify something, when the researcher is interested in the etiology of some condition or interested in direct interaction with a certain respondent; when the researcher is interested in uncovering some motivation, intent or explanation or when the researcher tries to ascribe meaning to some event, situation or circumstance.

Elite unstructured and semi-structured interviews were chosen for this enquiry as the information required was a description and analysis from informants that had insight or privileged knowledge of the policy process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The unstructured nature of the interview allowed for a more naturalistic, individual viewpoint. As Guba and Lincoln (1981: 169) conclude, highly structured interviews provide little more than grids to understand social processes, while elite unstructured interviews allow for 'contextual meanings for situation', that is, 'explicit and value-resonant grounding'.

Consideration must also be given to the questions devised and delivered for the interview process, as the questions may affect or impact upon the data collection. Minichiello et al, (1990) described four types of questions appropriate to interview technique, namely, 'descriptive', 'structural', 'contrasting' and 'probing'. Descriptive questions are often used to start the interview. Responses from these
questions will provide descriptions of events, people, places and/or experiences. Structural questions are when the questions are aimed at finding out how the informants organise their knowledge; while contrasting questions enable the informant to make comparisons of situations or events. Probing questions are used when the researcher wants to elicit information more fully than the original questions achieved. The researcher may also use a reflective probe strategy where the answer is given back to the informant in order to clarify or verify a particular issue. This strategy is important as it double checks the researcher's interpretation of the answer.

Patton (1980) identifies another type of question which is relevant to this enquiry: opinion/value questions which are aimed at understanding the cognitive and interpretive processes of the informant. This type of question allows the informant the provision for his or her opinion to be taken into account rather than merely providing clarification or reflection on a particular issue. It is important when using opinion/value type questions that it is stated explicitly in the analysis that it is the informant's values or opinions.

All forms of questions described were used in the enquiry for both the unstructured and semi-structured interviews. As well as decisions concerning the type of interview, decisions were also made concerning the sample of interview informants.

**Sampling Methods of Interview Informants**

The purpose of sampling is to produce a group of informants which is representative of a chosen population. Morse (1994:228) argues that as
the researcher learns the roles and relationships among participants, he or she may be better able to identify appropriate informants.

According to Morse (1994:228) there are two types of selection of informants: primary and secondary. Primary selection of participants describes the opportunity for the researcher to sample informants who have the knowledge and experience the researcher requires, have the ability to reflect, are articulate and are willing to participate in the enquiry. While secondary selection takes place when the researcher cannot select the informants by the primary criteria but by some other means, such as, through advertising.

Patton (1990) provides guidelines for sampling and suggests that 'logic and power' are behind purposeful selection, that is, the sample should be 'information rich'. Patton (1990) identifies four types of samples: extreme or deviant case sampling, intensity sampling, maximum variety sampling and critical case sampling.

According to Patton sampling types are defined as follows:

- **Extreme or deviant case sampling** is used to select participants who exemplify characteristics of interest. The analysis focuses on instances, attributes or key factors that contribute significantly to the example. Once analysis is progressing data are enriched by the purposeful selection of confirming cases and is confirming (negative) cases.
- **Intensity sampling** selects participants who are experiential experts and who are authorities about a particular experience.
- **Maximum variety sampling** is the process of deliberately selecting a heterogeneous sample and observing commonalities in their experiences.
- **Critical case sampling** is the selection of examples that are significant for the identification of critical incidents that may be generalised to other situations. Patton (1990)
The sample chosen for this enquiry was derived from what Morse (1994) describes as 'primary' selection. The informants chosen had the knowledge of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy process and were willing to participate in the enquiry. The sample can also be identified as 'intensity sampling', as described by Patton (1990). The informants possessed the experiential knowledge needed for the enquiry. The informants were interviewed to gather the data necessary for the enquiry.

CONDUCT OF INTERVIEWS

Fourteen interviews were conducted for this enquiry, ten elite unstructured interviews and four semi-structured interviews. See Appendix C for the list of interview informants. If individuals were considered as having a view because of their position, expertise or insight during either the formulation or implementation phase of the policy, the name was placed on an 'elite' list which was compiled from written text analysed.

As a result of initial elite interviews, other people who had a significant role in the policy process would be revealed and would be considered as possible interview informants. These informants were selected and interviewed because of their knowledge of the 'broader picture' or 'context' of the federal/state government relations at the time of implementation.

Possible respondents were approached initially by phone with a request for an interview and then the request confirmed with a follow-up letter. The researcher was successful in obtaining participation from all
respondents approached. A time which was convenient to the respondent and the researcher was negotiated. The interview was either unstructured or semi-structured, depending on whether specific information was needed or a general situation overview was required. The interview was recorded using a tape recorder. The data obtained was then transcribed and analysed. All interview respondents gave verbal permission for the information they provided to be used in this enquiry.

**SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS**

The interview respondents varied considerably in relation to position, department or organisation they were representing. The sample was chosen depending on the role they played at the time, in the particular phase in the formulation and implementation process. For example, the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs of the time, was interviewed because of her pivotal role in the establishment of the Task Force. Members of the Task Force were interviewed, including representation of both 'bureaucrats' and the 'outside' artists, to verify both the formulation and implementation phase. The Executive Officer appointed by the Commonwealth Department of Education was interviewed because of her privileged position 'directing' much of the process.

Informants or respondents were also interviewed who represented the inter-governmental organisations which were responsible for responding to the recommendations. The former Director General of Education of Western Australia and a departmental official from the
Victorian Ministry of Education was interviewed because of the role of the states in the implementation process.

As the implementation process unfolded in this enquiry, it was necessary to interview key players in the projects that resulted from the recommendations of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, such as the Arts and Advocacy Conference, the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers and the National Arts in Australian Schools Project. A list of the informant's position appears in Appendix C

Data gathered from the interview informants was also analysed.

**DATA ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS**

According to Guba and Lincoln (1981:183) there are generally two stages of interview analysis. First, the single interview is analysed which takes into account the respondent's personal context, the possibility of respondent bias, the credibility of what has been reported and the interactional process between the interviewer and the respondent. Second, the single interview is analysed as part of a larger set of interview data.

Bogdan and Taylor (1975) identify three stages in data analysis of interview data. First, 'coding', secondly, 'refining one's themes and propositions', and finally, 'reporting the findings'. Coding is concerned with discovering themes and developing propositions. Coding looks for groups of words, phrases, sentences and themes. The researcher must make decisions concerning which issues are key or peripheral. According to Minichiello (1990:293) a coding system is a means of
reorganising the data according to the conceptual themes recognised by
the researcher. Coding systems label and reorganise data according to
topics. Coding systems need to be conceptually based and clearly
defined.

Qualitative data needs to be transcribed, coded and filed. Minichiello et
al, (1990) suggest that a transcript file be kept with a tape recorder. This
file is a reproduction of the formal interview which took place between
the researcher and the informant. The transcript file generally includes
a transcription of the interview, observers comments and a cover page.
Transcript files should be organised to facilitate the process of coding
data for analysis. Transcript files were kept for this enquiry.

Interview data analysis applied in this enquiry involved the
development of coding systems, the identification of themes or
constructs and the application of coding systems to constructs, in order
to verify and explain constructs and ensure congruence of the policy
process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The possible
variables or factors which affect the implementation process as
identified by Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990), were used as
categories to identify themes or constructs in the analysis of interviews.
These categories can be found in the related questions in Chapter Two.
Examples of these categories include *conflict, self interest, commitment, coalitions, symbolic reasoning* etc.

Data was gathered from written texts and artefacts as well as interview
informants. This data was analysed to cross-validate and confirm
research findings. A description of this validation follows.
VALIDATION OF DATA ANALYSIS THROUGH TRIANGULATION

Data analysis in qualitative studies may be cross-checked, confirmed or verified. Miller and Fredericks (1994:1) use the term qualitative confirmation and contended that the qualitative researcher often has to defend a methodological justification of qualitative research methods. The researcher must 'somewhere in the research act itself be concerned with issues of confirmation'. Miller and Fredericks (1994:11) define qualitative confirmation as 'those logical conditions that must be obtained between evidence and hypothesis'. Therefore, establishing a case for qualitative confirmation involves the nature of hypothetical thinking, with the practice of qualitative inquiry. Miller and Fredericks suggested that the researcher must identify the methodological options for generating qualitative data, the formulation of rules to apply to qualitative data, which will become qualitative evidence. Qualitative confirmation requires the development of an elaborated framework.

Miller and Fredericks (1994:12) argue that qualitative evidence is not uniform. That is, even for a given research question or hypothesis, there may be a variety of data sources used by the investigator or different data sources used by different investigators. Miller and Fredericks (1994:55) contend that the notion of qualitative confirmation is both a pragmatic and theoretical necessity in conducting qualitative research. Miller and Fredericks (1994:3) purports that confirmation theory, remains a 'viable conception to defend a methodological conception' and as a defence for 'methodological justification'.
Rudner (1966:pp4-7) points out that often qualitative researchers are criticised as being involved on the 'context of discovery' rather than the 'context of validation'.

Swinburne (1973) proposes that confirmation theory provides a description of what the study means to say and how this evidence relates to a hypothesis.

Huberman and Miles (1994:438) highlight the importance of verification in qualitative studies. Verification entails 'checking the most common or most insidious biases that can appear in the process of drawing conclusions'.

Triangulation is identified by Huberman and Miles (1994:438) as the term most often used with analysis and confirmation. They argue that when a researcher self-consciously sets out to collect data and double-check findings by using multiple sources and modes of evidence, then a triangulation process will be built into the data collection.

Triangulation refers to combining different techniques of collecting data within a study concerning a particular phenomenon. Triangulation is intended as a heuristic tool for the researcher. Triangulation as a research method was central to the qualitative research methodology proposed by Parlett and Hamilton (1972). Guba and Lincoln (1981: 257) refer to triangulation as the process of comparing and contrasting information drawn from different sources. They claimed that as a technique it is useful for verifying information on the same event from different actors and for producing more confidence in data generated from different methodologies.
Importantly, the process of triangulation allows for multiple value perspectives to emerge from the same context. It allows for the checking of 'facts'.

Huberman and Miles (1994:438) define triangulation as multiple measures that ensure that 'the variance reflected is that of the trait or treatment and not that associated with the measures'. They see triangulation as a 'tactic' rather than a 'mode of inquiry'.

Denzin (1978) identifies four basic types of triangulation: 'data triangulation', 'investigator triangulation', 'theory triangulation' and 'methodological triangulation'. Data triangulation is when the researcher uses a variety of data sources in a study. Investigator triangulation is when several different researchers or evaluators are used in a study. Theory triangulation is when multiple perspectives are used to interpret a single set of data. Methodological triangulation is when multiple methods of data collection and analyses are used to study a single problem.

According to Cohen and Manion (1985:278), the chief problem confronting the researcher using triangulation is that of validity. The researcher is confronted with three areas of concern: the selection of methods, the combination of methods and the use of data collected.

Cohen and Manion (1985:278) argue that if the researcher wants his or her inferences to be generalised to the wider population then methods yielding statistical data would be more efficient. On the other hand, if the information sought represents a personal or phenomenological
perspective or process rather than product, then accounts or interviews will meet researcher's needs more successfully.

In terms of the combination of methods, Cohen and Manion (1985:280) purport that no simple directive can be provided. The combination of methods will depend on the objectives of the study and the particular setting. The combination of methods should build up 'as full a picture of the areas he (sic) is investigating as time and facilities permit'.

In relation to how the data is to be used, Cohen and Manion (1985:280) argue that with interpretive or qualitative data, the researcher will endeavour to draw meanings or explanations from the data depending on the original objectives in undertaking the study.

**QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS USED SPECIFICALLY IN THIS ENQUIRY**

The methodology applied in this enquiry draws on the research outlined above. As proposed by Miller and Fredericks (1994), data was gathered for the enquiry using multiple methods which allowed for qualitative confirmation. Document analysis, elite unstructured interviews and semi-structured interviews were employed. Interviews were conducted to confirm interpretations gathered from documents and written texts.

As suggested by Marshall and Rossman (1989), all documents used for data gathering were coded in a logical and systematic way. The section titled, Reference List of Written Documentation outlines the reference codes adopted for this enquiry. (p. 280).
Using the management techniques proposed by Huberman and miles (1994), data gathered was systematically arranged and presented. Data was reduced by sorting, then categorised according to the areas identified in the Research Questions (Ch. 2. p. 71). Common issues and themes were revealed which allowed conclusions to be drawn. Content from both interview data and written documentation was analysed using the categories identified in the Research Questions.

Following suggestions by Guba (1981), the researcher used written text to track and reconstruct events and make possible connections of the policy process to possible causes. As highlighted by Huberman and Miles (1994:425) any themes that emerged from written documentation were tested for confirmation through the interview data. This process was repeated where emergent themes were tested against written documentation.

The data gathered in this enquiry was cross-checked and verified, as suggested by Miller and Fredericks (1994). After the data had been gathered and analysed and emergent themes were evident, possible explanations were constructed.

Finally, a position was taken on the issue of explanations in terms of causality. Huberman and Miles (1994) argue for the importance of finding causality in a study and that qualitative studies are well suited to finding causal relationships. On the other hand, Denzin and Lincoln (1994), see qualitative studies in a different light, not necessarily needing to find a cause but instead connecting parts to the whole by stressing meaningful relationships. This enquiry tends to adopt neither stance, attempting to connect the parts of the policy process by finding
relationships which may or may not describe causes but highlight emerging themes instead.

CONCLUSION

This chapter outlined the qualitative research methodology adopted to answer the questions posed in the previous chapter. The discussion includes data gathering methods, sampling methods of informants, processes in data analysis and the validation of data analysis.

The strength of theoretical framework and methodology of this enquiry lies in the ability to validate and confirm its findings through triangulation. The qualitative research methodology chosen allowed the researcher to find causal relationships and to gain access to the motives, meanings, actions and reactions of the key players in the policy process.

After exhaustive data gathering procedures from multiple sources (written documents, artefacts and interviews) the researcher is confident that the conclusions drawn throughout the enquiry have been cross-checked, confirmed and verified. As in any sound qualitative study, the researcher has been open in declaring his values as a researcher and as a strong advocate for arts education in Australia. The samples from both the written documentation and the interview informants are representative of all phases of the policy process. The researcher has followed correct and ethical procedures in gathering and analysing the data and the conclusions that have been drawn are based on the data gathered.
The next chapters outline the policy process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy reconstructed through the methodology presented in this chapter, as part of the process of finding answers to the research questions outlined in Chapter Two. The first chapter tracks the establishment in 1983 of the Task Force by the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs to the presentation of its recommendations in late 1984.

In particular, the next chapter introduces the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre into the picture. These were the federal bodies responsible for the implementation of the majority of the Task Force recommendations.
CHAPTER FOUR

EDUCATION AND THE ARTS POLICY PROCESS: THE FORMULATION PHASE

OVERVIEW

This chapter presents and analyses data concerning the formulation phase of the policy process through answering the research question:

What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy at the formulation phase? And to what extent did it affect the degree of success of the implementation?

This is done by examining the formulation process of the policy, from the establishment of the Task Force in 1983 by the Commonwealth Minister of Education, through to the presentation of its recommendations by the Task Force in November 1984. The focus on policy design reflects identification by Winter (1990), as an important variable affecting policy implementation.

While answering the specific research question above, a number of related questions which have been developed from the model proposed by Winter (1990), are also posed. The related questions are used to determine research findings at the conclusion of this chapter. The focus of this phase of the enquiry is on the dynamics of the Task Force and the contribution by the Task Force to the final report titled, Education and the Arts (1985). As well, other policy initiatives which
affected the policy process, such as those taken by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, are introduced and examined.

**INTRODUCTION**

A number of educational policy initiatives in the early eighties at the Commonwealth level impacted on the development of arts education policy in Australia. To place the formulation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy in a context it is necessary to describe some of these initiatives as well as the government agencies where they originated.

A major actor in the context is the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC), which was the organisation charged with the implementation of most of the recommendations from the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

The Commonwealth Schools Commission was established in 1973 as a national agency with consultative and co-operative powers to advise the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs on standards, priorities and financial assistance for schools. The Commonwealth Schools Commission Act 1973, gave the Commission wide powers to consult and co-operate with State governments and government/non-government school authorities and to consult with interest groups. The Act also gave the Commission power to administer legislation.

The CSC was responsible for the administration of an array of Commonwealth funded programs. In 1983, at the time of the formulation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, the programs...
funded by the CSC totalled $1,200m (P83:1). There were four major divisions functioning within the CSC: the General Resource Division, the Specific Purpose Program, the Operations and Resources Division and the Curriculum Development Centre. See Figure 2.1

**Figure 4.1**
The Organisation of the Commonwealth Schools Commission at 31 December, 1983

The General Recurrent Resources Branch was responsible for policy development and administration in relation to General Recurrent

---

1See 'Reference List of Written Documentation' section for coding system adopted.
Grants and Capital Grants Programs. In 1983 the General Recurrent Resources Branch disbursed $870 m, or about 66% of the total fund accounted for by the Commission. ($308m on government and $563m on non-government schools). Commonwealth general recurrent grants to states and Territories were used to meet the operating costs of schools\(^2\). The Capital Grants Program ($194m) was available to assist government and non-government State education authorities for the expansion of schools and the establishment of new schools.

The **Specific Purpose Programs Division** was responsible for Commonwealth policy development and administration of a number of programs such as the Disadvantaged Schools Program, Country Area Program and Projects of National Significance Program. In 1983 the Specific Purpose Programs amounted to $168m or 14% of the total Schools Commission funds.

The **Operations and Resources Division** was responsible for the coordination of the Schools Commission's internal operations and resources, in areas such as, staffing, finance and legislation, research and statistics. In 1983 it operated on a budget of less than $5m.

The repeal of the Curriculum Development Centre Act 1975 and the concurrent amendment of the Commonwealth Schools Commission Act 1973 led to the establishment in 1984 of the Curriculum Development Council and the reactivation of the CDC on June 29 1984. Proclamation of the amended CSC Act 1983 established the CDC a

---

\(^2\)It is important to note that Commonwealth financial assistance to State schools was through State Grants legislation, i.e. tied grants for the implementation of Commonwealth educational policy. General running costs such as teacher's salaries were paid by the States through annual disbursement of taxes to state governments.
division within the CSC. The CDC was responsible for the development and dissemination of national curriculum materials. (P85:1)

Two significant actions occurred in 1983 with the Commonwealth Schools Commission, which were to impact on the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy: reactivation of the Curriculum Development Centre and the Programs of National Significance. First, in July 1983 the Commonwealth government asked the CSC for advice on establishing two new specific purpose programs, the Computer Education Program and the Participation and Equity Program. By December 1983, the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, had tabled a speech in the Australian Parliament outlining the acceptance and function of the Participation and Equity Program. The program was the 'centrepiece of the overall framework of youth policies, administered by the CSC and the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) Council and co-ordinated by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs.' The establishment of these new programs signalled the Commonwealth government's evolving educational priorities: participation/equity and a gradual move to technology education. These moves were reinforced later when terms of reference of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy were developed and openly reflected a priority of participation/equity.

Second, there was a planned re-activation of the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC). The CDC became a division of the Commonwealth Schools Commission and responsible for the development and dissemination of national curriculum materials. From official documentation, it was stated that after discussions with

---

3The budget for 1983 for the CDC was not specified at the time.
officials on the CDC's future role, it was decided that arts education would be a significant area of its responsibility. Accordingly, the CDC was allocated, as one of its priority tasks, the area of curriculum development in relation to education and the arts. (C84:6)

In late 1983, in response to the Commonwealth government's initiative in convening the national Task Force on Education and the Arts, the CSC, without waiting for the Task Force recommendations, established an Arts Education unit in the projects of National Significance Program. Miss Monica Miland, a full-time Commissioner with the CSC and also an initial member of the Task Force, was responsible for this unit. (P83:1)

By the end of 1983, the arts education programs were being administered by two separate areas within the Commonwealth Schools Commission. The CDC with the responsibility for the development and production of curricula materials, and the Specific Purpose Program, under Projects of National Significance within the Services to Schools Branch.

Another related event was the announcement by the Australian government on 28th July, 1983 of its intention to give priority to the development of arts education which was cited in the report titled, *Funding Guidelines to the Commonwealth Education Commissions for 1984*. The Commonwealth Schools Commission guidelines stated, that it was 'important that all young people have the opportunity to gain self confidence and skills through active participation in the arts'.

---

3: This funding guideline was directed to the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission
As a consequence of the Commonwealth Minister for Education commitment to art education, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC) was asked by the Commonwealth Government in 1983 to review existing provisions for tertiary arts education and training, comment on these in relation to employment opportunities for young people and to examine future policy. The CTEC was also asked, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Schools Commission, to review teacher education, taking into account the Commonwealth Government's objectives, including increased participation in education and implications for new directions in curriculum and teaching.

As well as these policy changes towards improving arts education and giving it a more visible profile on the educational agenda, according to data from interviews, the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs was directing efforts to achieve action. Interview informants confirmed that the Minister had a passion for improving arts education in Australia.

So, it appears that by 1983, a number of initiatives were on the way to improve the situation of arts education in Australia. Namely, the CTEC review of teacher education, the establishment by the Commonwealth Schools Commission of the arts education unit in the Projects of National Significance Program, the added responsibility accepted by the CDC for arts education and, finally, the personal interest being shown by the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs. These initiatives were providing a favourable climate for strengthening and improving arts education policy at the national level and it was within this context that the Task Force was established.
During an interview with the researcher, the former Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Senator Susan Ryan, stated that, as a result of her dissatisfaction with the state of arts education at the school level, she demonstrated her personal 'passion' for the arts and her commitment to the improvement of arts education by establishing a Task Force on education and the arts in August 1983.

It was common practice in the eighties for the Commonwealth government to establish national working parties to advise and make recommendations to the Minister on policy direction and initiatives. Generally, the selection of the national working parties was organised by the senior bureaucrats from the Ministry responsible. In the case of the Education and the Arts Task Force, the Minister stated that she 'hand-picked' herself the national working body. Eleven Task Force members were chosen. Combined with seven bureaucrats, were a group of four 'outsiders' or non-portfolio people, who according to the Minister brought with them 'passion for arts education' and 'relevant experience', as both practicing artists and teachers.

See Appendix D for the members of the Task Force. A list of another ten people, who were not named as signatories of the final report, but served with the Task Force during its life-time can been found in Appendix E.

The terms of reference for the Task Force (1985:vii) were:
1. To develop options for consideration by the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs for a strategy of Commonwealth initiatives in education and the Arts with the emphasis being placed on the needs of young people both within and outside the school system.

2. The arts are to be defined comprehensively to include all forms of creative activity appropriate to the target group.

3. The options referred to in term 1 should be developed in the context of specified goals in terms both of developing the creative talents of young people, and the beneficial effects that involvement in the arts can have on educational participation and achievement.

4. Both short term and longer term options should be considered and estimates of costs indicated. Longer term options should include possible activities for both the lead up to and during International Youth Year in 1985 and the Australian Bicentenary in 1988.

5. Within three months of its first meeting the Task Force should make at least a progress report to the Minister.

6. In view of the timescale for the work of the Task Force, original research will not be required. The Task Force should take account of the 1977 report, Education and the Arts, however, it will be necessary to develop a contemporary perspective taking particular account of innovatory activities and ideas.

7. The Task Force should consult with State and Territory authorities as required and also the Australia Council. However, it should be noted that the terms of reference did not specifically require the Task Force to involve State and Territory departments of education but did specify involvement with the Australia Council, a Commonwealth organisation.

**FORMULATION OF THE REPORT**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Senator Susan Ryan, requested an interim report be submitted to her within three months.
Some members of the Task Force, (interviewed by the researcher), confirmed that a 'quick appraisal of the situation was needed'.

The first meeting of the Task Force was held in Canberra on August 31, 1983. The Minister, Senator Ryan attended part of this meeting. According to the Task Force report, Senator Ryan, in discussing the role of the Task Force and the reasons for its establishment, sketched in another aspect of the context. She stated that the Government was concerned with 'disparity of opportunity' and therefore, there was a need for proposals which would close the gap between those with access to arts and those without.

According to the Minister, the disadvantages which 'poorer children' suffered had to be overcome and youth unemployment would have to be considered. The Minister's view reflected the social, economic and education context at the time. Youth unemployment was rising nationally in the early eighties in Australia. The Williams Committee (the Williams Report, 1979) argued that schools should be more vocationally oriented. This report lead to the Commonwealth Schools Commission introducing various transition programs and schemes in the early eighties which were 'structural directed activities', such as improving facilities, improving resources and empowering the individual. This reference to youth unemployment reminded members of the Task Force of the news release announcing that the brief for the Task Force had the potential for promoting economic growth and employment and that the arts should be an integral part of the curriculum. Economic growth and unemployment was a priority area for the federal government at the time.
The notion of the arts as an employment avenue for youth was in keeping with the government's policy, at the time, of 'equality of opportunity', which was reflected in many Commonwealth programs such as the Disadvantaged Schools Program, the Country Area Program and Participation and Equity Program.

Seven meetings of the Task Force were held. After three and a half months, an interim report was submitted to the Minister on December 14, 1983. This report issued a series of recommendations, not in any order of priority nor with any costing attached. On 24 January 1984, the forty recommendations of the interim report were discussed by the education department officers and the Minister who indicated her 'in-principle' support for implementation of the recommendations and that action was to be taken.

It was agreed that the majority of the recommendations did not involve additional Commonwealth expenditure. Most of the recommendations, with a direct Commonwealth involvement concerned a total of seven governmental organisations, under the jurisdiction of two Commonwealth departments, namely, the Department of Home Affairs and Environment, the Australia Council, the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, the Commonwealth Schools Commission, the Curriculum Development Centre, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority. Except for the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations and the Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority, there was a person on the Task Force from each of these Commonwealth departments.
After accepting the preliminary report, the Minister agreed that she would write to appropriate Ministers and heads of portfolio agencies, promoting the recommendations, which directly related to their responsibilities.

The Task Force report was to be completed and submitted for the consideration of the Conference of Ministers with Responsibilities for the Arts and Cultural Affairs, who were to meet on February 24, 1984. The report was to be printed by the Department of Education for distribution. The Minister did not propose tabling the report in Parliament. According to the Minister, she had received informal favourable responses from the Commonwealth Arts Minister who had in turn expressed his support for her to continue with the process.

Formal support was also given to the Minister of Education and Youth Affairs by the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment, Barry Cohen. As a result of the Conference of State and Territory Ministers with Responsibilities for the Arts and Cultural Affairs, the Ministers agreed to establish a Joint Standing Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers of States and Territories. It was hoped that the establishment of this committee would 'greatly facilitate co-operation with the States' concerning the recommendations of the Task Force.

The Conference expressed the view that there was a need for immediate and urgent attention to some of the recommendations, but did not go as far as to identify them. The Minister for Home Affairs and Environment, Mr Cohen, when addressing the Conference, had expressed the view that the '1980's would be the decade of the arts in
The Department of Education and Youth Affairs, General Policy Branch, was given the task of developing the Terms of Reference for the proposed Joint Standing Committee of Ministers for Education and Cultural Affairs, later known as the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers (JCCEM). The important role of the JCCEM, and its impact on the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, will be discussed in detail in later chapters.

Between January and October 1984 some action was initiated by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs to implement several key recommendations of the progress or interim report. Dr Tannock, Chairman of the Commonwealth Schools Commission, was to be advised of the Minister's support for the recommendations, so that they may be taken into account in determining an interim Commonwealth Schools Commission's allocation of $208,000 for arts education, under the Projects of National Significance Program. (Appendix F)

It is important to note that the initial decision by the Commonwealth Schools Commission to fund arts education from this program would have far reaching effects on the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. At this time the Projects of National Significance Program was the only Specific Purpose program where funding could be allocated to arts education, as other major programs, such as the Disadvantaged Schools Program and English as a Second Language Program had already specified their funding allocations. Also, the Department of Home Affairs and Environment (who was responsible for the Australia Council, the Australian Film Commission and the Australian Film and Television School) was aware of the Minister's
support and would take notice of it when preparing new policy bids for 1984-85. (Appendix F) Approval was also given for the creation of a Clerk Class 9 position in the General Policy Branch of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, for two years, to be concerned full-time with education and the arts matters. Vanessa McKenzie was appointed to this position. (C83:1) Comprehensive details of these actions can be found in Appendix F. It is interesting to note, that the General Policy Branch of the Commonwealth Department of Education played an active role in policy process; in that, the only full-time member of the Task Force was housed within this organisation and the Chairperson of the Task Force was from the General Policy Branch.

A significant action, which was to affect the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, was the way in which the General Policy Branch of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs attempted to modify the initial policy intention. The General Policy Branch was provided with the interim report and asked by the Minister to make comment. R.T. Kinnaird, Assistant Secretary of the General Policy Branch, who was also Chairperson of the Task Force at the time, proposed to the Minister on March 29, 1984, a number of issues and a strategy of how and where the Task Force on Education and the Arts exercise might proceed. (C84:23)

It is interesting to note that the General Policy Branch was critical of the interim report (C84:23) and argued that the Task Force was initially directed to provide the Minister with options for a 'strategy' of Commonwealth initiatives, but instead it basically had provided a series of recommendations which they acknowledged 'do not add up to a strategy either for the short term or the longer term'. Kinnaird stated
that a 'strategy' needed objectives, a timetable and a plan of action for implementation.

The General Policy Branch, stated that the objectives of the education and the arts, outlined in the interim Task Force report, should be framed in terms of, or in relation to, major government policy objectives for education and young people as a whole. The specific purpose program, Participation and Equity (PEP) major objective was for young people to complete full-time secondary education. It was felt that the PEP program had two implications for arts education strategy. First, the PEP program provided the opportunity for arts education to reach the majority of young people and that it was necessary to take advantage of this opportunity for the larger numbers of young people who would be staying on in the education system. Second, the objectives for education and the arts should be tied to the PEP time frame. The General Policy Branch advised that longer term objectives for arts education should be formulated in terms of a target level of achievement or provision of opportunities for the end of the decade. In effect, this meant that the timetable for the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy should be the PEP time frame.

The General Policy Branch felt that a 'plan of action' should be designed as a series of Commonwealth initiatives (rather than a series of recommendations) which would collectively achieve the objectives of the Task Force report by the end of the decade.

The General Policy Branch seemed to make a distinction between initiatives and recommendations, in that initiatives appeared to be more 'general', while recommendations were 'specific'. The Policy
Branch appeared to argue for a less specific proposal. They also recommended as short term objectives that priority among young people in the arts education area should be determined on the basis of need and that the greatest need were the young unemployed. In the long term, the General Policy Branch advised that arts education should be directed in support of the 'majority' of young people, and in the short term, the immediate priority was to make more provision for arts education directed to the 'young unemployed'. The recommendation by the General Policy Branch was that the 'majority' could be catered for with existing Commonwealth initiatives, i.e. PEP, and that the 'young unemployed' could be catered for with other existing Commonwealth programs such as CEP and CYSS (these programs were community based support programs for young unemployed people).

The proposal by the General Policy Branch was to maintain the existing support (funding) or to expand the funding provision for the arts through existing programs. The General Policy Branch, through the Assistant Secretary, R.T. Kinnaird, recommended to the Minister that the Task Force be invited by letter, from the Minister to reconvene, 'spelling out the framework as outlined' by the Policy Branch and requesting that possible initiatives be organised and priorities set within the proposed framework, and that the Task Force be requested to provide costing of major proposals. It was also recommended that the membership of the Task Force be expanded to include representatives from the Youth Affairs Division and Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (DEIR). It was also recommended that the General Policy Branch would prepare a draft Report, to be circulated quickly, to speed up and focus the issues.
The proposal by the General Policy Branch to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs for a new strategy, or a framework, for the Task Force was highly significant to the policy process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, in that, the strategy proposed was aligning the recommendations made by the Task Force members to 'fit' with existing Commonwealth initiatives. Specifically, the PEP program and community programs for the unemployed. Not only were the recommendations to be framed in the short and long term objectives of the PEP program but the plan of action and time frame was to align also with the PEP program. It could be concluded that by absorbing the arts education initiative into existing programs, the initiative lost the prominence on the educational agenda it was striving for and, more importantly, it missed out on the major funding it was hoping to achieve. Arts education had become yet another area within the large umbrella of the existing Commonwealth government programs.

**RECONVENING OF THE TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION AND THE ARTS**

The Task Force on Education and the Arts was reconvened to a meeting in Canberra on the 4th October, 1984, two months after its first meeting.

At the October 4 meeting, a senior officer of the Commonwealth Schools Commission on the Task Force, B McNamara, pointed out it was necessary to mount arguments for new funding. It was deemed essential that each of the recommendations have costing allocated to them and an indication given as to which agency or Department would
be responsible for their implementation in the context of a possible three to five year plan of action.

McNamara suggested that the Task Force might wish to recommend the establishment of a major Specific Purpose Program (similar to PEP, DSP or CAP) for education and the arts, which would be administered by the Commonwealth Schools Commission. This was welcomed by the Members, but it was noted that this particular suggestion had been vigorously opposed by the previous representative from the CSC. Effectively, this was a program proposal by a CSC officer that was to be administered by a CSC member. The meeting was unable to resolve the issue and discussion ended when some members of the Task Force left the meeting early.

Through interviews by the researcher, Task Force members revealed that a considerable amount of conflict existed between the non-portfolio members (Chapman, Gordon, Letts, Perrier, Westwood), and the other members (Bourke, Grahame, McNamara, Moran, McKenzie), concerning the dissatisfaction or the lack of progress of the Task Force report. The level of conflict was high when the non-portfolio members left the meeting at lunch and met unannounced, with the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Senator Ryan at Parliament House to air their dissatisfaction and frustration.

Also, during the lunch break of the meeting of October 4, the Chairperson, drafted a chapter on Strategy and Implementation. The draft, according to the Minutes, took into account the morning's discussions, in both 'substance and tone'. (C84:19)
As a result of the impromptu meeting with the Minister, the Minister suggested to the non-portfolio members a number of significant issues, which they brought back to the meeting:

1. the Task Force propose a Specific Purpose program within the CSC with a budget of $5m per annum over a three year period. The first report of the CSC/NAEC\(^6\) the Working Party on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education might be used as a model.

2. Recommendations be divided into the following administrative categories according to whose responsibility to implement:
   (i.) Commonwealth
   (ii.) Commonwealth/State
   (iii.) State
   (iv.) Other - requiring new structures or to be fitted in with new initiatives.

   Funding could be shared on a 50/50 basis between Commonwealth and States. (C84:19)

The Minister also indicated:

3. she favoured the setting up of a National Arts Education Development Program within the DEYA with an annual budget of $1m to commence in the 1985/86 financial year. In the tertiary education sector, it might be possible to establish something on the model of the TAFE element of the Participation and Equity Program. (C84:19)

It is interesting to note that the funding structure proposed by the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs resembled the proposal put forward by McNamara and remained unchanged in the final Task Force report. The CSC representative explained to the Task Force, that there were several program administration models currently being used by the CSC which arts education could adopt, e.g. the National Computer Advisory Committee which advised the CSC; the Aboriginal Program which holds funds centrally; and the Multi-cultural Program

---

\(^6\)National Aboriginal Education Committee
which provide some funds for States to mount projects according to their local priorities (as determined by State level committees) and which retains a portion of funds which are held centrally to implement national level initiatives. This multi-cultural model was suggested, as one which may offer scope in the arts education field.

Also, at this October 4 meeting, it was pointed out that there was scope for initiatives using funds provided by the DEYA for International Youth Year, the possibility of funding of arts related initiatives under PEP and that arts education would be one of nine focal categories in the CSC's guidelines for PEP. The CSC's Professional Development Program was also taking on arts education as one of its priorities. (C84: 18 & 19)

THE FINAL REPORT: EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

As a result of addressing the terms of reference, and incorporating sections of the progress report, the Task Force produced a final report outlining thirty four major recommendations, including funding guidelines. The report was titled Action: Education and the Arts, an illustrated edition of the Report of the Task Force on Education and the Arts to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs. A list of recommendations made the Task Force can be found in Appendix G. The objectives outlined by the Task Force can be found in Appendix H. While the list of departments and organisations responsible for the implementation of the recommendations can be found in Appendix I.

The report was divided into two parts, Recommendations for Action and Background and Rationale. It comprised five chapters, The Issues:

The report recommended the government allocate $6.1 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88, in the form of a Specific Purpose Program to be supported at the level of $5 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88. Funding structures proposed by the Task Force can be found in Appendix J.

The Arts in Education program would be administered as a joint Commonwealth/State program for both government and non-government schools. The government and non-government school authorities in States and Territories would be required to progressively achieve an equal partnership with the Commonwealth government. Funds would be disbursed to the States and Territories on the basis of $200 000 base grant to each, plus an allocation calculated on the basis of total enrolments.

It was recommended that the sum of $1 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88 be allocated to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs for national support for out-of-school initiatives in education and the arts. As well, $100 000 per annum be allocated to the Curriculum Development Centre for the specific purpose of arts education curriculum projects.

The report was presented to Senator Ryan, Minister for Education and Youth Affairs by the Chairman, Garth Boomer, newly appointed...
Cirector of the Curriculum Development Centre, on behalf of the Task Force on Education and the Arts on 1 November 1984.

A summary of the final task force report has been compiled by the researcher and can be found in Appendix K.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**

The formulation phase of Education and the Arts, 1985 policy process may be analysed in terms of the first of Winter's (1990) four socio-political processes or conditions: Policy Formation Process.

The specific research question applied in this enquiry to the policy design or formulation phase is:

*What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy at the formulation phase?*

The possible factors which have been derived predominantly from the Winter (1990) model and other literature are: conflict, self interest, commitment, lack of consensus, coalitions, valid causal theory, symbolic reasoning and level of attention. These factors have been used as the basis for the development of a series of related questions.

**Conflict:**
- Was there conflict among the Task Force members?

According to Winter (1990) policy formation processes are often characterised by conflicts among actors, who each follow their own interests resulting in disagreement about goals. From both written documentation and interview data it was clearly evident that conflict existed within the Task Force; that is, between the bureaucrats and the...
non-portfolio or 'outside' members of the Task Force. According to one non-portfolio member interviewed, the initial Task Force meetings were perceived as 'frustrating' and 'negative' by the 'outside' arts administrators. She claimed that 'layers of bureaucracy' clouded issues which delayed the execution of the report. Subsequent interviews revealed that some members had missed meetings, come poorly prepared and clearly didn't display the commitment required. Delays were evident, such that the third Chairperson was appointed and sent in by the Minister, to 'come up with the goods' and to do it 'quickly'.

Other factors can be found in the Minutes of the October 4 meeting which could signal dissatisfaction among Task Force members. According to the Minutes, several members of the Task Force queried what had happened since the last meeting and expressed concern at the apparent lack of Government action and funding provided to education and the arts in the 1984/85 Budget. At this meeting the Chairperson released to the Task Force members the draft Final Report. He apologised for the late circulation of the papers and explained that he had been absent from the office (but for a few days), for all of the four weeks, because of attendance at a course and subsequent illness. Consequently, he had been unable to contact members and circulate papers earlier. He agreed that this was unsatisfactory. (C84:18)

Concerns were raised by the Task Force members about the underlying tone of the draft Final Report. The final report had been re-written by the General Policy Branch to take into account existing federal initiatives, such as the Participation and Equity program. The Chairperson, acknowledged that the Final Report was not intended to replace the forty one recommendations of the interim report but it was
intended to provide a focal point, in the form of a program, for implementing them.

The General Policy Branch had stated, in the response to the Minister (C84:23), that the modified approach had been canvassed in broad terms with the non-portfolio members of the Task Force, who 'enthusiastically supported it'. Interviews with former Task Force members revealed that this was not the case. This discrepancy was also supported in the minutes of the October 4 Task Force meeting where it was stated that a 'number of reservations were expressed about the tone' of the proposal. Members indicated that they would like the underlying rationale and philosophy of the initial progress report retained. It was agreed that a strategy/implementation chapter be added to the Progress Report.

According to a portfolio Task Force member interviewed the modified report presented by the Chair was 'totally off the direction the Task Force was going' and the non-portfolio members were 'very, very angry'. The five non-portfolio members' dissatisfaction was evidenced when they promptly left the meeting at lunch and met unannounced with the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs at Parliament House. It is interesting to note, that these members were able to gain access to a Minister of government at such short notice, considering that Ministers have heavy and highly planned schedules. It was the outcome of this meeting that the Minister recommended a number of funding options, which were included in the final report.

Interviews with both former Task Force members and the former Minister confirmed that conflict was evident and that it caused barriers
to the smooth deliberations of the Task Force. The interview informants confirmed that 'camps' existed within the Task Force - the bureaucrats and the non-portfolio members and the Department of Education and the Department of the Arts.

In summary, analysis of data indicates that there was conflict among Task Force members which confirms Winter's (1990) variable of 'conflict'.

_Self interest:

• Did the Task Force members follow their own interests during the formulation phase?

Some Task Force members were disappointed in the final stages, that initial reports, which had been developed and agreed to by the Task Force, had been changed in a direction, by other members, which did not reflect the initial philosophy of the group. These changes could be attributed to members following interests of their own or the organisation/s they represented. A prime example, was the modification to the interim report and change of direction proposed by the General Policy Branch of the department of Education and Youth Affairs.

It appeared that members of the Task Force tended to follow their own agendas. For example, the non-portfolio members were very committed to providing creative arts experiences for all students at the school level, while DEYA representatives felt that it was important that the any recommendations align closely to existing established Commonwealth objectives and programs, including unemployed youth. Interviews with two of the Task Force members confirmed that
the non-portfolio members were generally concerned with youth in schools while the bureaucrats tended to emphasise youth outside of the school situation. It is important to remember that the federal education portfolio included Youth Affairs and that new policy directions were being developed for senior secondary education.

Self interests of the members caused conflict and at times delayed or changed the direction of the formulation process. Non-portfolio members perceived a 'conflict of interest' at times, for example, the second Chairman of the Task Force was also the Assistant Secretary to the General Policy Branch of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs and the third Chairman was the Director of the Curriculum Development Centre. Through interview, a non-portfolio member stated that the second Chairman was not an 'activist' for the arts and at timed 'blocked' the deliberations. (Interview Five7) It is important to recall, that Chairmen of the Task Force were not independent actors in the policy process. Their actions are indicative of actors who, besides their possibly personal position, represent organisations, following a particular mandate.

Lack of consensus:

- Was there lack of consensus by the Task Force members concerning the main objectives when formulating the policy?

Tensions arose concerning the objectives and the structure of the report. Task Force members were concerned that the integrity of the preliminary report was not being maintained. Some members felt that it should relate specifically to the improvement of arts education, while others thought that it should reflect broader Commonwealth

7See Appendix C for indexing of interview informants.
program objectives. Through interviews with Task Force members it was acknowledged that at times Task Force members had to launch 'savage attacks' to develop better structures for the report. It was perceived, that some members of the Task Force weren't giving the arts a high enough priority. Lack of consensus by the Task Force members, concerning the change of emphasis of the interim report, existed in the formulation phase.

Commitment:
• Was there lack of commitment by the Task Force members during the formulation phase?

The commitment by the Task Force members varied considerably. It was apparent that some members, particularly the non-portfolio members or 'outside' artists were 'passionately' committed to the improvement of arts education and the promotion of the arts in the education sphere; while other members, perceived the arts with less commitment and enthusiasm. According to one non-portfolio member interviewed one Chairman perceived arts education as having a 'very low priority because of the current climate of unemployment'. According to an interview informant, another Chairman's 'heart wasn't in it and felt like a fish out of water'.

Coalitions:
• Were coalitions formed by the Task Force members during the formulation phase?

Strong coalitions formed among the Task Force members. The non-portfolio members appeared united and combined, often displaying the need to collectively support each other. This was evidenced at the October 4 meeting of the Task Force, when they left together to meet with the Minister of Education and Youth Affairs. According to one
interview informant there may have been 'three or four camps' within the Task Force. The portfolio members, the non-portfolio members, the 'education' government representatives (Department of Education and Youth Affairs) and the 'arts' government representatives (Department of Home Affairs and Environment). These coalitions, reflect, in fact, organisation coalitions that impacted upon the formulation phase.

**Level of attention:**

- Did competing issues affect the level of attention afforded by the Task Force members?

According to Winter (1990) successful implementation is likely to be positively related to the level of attention by the policy proponents in the policy-formation process. Winter (1990:25) contends that most actors in the policy formation process are only part-time participants faced by competing claims for attention from other private and public roles; participants are often exchanged with new ones. With only one full-time member of the Task Force, the part-time status of the Task Force diminished the level of attention.

Of the eleven members appointed to the Task Force, only one, the Executive Officer of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, was employed (in the latter stages of the formulation phase), on a full-time basis responsible for matters relating to the formulation of the report, Education and the Arts, 1985. Six members were employed by Commonwealth organisations, namely, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs (1), Department of Home Affairs and Environment (1), the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (1), the Commonwealth Schools Commission (1), the Australia Council (1), the Curriculum Development Centre (1). These six members
represented two Commonwealth departments: the Department of Education and Youth Affairs and the Department of Home Affairs and Environment. Four members were either private artists, arts educators or arts administrators from Victoria (2), South Australia (1) and New South Wales (1). The four non-portfolio members were 'flown in' to Canberra for Task Force meetings.

Information gathered from interviews and written documents revealed that some members of the Task Force put an 'inordinate amount of time' into the formulation of the policy and were 'extremely hard working'; while it was stated by one interview informant that others saw membership on the Task Force, as merely a 'stepping stone' to other higher positions within the bureaucracy. The part-time nature of the Task Force deliberations made it difficult in terms of communication and timing. At times, Task Force members would not receive agendas and pertinent papers prior to the meetings, or members would not have enough time to peruse documents before the meetings. It was claimed that some members were inexperienced and not familiar with particular issues that related directly to arts education, which again caused tension and anxiety with others. Although, there were no competing issues on the agenda for the Education and the Arts Task Force, it was perceived by the non-portfolio member interviewed that total support and commitment by all members for the policy was not evident.

During the formulation of the Task Force report the committee was chaired by three Chairman. Interviews with Task Force members confirmed that the group was often 'struggling' and that the change of
Chairman caused an 'unsettling effect' and precluded the level of commitment needed to achieve satisfactory outcomes.

**Valid causal theory:**

• Was the policy based on a valid causal theory?

Winter (1990:25) argues that successful implementation is more likely if the policy proponents in the policy formation process have based their decisions on a valid causal theory about the problematic behaviour to be regulated by the policy and the relationship between the policy instruments and that behaviour. According to Winter, the application of a valid causal theory presumes that such a theory exists, and second that it has been applied by the policy proponents in analysing the consequences of the policy decision. It does not presume that all proponents agree about the theory application, except that each knows what he/she is doing and has been thinking about consequences in relation to his/her values.

Based on the premise 'it is clear that arts education has been inadequately supported in the past, even though artistic endeavour is fundamental to the development of a creative and productive nation' (Education and the Arts, 1985: vii) the Task Force report identified an overarching aim, four main objectives, five themes or issues and nineteen specific objectives in an attempt to improve this situation. It is difficult to confirm whether the Task Force report was based on a valid causal theory or the Task Force members applied one to the policy. It appears that the report was based on a number of basic premises, such as low economic growth, increasing levels of youth unemployment and that arts experiences at the school level were inadequate and neglected. It was assumed that improvement in arts
experiences would lead to better employment and improved economy. The Task Force report, stated that the situation could improve the situation by addressing a number of broad areas, such as, encouraging leadership at the Commonwealth, State and local level; endeavouring to change community attitudes and actions; encouraging equality of opportunity for experience and active participation in the arts; addressing teacher education, curriculum development, community resources and trying to develop cultural identity. These areas of concern appear to reflect a causal theory deemed valid by Task Force members but the subjective nature of the conclusion and lack of confirmation makes it difficult to validate.

Symbolic reasoning?  
- Was the policy adopted for symbolic reasons?

According to Winter (1990:25) at times, demonstrating a willingness to act may be more important than actually solving problems and that implementation success is unlikely if the policy was adopted for symbolic reasons. The Education and the Arts, 1985 policy appeared not to be developed for purely symbolic reasons. According to the Task Force members interviewed it appeared that the non-portfolio members had a philosophical commitment to improve the arts through the policy formulation. According to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, she established the Task Force with the belief that the final results would bring about change and improvement to arts education.

The final report provided an implementation plan, which included a large number of recommendations, the identification of the organisations or groups responsible for its implementation and
funding recommendations. According to the Task Force members and the former Minister for Education and the Youth Affairs interviewed, the Task Force genuinely believed when presenting it's final report, that it would affect positive change for arts education. The pragmatic nature of the report, including the relatively large amount of time and effort in formulating its recommendations, is evidence that this policy was not developed for purely symbolic reasons.

**ANOTHER POSSIBLE VARIABLE**

Another possible variable not specifically identified by Winter, but identified as a result of this enquiry, which may have affected the implementation process is: policy proponent selection.

It is important to note that some concerns were expressed to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs relating to the lack of representation on the Task Force by some organisations. Letters were sent to the Minister for Education concerning the lack of Aboriginal representation and dance/movement representatives on the Task Force. The Minister replied that 'members were chosen because of their broad experience in the fields of both education and the arts rather than any one discipline and it was certainly not possible to have members from across the entire spectrum of the arts'. (C84:9, C84:5)

Through interview, the Minister stated that she had 'hand-picked the Task Force members'. Not only were concerns raised by Aboriginal and dance representatives in the formulation phase, state education organisations were critical concerning the composition, of the Task Force during the implementation phase. These criticisms will be raised
in greater detail in the next chapter when State/Territory organisational responses to the policy are examined.

It appears that implementation studies, including Winter (1990), do not highlight the importance of this factor; that is, the notion of 'over' representation by one or more interest groups within the formulation phase nor the notion of political appointments. For example, when policy formulators are not truly representative of the target group for which they are attempting to formulate policy, the variables of initiation and selection of members could be a critical factor affecting policy formulation.

Close examination of the Task Force composition indicates that, in fact, the eleven member Task Force group consisted of six bureaucrats from within two Commonwealth Departments; namely, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs (including membership from the CSC, the CDC, CTEC) and the Department of Home Affairs and Environment (including the Australia Council representative). The five non-portfolio members were arts administrators or professional artists. On examination, of the other ten signatories, who worked with the Task Force, we find similar results all ten were bureaucrats from within the Department of Education and Youth Affairs or members of the Commonwealth Schools Commission. (C84:6)

In this case, the Task Force, tended to 'overly' represent a limited number of federal organisations while attempting to make major recommendations for arts target groups housed in State and Territory organisations. Questions could be raised whether the formulators of policy would lean towards their own needs and interests if the majority
of members represented one particular interest. It could be concluded that the composition of the Task Force caused conflictual problems with the organisations it 'represented', as well as, organisations it had nominated for carrying out its recommendations.

In summary, there appears to be a number of possible factors or variables which affected the formulation phase of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy with the potential to impact adversely on implementation. The main factors appeared to be that conflict existed and coalitions were created within the Task Force membership. Basically, two groups existed, the bureaucrats representing the Commonwealth government and inter-governmental organisations and the non-portfolio members who were considered as 'outsiders'. It was perceived by the non-portfolio members that the bureaucrats did not have the same commitment to arts education that the non-portfolio members had. It appeared that the bureaucrats were manipulating the Task Force report to follow closely the Commonwealth's broad objectives for educational change (e.g. the Participation and Equity framework). This was perceived by some members as not placing arts education high enough on the educational agenda. The factors and variables identified in the formulation phase are consistent with the possible variables proposed by Winter (1990). To what extent did these variables affect the degree of success of the implementation? It appeared to them that these variables caused confusion, disharmony which resulted in delays in the process. Although 'annoying' to the development of the final report, the actual effect on the degree of success of the formulation process (or subsequent effect on the implementation process) by these factors is not
clear; the affect may have been minimal, but the unresolved conflict could have been instrumental in assisting the government policy position to prevail. The Task Force had fulfilled its terms of reference. It had proposed a strategy of Commonwealth initiatives, it had considered short and long term options, made a large number of recommendations and provided estimates of costs for implementation.

**THE NEXT PHASE: COMMONWEALTH IMPLEMENTATION**

Immediately following the submission of the final Education and the Arts, 1985 report to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, it was decided at the senior level of the Commonwealth Department of Education and Youth Affairs, that the Task Force recommendations would be distributed to the relevant agencies, outlined in the report, requesting comment with a view of preparing 'advice on reactions to the report' early in 1985-86. The next chapter will deal with the implementation phase.

This implementation phase of the policy process, as it relates to the second socio-political condition or process proposed by Winter (1990), is the 'Organisational and Inter-organisational behaviour', that is, in terms of the possible variables or factors which may affect the implementation process.

The next chapter outlines the responses made by the States and Territories to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs when asked to respond to the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. The related research questions are then applied to these responses.
CHAPTER FIVE

EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
POLICY PROCESS: IMPLEMENTATION
RESPONSES FROM THE STATE/TERRITORY LEVEL

OVERVIEW

During 1984 a small number of recommendations of the interim or progress report of the Task Force on education and the arts had been implemented at the Commonwealth level prior to the submission of the final report. These included the establishment of an arts education unit at the Commonwealth Schools Commission through funds from the Projects of National Significance Program and the appointment of the full-time Executive Officer within the Department of Education and Youth Affairs to advise and act on education and the arts. Once the final report had been submitted to the Minister of Education and Youth Affairs, the implementation of the major recommendations was undertaken. Initially, those organisations identified as responsible for the recommendations were sent copies of the final report and requested to comment.

This chapter examines the responses by the State and Territory organisations by presenting and analysing data which relates to the second of Winter's (1990) socio-political processes or conditions 'Organisational or Inter-organisational Implementation Behaviour'. Winter's socio-political condition has been expanded to include research by Goggin et al (1990), which attempts to explain inter-
governmental policy implementation. The second research question is applied:

What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy at the implementation phase at the Commonwealth/Federal level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

While answering the specific research question above, a number of related questions, which have been developed from the Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990) models, are posed. The related questions explore the possible factors which may affect implementation. These possible factors are: 'conflicting interests and incentives', 'goal priority', 'coordination', 'delays', 'inducements', 'constraints', 'capacity and propensity to act'. Each of these factors is applied to the implementation phase of the policy process at the state/territory level in this chapter and at the Commonwealth level in the next chapter.

INTRODUCTION

Australia has six states: New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, Queensland and two territories: the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. Organisations within these states and territories, which had been identified by the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy as being responsible for implementation of one or more of the recommendations of the Task Force report, were asked by the Secretary of the Commonwealth Department of Education and Youth Affairs to respond to the report.
The responses by the organisations are outlined briefly in this chapter, followed by a more detailed examination of the responses by Victoria and Western Australia. This examination reveals a high degree of variance or contrast in response, among the States and Territories. Possible factors or variables, which may affect the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy at the implementation phase, are then explored.

Detailed specific responses to individual recommendations by organisations from the states and territories can be found in Appendix L, while a summary of the responses made by the departments of education at the State/ level can be found in Appendix M.

Data has been gathered from written documents, such as letters and memorandum, specifically official departmental responses to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. Details of written documents and their sources can be found at the conclusion of the thesis, in the section titled, 'Reference List of Written Documentation'. Interviews were also used as a source of data. Key players in Victoria and Western Australia, involved in the implementation process, were identified and interviewed. The list of interview informants can be found in Appendix C.

Before examining the variation in responses by the States and Territories, it is important to return and briefly examine the state/federal relations in Australia, within the education sector, that existed prior to the formulation and implementation of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy.
Constitutionally, the Commonwealth government in Australia has no direct control over education. It does provide funding through 'earmarked' or 'block' grants to States such as, General Recurrent Grants. The States and Territories have Constitutional responsibility for education and provide the majority of funding to the education sector\(^1\). However, Section 96 of the Australian Constitution allows the Commonwealth to apply funds to education, according to the priorities determined by the Commonwealth, on the terms and conditions legislated by the Commonwealth Parliament. (Birch, Hind, Tomlinson, 1979)

It appears that conflict has often been present between the States and the Commonwealth, in relation to inter-governmental behaviour, with regard to education in Australia\(^2\). Dudley and Vidovich (1995:130), point out that in the nineties the Commonwealth increased its role in all sectors, its rationale being to 'enhance coherence and coordination in the national interest'. States are still interpreting Commonwealth moves as a threat to their autonomy and are trying to resist increased Commonwealth intervention, while still trying to maximise any benefits they might secure from national co-operation. Historically the States have repeatedly argued for additional Commonwealth funding, while still wanting their authority and autonomy to be retained. Two examples highlighting this conflict are provided, which point out the variation in responses by States and Territories to the Commonwealth.

\(^1\) Additional information concerning Australian Commonwealth/State relations and funding can be found in Spaull, A. (1987) or Dudley, J. and Vidovich, L. (1995).

\(^2\) State governments controlled the schools sector, i.e. government schools and Technical and Further Education colleges while the Commonwealth 'de facto' controlled the public university sector, through direct funding.
First, the establishment of the Australian Education Council (AEC). The Council, which evolved from the first meeting in 1936 of state Ministers for Education, was formed in 1975 when the States feared increased pressure by the Commonwealth to become more involved in education. The AEC was established when the States decided that they needed a strong body to act as an effective balance to the Commonwealth.

Pimblett (1986: 15) contends that one of the most constant themes of the AEC has been the relative relationship between the roles of the Commonwealth and the States in determining educational policy. While the States have had unchallenged constitutional responsibility for education, the AEC has made the financial power of the Commonwealth central to its role. At various times, according to Pimblett, the AEC has been used to 'counter balance' the actions or 'encroachments' by the Commonwealth into the State's rights. The States, however do not act as a 'collective single voice' counter-balancing the Commonwealth. According to Birch et al, (1979:32) historically, the States collective opposition to the Commonwealth has rarely been unanimous, and the States have not been consistent in their opposition.

Another example of conflict within state/federal inter-governmental relations was 'schools sector' funding in the 1970’s. Although the States had been continually persistent about opposing Commonwealth intrusion, they still sought its financial assistance. The strength of the State's protests had varied according to the particular circumstances surrounding the 'grant of Commonwealth moneys' and according to
the 'political complexion of incumbent governments'. Birch et al, argued

In general terms, their assessment of their own State's interests has been given greater importance than their loyalty to the national intentions of their respective political parties, but their motives have not always been altruistic. The consequences of any political decisions upon the behaviour of the voting public has often been a prime consideration. (Birch et al, 1979:32)

In March 1985, the Secretary of the Commonwealth Department of Education, wrote to education and arts organisations in each state and territory, which the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy had identified as being their responsibility, seeking their comment and advice concerning the recommendations of the Education and the Arts, 1985 report.

All state and territory education departments responded to the invitation to comment, as did some state and territory arts organisations, such as, the Australian Film and Television School, the Victorian Ministry for the Arts, the Western Australia Arts Council

Generally, education authorities welcomed the report and the opportunity to comment. Responses ranged from very enthusiastic and strongly supportive, through to positive and supportive with some qualification on one or two points, to a more general criticism.

In a synthesis of the responses, the Commonwealth Department of Education agreed that responses were generally supportive, although the following synopsis of comments were expressed:
• there was a need for more Commonwealth/State consultation;

• every State expressed the view that teacher training and professional development required immediate attention and that many of the remaining recommendations hinged on this;

• strong support for the information sharing network

• resistance of any notion of ear-marked funds (WA, NSW and QLD)

• Queensland considered funds would be better spent supporting existing programs and concern was expressed that Commonwealth funds could be directed towards priorities not selected by States.

(C85:11)

The following is a brief summary of individual state and territory organisations responses from New South Wales (NSW), Queensland (Qld), Northern Territory (NT), South Australia (SA) and Tasmania (Tas) to the Task Force recommendations. Responses from Western Australia (WA) and Victoria (Vic) will be discussed in more detail, as they provide sound examples of the range of inter-governmental behaviour which could be experienced during the implementation process.

NEW SOUTH WALES

New South Wales Department of Education

The NSW Department of Education (C85:23) was, in general, supportive of the Report's recommendations. It highlighted two main reservations concerning the report. The first, was that the recommendations would duplicate, to a degree, some of the actions already being undertaken as part of its existing special purpose
programs such as the Participation and Equity Program and Disadvantaged Schools Program. The second was that the funding and administrative structures for implementing the report, should have taken greater account of the need for a continuum of learning experiences in the arts over an extended period.

The NSW response suggested that close consultation between the Commonwealth and the State was needed, to ensure the greatest possible integration between existing Departmental programs and structures. It agreed that the implications of the recommendations for staffing and funding would depend on the outcomes of the recommended consultation between the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Education.

The NSW Department of Education was prepared to co-operate with other States and the Northern Territory, in developing mechanisms for an information sharing system for education and the arts. The Department was also willing to provide arts in education curriculum information to the Curriculum Information Network (CIN) established by the Curriculum Development Centre.

The NSW Department was also prepared to make available school facilities for arts in education outside of school hours, a recommendation by the Task Force, provided that a suitable funding basis and management structure was agreed to by the Commonwealth.

The NSW Department was willing to participate in formal discussions initiated by the Commonwealth to explore additional ways of promoting the involvement and representation of Aborigines, ethnic-
groups and women in arts education. The department also agreed to expand its existing programs to provide greater access to arts education for children in remote areas but pointed out such expansion would be contingent on receiving additional funds for this purpose.

The NSW Department of Education was willing to set up procedures to support an arts in education grants program established by the Commonwealth. The Department expressed the view that it would have been willing to increase the levels of arts advisory and consultancy services to schools if additional Commonwealth funds were available.

Similarly, if Commonwealth funds were increased for Professional development, the department would undertake to provide additional inservice courses in arts education for primary teachers and training arts advisors.

Generally, the NSW response was positive but many of the responses were qualified, with statements such as

'The Department is willing to set up procedures to support an arts education grants program established by the Commonwealth....' (C85:23)

'If additional Commonwealth funds are available this Department would increase the levels of arts advisory and consultancy...' (C85:23)

'If Commonwealth funds for professional development were increased the Department would undertake to provide..' (C85:23)

Overall, the NSW responses were generally supportive, but only if the Commonwealth was to provide additional funding for the
recommendations. The NSW Department was not willing to support the recommendations without financial assistance.

**NSW Office of the Minister for Arts**

The response from the Office of the Minister for the Arts was generally supportive of the recommendations.

**QUEENSLAND**

**Queensland Department of Education**

The Queensland Department of Education generally accepted and supported the recommendations with the report. However, the department expressed reservations by stating that it was a matter of concern that Commonwealth funding could be directed towards priorities which have not been selected by the State. From a Queensland point of view it would be preferable to receive Commonwealth funds to support ongoing programs. The allocation of funds to provide for administrative structures or to establish a senior position which would duplicate what already exists in this State cannot be supported. The concept of developing infrastructures to duplicate the activity of the States in the field of Education cannot be endorsed. (C85:15)

The Queensland Participation and Equity Program Advisory Committee supported this notion and argued that the earmarking of Participation and Equity Program funds by the Commonwealth for specific needs groups and/or for activities in specific areas is not in the best interests of the Program (C85:15)

While acknowledging the PEP program could contribute to the suggested outcome of the Task Force report, to develop innovative arts-focused curricula, the Committee contended it
would not support the strategy of earmarking a significant proportion of Participation and Equity funds as being a desirable way of achieving such an outcome. (C85:15)

The Queensland Department of Education strongly supported particular recommendations of the report. It agreed that a representative from Queensland serve on the joint standing committee which was to be established by the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Minister's Council. Mr G Hay, Assistant Director, Division of Curriculum Services was nominated as the support officer for this committee. Other supported recommendations included the Curriculum Information Network, proposed for the Curriculum Development Centre, and the use of school buildings out of hours for arts related areas.

In a similar vein to the NSW response, the Queensland Department of Education supported programs to incorporate Aboriginal arts in schools and to provide advisory and consultancy service in arts education, on the condition that the Commonwealth provided additional funding for these initiatives. The Queensland Department of Education was not willing to provide financial support.

The Queensland Department of Education concluded it's response to the Commonwealth Department of Education by stating

Reservations must be expressed about the other recommendations for reasons already stated or because it is envisaged that their adoption would result in diminution of this State's constitutional duty towards Education or because agreement could result in a distortion of policy within the Department of Education. (C85:15)
Queensland Department of Arts, National Parks and Sport

The Queensland Department of Arts, National Parks and Sport was supportive of the recommendations. It did make particular reference to Recommendation 2 (funding of arts access centres) and noted that the Queensland Department of Education had already developed plans for the use of community resources for arts education.

An important point was raised by the Queensland Department of Arts, National Parks and Sport, in relation to the National Advisory Committee. The organisation stated that the strategy chapter of the Task Force report would require Ministerial policy consideration due to the fact that a funding input is expected of State Arts Ministers. Importantly, none of these Ministers would have representation on the proposed National Advisory Committee, (which was to be appointed by the Commonwealth Minister for Education), nor would they have representation on the State Committees which were to be appointed by the State Ministers of Education after consultation with the Commonwealth Minister for Education.

Queensland State PEP Committee

The Queensland State PEP Committee accepted the report as a whole but did not accept recommendation 18, that a significant amount of State PEP funds be earmarked for education and the arts projects for persons over school leaving age. The Committee did not believe that PEP funds should be earmarked to activities or specific areas as this ‘would not be in the programs best interest’. (C85:11)
Northern Territory Department of Education

The Northern Territory Department of Education was generally supportive of the Task Force report. (C85:14) The Department responded by identifying specific recommendations which it felt it could support. The only recommendation not supported was Recommendation 31, which states:

That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the co-operation of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to inform artists working in schools of current arts curriculum policy and, where necessary, establish courses and workshops so that the artists may develop their work to complement current educational thinking at system and school levels.

The Department argued, that the Artist-in-schools program, which had been operating in Northern Territory for five years, was 'refreshing' and successful because of its 'non-institutionalised approach' by artists within the school environment. The Department also reminded the Commonwealth Department of Education and Youth Affairs that 'the Arts is but one focus of educational concern'. It contends that Literacy, Numeracy, Health and Physical Education, Languages Other than English and Computer Education were all current Northern Territory priorities and that it was not possible, within existing resources, to provide all curriculum areas comprehensive personnel support. (C85:14)

A response by the Northern Territory Department of Education PEP Committee concerning Recommendation 18, that a significant proportion of PEP funds should be earmarked for the development of innovative arts-focused curricula, caused some concern. The Deputy
Secretary of Schools (NT), responded by stating that while the Northern Territory PEP Committee recognised the value of the arts, the recommendation appeared to represent another 'add on' focus to the program. The Deputy Secretary warned that it may have lead to a further fragmentation of the program and would not assist in clarifying or focusing the complex and difficult aims of the project, especially in relation to the particular population of Aboriginal students. (C85:14)

Northern Territory Government PEP Committee

The Northern Territory PEP Committee was supportive of the Task Force recommendations except for recommendation 18. (that a significant amount of state PEP funds be earmarked for Education and the Arts projects).

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

South Australian Department of Education

The South Australian Department of Education (C85:20) was the only South Australian organisation to respond to the Task Force report and was very supportive, in principle, of the recommendations referred to it. The South Australian Department of Education highlighted a number of specific recommendations that it would support, such as the development of the quantitative data base, and the involvement in the setting up of outside arts facilities. The Department strongly supported the aim of involving girls in technology and agreed that an increase in arts grant funding by the Commonwealth was desirable. The Department also argued that the Australia Council did not give this notion a high enough priority. (It is important to reiterate that the
Australia Council's objectives do not relate to education or schools. The Australia Council could not fund school based projects.

In general, the Department was supportive of the Task Force recommendations and wanted to be involved in their implementation. (C85:20)

TASMANIA

Tasmanian Education Department

The Tasmanian Department of Education (C85:21) was the only Tasmanian organisation to respond to the Task Force recommendations and was generally supportive. However, it did state that the report did not emphasise sufficiently the importance of staff training. The Department believed that this aspect should be the highest priority of all the recommendations provided in the report.

Two other major concerns of the Tasmanian Department were raised. First, that budgetary restrictions would make it difficult to allocate sufficient funds to bring about significant improvement in the immediate future. Secondly, the report gave arts education such a broad definition, that funds that could be made available were likely to be spread quite thinly, with little or no impact. (C85:21)

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority

The ACT Schools Authority (C85:4) was the only Australian Capital Territory organisation to respond to the Task Force report and, in general, supported the thrust of the recommendations affecting
schools. At the time, the ACT Schools Authority supported a policy of schools having the prime responsibility for the development of curricula so that at the school level curriculum issues were negotiated. The ACT Schools Authority singled out the strong need for improvement in both pre-service and inservice teacher education and that it was essential that maximum effort and funding needed to be directed directly to schools. The ACT Schools Authority response to the Commonwealth Department of Education argued that an awareness program should be undertaken in all states and territories to inform parents, teachers and students concerning the importance of the arts.

The ACT Schools Authority expressed reservations concerning two recommendations of the Education and the Arts, 1985 Task Force report. The first was Recommendation 8, that suggested a stereotyping of certain art forms, which according to the Authority was quite inappropriate. While the Authority supported the spirit of the recommendation, they stated 'the implementation process should include positive action to ensure that males are encouraged to undertake these courses'. The second was recommendation 16. It was argued that although encouragement of innovative programs was important such programs needed to include 'provision for long term system and school support and the appropriate mechanisms for extending the program beyond the initial context'. (C85:4)

The responses, so far, by the States and Territories to the Task Force recommendations are significant to this enquiry, as they highlight the range of responses among the organisations responsible for implementation. The level and variation of support by these organisations affects the success of the implementation of the
recommendations. Responses from Victoria and Western Australia will be discussed in more detail.

The contrast in the responses made by the Victorian and Western Australian education authorities are significant to this enquiry, as it illuminates the range of governmental and inter-governmental behaviour during the educational policy implementation process in Australia in the mid eighties. The following is an account of the responses provided by these two states.

**VICTORIA**

**Victorian Education Department**

From the outset, the Victorian Education Department (C85:25) was extremely supportive of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. It felt that the report was 'timely' and would ensure an 'increased impetus for arts education' in Victorian schools. In general, the overall scope and direction of the policy was strongly supported and endorsed. It claimed that it would be successful, if the various education levels -national, state, region and school are co-ordinated. It was felt that the broad objectives of the report were completely consistent with the Victorian Ministerial Paper No. 6 'Curriculum Development and Planning in Victoria'.

It is interesting to note, that the Victorian Ministerial Paper had extracted the objectives from the 1977 Education and the Arts national report for its own report. Although, the Victorian Education Department acknowledged, as had the 1985 Task Force report, that even though the objectives had been extracted from the 1977 report...
there had been very few gains for arts education since that time. (and) To bring about more fundamental change that ensures all students do in fact have 'access' and 'participation' (for example) in arts programs will require a far higher level of commitment than has been apparent in the past (C85:25)

The Victorian Education Department argued that there was a need to ensure that the focus of the recommendations was firmly directed toward the needs of young people. The Victorian Education Department was either supportive or strongly supportive of all the recommendations of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy.

Another state organisation, the Victorian Ministry for the Arts, also responded to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, by providing a position paper. The tenure of response by this state government arts department is also significant to this study.

**Victorian Ministry for the Arts**

The Victorian Ministry for the Arts argued that a national Task Force on Education and the Arts and a Victorian Ministerial Working Party (C84:24) working together would provide co-ordination and leadership at the state and federal level, which would allow for a 'real opportunity for development and action'.

The Victorian Ministry for the Arts endorsed and supported the broad objectives of the Education and the Arts Task Force preliminary report. According to the Position Paper, the Ministry was willing to 'inform, consult, motivate and share planning and decision making'. The Position Paper proposed and established a framework for the 'long awaited development of innovative programs' across education and
the arts. The Ministry was willing to co-operate in whatever ways it was able to ensure the rapid implementation of the Task Force recommendations. (C84:24) The Ministry for the Arts provided a three tier framework under the groupings of Leadership and Co-ordination, Community Attitude and Action, and Equality of Opportunities. The Ministry had nominated the names of three Chairpersons who would co-ordinate a number of state agencies in three working parties. It was stated that all working groups would develop a consultancy approach to address the 'wider issues'. It was envisaged that Group One would 'spearhead public/political voice', Group Two would 'inform, challenge and consult', while Group Three would represent 'special views and interests'. (C84:24)

On the whole, the Victorian response indicated that the Victorian Department of Education was extremely positive, supportive and excited to become involved in the Commonwealth/state endeavour. On the other hand, responses from Western Australian government organisations painted a very different picture.

**WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

**Education Department of Western Australia**

The Deputy-Director General of the Western Australia Education Department, (C85:28) responded in writing to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs concerning the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. He replied in his role as the officer nominated by the

---

3 Ann Morrow, Carolyn Hogg and John McLaren
4 Warren Louden
Director-General of Education and as the Chairman of the State Participation and Equity Committee.

From the outset the response was negative. The Deputy-Director General voiced 'grave reservations about the composition of the Task Force'. The response was critical of the lack of representation on the Task Force Committee by school or system administrators. He argued that

by failing to include either a school or a system administrator the Committee was denied the benefit of a person who could consider the administrative implications of any proposed changes. The result is clear in the report. (C85:28)

It was felt that the composition of the Task Force ensured that the 'upgrading of the place of the arts in the school curriculum was a shared value position from the outset'. The Deputy-Director General stated that while he personally had sympathy for this point of view, it was adding yet another demand upon schools which were already 'under siege' in regards to improved literacy, the extension of teaching foreign languages, the introduction of aboriginal studies and the initiation and expansion of computer studies.

He argued that the Task Force report was similar to many reports on pre-service teacher education which

focused on the need to do more about a variety of areas but do not suggest aspects of curriculum which can be reduced in coverage or omitted altogether (C85:28)

The Deputy-Director General then addressed the response to individual recommendations. The first recommendation of the Task
Force concerned the establishment of the a joint standing committee to co-ordinate and implement the policy. The Western Australian response to this proposal was

The first recommendation reflects a view commonly held by those not involved in the direct provision of education that what happens in the schools of the nation is determined by agreements between Ministers, monitored by national committees and imposed on schools. The composition of the Committee made this view almost inevitable. (C85:28)

The second recommendation was the establishment and subsidising of arts access centres by the Commonwealth in partnership with the States and Territories. The Western Australian response was

Given the patterns of educational spending by the Commonwealth on education in Government schools in real terms in recent years this recommendation inevitably means the ear-marking of existing funds for specific Commonwealth-determined purpose. It is consistent with the Commonwealth's recent practice but would be opposed by all State governments. (C85:28)

Recommendation seven related to the arts of ethnic groups being brought into the school curriculum by courses being made available at TAFE institutions. The Western Australian response was

This recommendation shows that absence of a system-related TAFE representative, who would have been able to reflect the present position (C85:28)

While recommendation eighteen called for a significant proportion of the PEP funds being ear-marked for the development of innovative arts-focused curriculums, the Deputy-Director General replied
The recommendation appears to be based on a view that it is only by compulsion that arts related activities will be chosen by schools. (C85:28)

In relation to recommendation twenty, where the Task Force called for the increase of arts advisory and consultancy services in schools, the Western Australian response was

In this State most of the arts, music, drama activities are undertaken by specialist staff. The recommendation is thus of less value than it may be in other States. Without wishing to unduly labour the point national committees are likely to attempt to find generic solutions to situations of individual States. Such solutions are unlikely to be successful. (C85:28)

The final individual recommendation that was responded to was recommendation thirty one where the Task Force requested that the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs sought the co-operation of the State and Territory Ministers to inform artists working in schools of current arts curriculum and policy. The Deputy-Director General's response to this recommendation typifies the inter-governmental behaviour which will be discussed in detail later. The response was

I am not sure what is meant by this recommendation. What is meant by 'current arts curriculum policy". I understand that under the Constitution, States have the responsibility for curriculum policy and I am at a loss to determine what role the Minister of Education and Youth Affairs would have in this regard. If on the other hand, some newsletter to teachers working in the field is intended there would be a place for such a publication. (C85:28)

The Deputy-Director General concludes his state's response by apologising for the 'negative tone' of the response but continues

the Task Force members, are, no doubt, enthusiastic and expert in their own fields. However, the Committee has
sought to achieve its aims largely through the schools sector. Its inability to receive advice from a person expert in that sector and the Committee's centralist perspective have combined to make its report of dubious value in achieving its aims. (C85:28)

As well as the Western Australian Education Department, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs received written responses from the Western Australian Arts Council.

**Western Australian Arts Council**

Similar to the Education Department response, the Council's response was negative (C85:29). It was felt by the members and the senior staff of the Council that while the general reaction was positive to the theme of the Task Force, disappointment was expressed concerning the 'very brief amount of time' given to study the report and formulate comments and that there was a general feeling that the Task Force had given inadequate attention to the arts situation in Western Australia. The Council argued that all States should have been represented on the Task Force.

The Council acknowledged that the 1977 Report on Education and the Arts was an 'important landmark' and it was disappointed that the Task Force was unable to present a more comprehensive survey of the State's achievements of the past seven or eight years. (C85:29)

The Council was most critical of the language and jargon presented in the Task Force report. The Council stated

> While we do not wish to be negative or carping in our commentary on the Report, we should record the view expressed quite strongly by a number of those who read it, that its appeal as a document is diminished by its
excessive use of jargon and by its not infrequent lapses into circumlocution, mixed metaphor and by what can be best described (in the words of Professor Leonie Kramer) as "the grotesque and irrational manipulation of the language". (C85:29)

One does not expect a Government report to be an outstanding piece of creative writing, but when it deals with a subject like Education and the Arts, its form should not be such to offend the sensibilities of those who believe that simple, clear and elegant expression is characteristic of those who have benefited from a sound education and who esteem good literature as a true art form.

Policy implementation by the Commonwealth government involves state governments, who are headed by politicians or run by bureaucracies, whose priorities or policies can disagree or conflict with the objectives of the Commonwealth policy. As Goggin et al (1990) contend federal and state bureaucracies often have interests of their own to protect. The adoption of new programs may conflict with the existing programs or policies. At times, the implementation of the new federal program or policy may be regarded as a threat to established state programs or policies.

The variety in responses by the State and Territory governments to the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy supports this contention.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The differences in response made by the organisations given the responsibility for the implementation of the Task Force recommendations, at the State and Territory level, is consistent with

The related questions developed for this enquiry, which are derived from the 'organisational and inter-organisational behaviour' described by Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990), can be applied to this phase of the policy process.

**Conflicting interests/incentives:**

- Did the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy have conflicting interests or incentives to the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

In the case of Western Australia, that State Education Department perceived the report as yet another policy which was developed and imposed by the Commonwealth. It criticised the lack of involvement by the States at the formulation phase, and it perceived the Commonwealth report as conflicting with the State's interests. It is apparent, from the negative tone of the response, that Western Australia may have been reluctant to become involved in the implementation of the policy. Western Australia may have been protecting its own interests and priorities. From interview data gathered it appears that at the time of implementation, the Western Australian government tended to support the 'rights' of the States. The Minister for Education strongly believed the States should have 'sovereign rights'. Committees or Councils within the Western Australian education sector were instructed to oppose 'anything perceived as a grab for Commonwealth power'. (Interview Six)

The Director-General of Education of Western Australia, employed at the time of the formulation and implementation of the *Education and
the Arts, 1985 policy, through interview stated, there was always concern at the State level that the Commonwealth 'always wanted to make the rules and only pay 5% of the bills'. According to another Western Australian senior bureaucrat interviewed, the perception was that 'the person who puts the major sum of money into a program should have the major say in it'. This notion was consistent with the other States and Territories in that, the willingness to be involved was on condition that the Commonwealth would contribute towards it financially. (Interview Six, Interview Seven)

**Goal priority:**

- Did the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy give priority to goals which competed with the policy?

Many of the states and territories, especially Queensland, expressed the view that funds for arts education would be better spent supporting existing State programs. There were concerns expressed by States and Territories that Commonwealth funds could be directed towards priorities not selected by the States. It was evident that States had developed their own goals and priorities with regard to Arts Education. These priorities seemed to compete with those proposed by the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. For example, the Western Australian Director-General of Education contended that, in interview with the researcher reflecting on the timing of the implementation of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy that a number of Commonwealth programs were deliberately 'distorted' by the Western Australian government to fit the State's priorities.

The conflict in priorities for funding, was a point also made by the State PEP Committees, in that they were strongly opposed to the ear-marking of funds, to priorities which had not been identified by them.
On examination of the written responses received by the Commonwealth Department of Education, concerning the recommendations made by the Task Force on education and the arts, and through interviews of key players, it appears that the States and Territories tended to give priority to their own goals and these at times competed with the policy.

**Co-ordination:**
- Were there any problems with co-ordination between the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy and the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

As States and Territories were asked only to respond to the recommendations made by the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy and not act upon them, it is difficult to comment on the area of co-ordination. Victoria was the only State which willingly offered a plan for the future co-ordination and implementation of the recommendations.

**Delays:**
- Were there any delays by the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy with the implementation of the policy recommendations?

There were no delays in making a response to the Task Force report as requested by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

**Inducements:**
- Were any inducements provided by Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy to the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy?

**Constraints:**
• Were any constraints placed on the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy by the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

There were no inducements or constraints placed on the States at this phase of the implementation process, as the States were required to respond to the recommendations only. Although the NSW Department of Education signalled clearly to the Commonwealth government it would require inducements for the implementation to proceed, the implementation at the state level was dependent on funding being provided at the Commonwealth level. The NSW response to the Task Force recommendations was fairly representative of many of the States, willingness to be involved if funding by the Commonwealth was included. Implementation was dependent on the provision of funding.

*Capacity and propensity to act:*

• Was there variation in the State and Territory organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy capacity and propensity to act on the policy recommendations?

There was great variation between the responses of all the States and Territories in their capacity and propensity to implement the recommendations, if required. This variation was demonstrated by the Victorian and Western Australian opposing responses. For example, the Victorian response was extremely positive. This state was willing to be involved and was adopting a 'pro-active' role in the implementation process. The Victorian government indicated willingness to work in partnership with the Commonwealth. Its priorities and policies were more closely aligned to Commonwealth policy. At the time of implementation the Victoria Department of Education was working its way through restructuring for arts
education, where integration of the art forms was high on the agenda. A notion supported and encouraged by the policy.

The Victorian Ministry for the Arts welcomed this 'very significant' report and was willing to 'co-operate in whatever ways it was possible to ensure the rapid implementation of the proposed strategy' (C84:24). The Victorian Department of Education was also willing to be involved in the implementation of the recommendations. (C85:25)

The Western Australian response focused clearly on it's dissatisfaction with the Task Force composition and the 'Committee's centralist perspective' (C85:28) and did not indicate it's capacity or propensity to become involved in the implementation process. On examination of the written documentation and through interview data collected, it is highly probable that Western Australia would have been resistant to being involved in the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

**CONCLUSION**

By mid year in 1985, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs had received responses from the majority of state and territory organisations responsible for the recommendations of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

According to Winter (1990:30) implementation failures are more likely if the implementation structure includes organisations that have institutional interests and incentives that conflict with the policy goals. From the data gathered and analysed, at this phase of the
implementation process, significant degrees of both support and hostility for the recommendations were evident from the States and Territories. At this stage, some conclusions can therefore be drawn.

Many of the States, including NSW, were willing to be involved if the Commonwealth was prepared to financially support the recommendations. States and Territories were not willing to fund the recommendations. This reluctance to fund provides some confirmation of the priority or goals that the States and Territories afforded arts education, and also highlights the importance of proposing achievable and realistic funding structures in the policy formulation phase. As this enquiry progressed, funding was confirmed as being a major factor in limiting the success of the implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

Some states, such as Western Australia, were critical of the policy formulation process, that is, the composition of the Task Force and the action of the Commonwealth of making recommendations, which were perceived as being 'imposed' on States. As this enquiry indicates, a major problem still exists in Australian education. Resistance by States and Territories to a perceived imposition appears to 'block' the smooth operation of the policy process. This notion is complex in nature and relates to the inter-governmental relationship, both politically and economically between the States and the Commonwealth. It relates to the way funding for education is distributed from the Commonwealth to the States and Territories, as well as inter-governmental organisations which have 'control' over education.
As the policy process unfolded in this story, it appears that the responses to the recommendations received from the States and Territories were never acted upon. To understand this, it is important to firstly analyse the behaviour of the major Commonwealth actor, the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC). The CSC was the organisation responsible for the implementation of Commonwealth education policies, therefore, responsible for implementing a large number of recommendations of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

The next chapter describes the responses made by the Commission to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. It analyses the decisions the organisation made and the funding it provided for the implementation of the policy. Related research questions identifying factors or variables which may affect the implementation process, as identified by Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990) at the 'Organisational or Inter-organisational' phase, are applied again and conclusions drawn at the Commonwealth level.
CHAPTER SIX

EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
POLICY PROCESS: IMPLEMENTATION
RESPONSES FROM THE COMMONWEALTH/FEDERAL LEVEL

OVERVIEW

This chapter presents and analyses data which relates to the second of Winter's (1990) socio-political processes or conditions 'Organisational or Inter-organisational Implementation Behaviour'. The behaviour under examination relates to the Commonwealth/Federal level. The third research question is addressed.

What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy at the implementation phase at the Commonwealth/Federal level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

By this stage of the policy process, the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy had been formulated by one Commonwealth department, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs and passed for implementation to another organisation within it, the Commonwealth Schools Commission, which had operational although not policy responsibility for the Curriculum Development Centre. Responses by these organisations were analysed. A number of related questions, derived from the possible variables or factors which may affect implementation, identified by Winter (1990), Goggin et al
(1990) and other policy studies are posed. Seven possible variables/factors are: 'conflicting interests and incentives', 'goal priority', 'co-ordination', 'delays', 'inducements', 'constraints', 'capacity and propensity to act'. Each of these questions are applied to the implementation phase of the policy process at the Commonwealth/federal. Data has been gathered from both written documents (archival material) and through interview.

**INTRODUCTION**

In March 1985, the Secretary of the Commonwealth Department of Education, Helen Williams, wrote to education authorities and arts agencies, to which the Task Force on Education and the Arts referred one or more of its recommendations, seeking advice and assistance towards consideration of the Task Force report.

A number of Commonwealth/federal organisations responded to the invitation to comment. From the education sector, the Commonwealth Schools Commission/Curriculum Development Centre, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and the National Aboriginal Education Committee responded. From the arts sector, the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment -the former Department of Home Affairs and Environment (whose portfolio included the Australia Council, the Australian Film Commission and the Australian Film and Television School) responded. As well, a response was received from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. (C85:5) (C85:6) (C85:3) Specific responses from Commonwealth/federal organisations to each recommendation can be found in Appendix N
Generally, the responses from the Commonwealth organisations were favourable. The Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission was unable to comment fully as it was jointly reviewing arts education and training in the tertiary sector at the time. However, the responses noted and approved the recommendations which related to teacher education and the National Aboriginal Education Committee stressed the need for substantial support for Aboriginal Arts.

The Australia Council’s view was that any desired changes promoted by the Task Force could only be achieved through the State and Territory education systems. It stated that

‘although the Council has an obligation to develop understanding and practice of the arts, it is not responsible and nor has the funds, to carry out arts education’. (C85:3)

Although a negative response, the Council did agree that Education and the Arts would be a standing item for future agenda. The Council stated that the greatest challenge for the policy was to bring about attitudinal change. The Australia Council eventually played a role in developing arts education by being a major player in the National Arts in Australian Schools Project, which was an outcome of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy that will be discussed in detail in Chapter Eight.

The Australian Film Commission response to the Task Force recommendations, to promote and develop film, video and radio in school curriculums, was not unlike the State and Territory responses. It was supportive of all the recommendations but advised that its own objectives of ‘training creative people to work in production’ and 'the
stringency's of its budgetary situation' made implementation difficult. (C85:5)

RESPONSES FROM THE COMMONWEALTH SCHOOLS COMMISSION AND THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

The responses to the Task Force report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC) and the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) are outlined in detail, as the responses from these two organisations are highly significant; the significance being, that the two organisations had been nominated by the Task Force as being responsible for action on twelve of the thirty four general recommendations. Also of significance, is the role that these two organisations played in the formulation phase of the policy, which was through representation by three members on the eleven member Task Force. As the organisations stated at the time, 'much of the burden for implementation falls on the Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre'. (C85:9) This was due to the education funding structures established at the federal level, in that, any funding that was provided for the implementation process of the policy was to come from the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC). The Department of Education and Youth Affairs had only budgeted for the secondment of the Task Force Executive Officer during the formulation phase. The implementation phase, including funding was the responsibility of the CSC.

To examine the implementation process, it is important to acknowledge the role of the Commonwealth Schools Commission/Curriculum Development Centre and the inter-
governmental relationship with the Commonwealth Department of Education within the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. The Commonwealth Department of Education was responsible for educational policy development. Therefore, the Education and the Arts Task Force was established by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. The Department of Education was responsible to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and, in the case of the Education and the Arts Task Force, provided secretariat services during its policy formulation phase. Once the policy had been formulated and submitted to the Minister, it was passed to the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC) for implementation. The CSC was responsible for government policy implementation. The CSC provided funding for policies either through specific purpose programs or, as in this case, through the Projects of National Significance Program. As the policy related to 'school' issues the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) was also involved. The CDC was a division of the CSC.

The Department of Education and Youth Affairs sought comment from the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC), concerning the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy.

In the joint response from the CSC and CDC, the difficulties of funding were highlighted

'from the outset, the expectation by the Task Force report, that the Commission and the Centre could act on all or a significant number of the recommendations was unrealistic'. (C85:9)
It is important to note, that the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre were critical of the Task Force report and acknowledged that the response, was neither the 'appropriate place for a critical analysis of the report', nor 'an alternative assessment of the arts in schools', but none the less, pointed out that the report's greatest weaknesses were in the treatment of issues surrounding 'state education curriculum, organisational structures and procedures'. (C85:9). This is interesting, in that these references concern general school policy and fail to mention the focus on youth unemployment.

It is important to remember that at the time of the formulation of the Task Force report, the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre had three representatives on the Task Force. The three members were the final Chairperson of the Task Force, Garth Boomer, who was at the time the Director of the Curriculum Development Centre, Bob McNamara who was the First Assistant Commissioner of the Commonwealth Schools Commission and Beth Moran who was the Assistant Director, Curriculum Development Centre. Through data gathering and analysis for this enquiry, it appears that major issues that are raised in the CSC response to the Task Force recommendations were not raised during the Task Force deliberations.

The CSC and CDC stated that State education authorities would find 'few guidelines for action outside those that more money can set in action'. (C85:9) State education departments were at the time of the implementation, evolving into 'decentralised' regional structures. The CSC criticised the Task Force report and contended that regional
educational authorities, which were emerging as an important organisational structure across Australia at that time, had been overlooked by the Task Force and that the Task Force had not encouraged 'local initiatives' for long term change.

According to the CSC response, the CDC, as a federal education agency, concerned with national school curriculum issues, identified three alternative factors as important in changing the status of the arts in schools. These factors focused on objectives that reflected the constraints facing the arts in the curriculum, that is, reallocation of resources to the arts, revaluing the arts as a curriculum priority and providing adequate professional development for teachers of the arts, particularly in primary schools.

The CSC and CDC proposed a number of alternatives to the recommendations proposed by the Task Force report. The organisations openly admitted that even though these were in 'sympathy' with the Task Force objectives they were 'different'. (C85:9)

The CSC and CDC's response to the recommendations by the Task Force for the allocation of funds to establish a specific purpose program ($6.1million per annum for the triennium 1986-88, i.e. $18.3m total) stated that

It would seem that in the short term, allocation of resources, (or reallocation of resources from within), through a federal specific purpose program is unlikely. (A Plan for 1986-88, p12). Nor are the state education authorities likely to initiate action independently. The chances for immediate or long term change at this level are remote. (C85:9)
It is important to note in 1984, that during the formulation phase of the policy, the CSC had allocated $208 000 to arts education as a component of the Projects of National Significance Program, which amounted to approximately 12% of the total allocated. Figure 6.1 provides the Notional Allocations for the Projects of National Significance for 1984.

**Figure 6.1 Notional Allocations for the Projects of National Significance Program (1984)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Areas, including Development of Commonwealth Programs:</th>
<th>Notional Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Education</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice and Diversity in Government Schools</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Education</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Girls</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented Children</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Community</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Evaluation</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Projects of National Significance</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Commission Programs</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1 727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(P84:2)

After requests made to government, non-government education authorities and interested community groups inviting them to apply for grants from the Projects of National Significance program for arts education, ultimately, these funds were distributed to 11 projects. Records concerning the source of allocation of eight of the projects could not be obtained by the researcher.
The three projects that were documented were first, $50,000 set aside for a joint Australia Council/Schools Commission project to produce a film about exemplary arts projects in schools. This project was based on recommendation 30 of the interim Education and the Arts report. The Curriculum Development Centre funded two projects in 1984, also based on recommendations of the interim report. The first of these was a dance/movement project based in three inner-city Melbourne primary schools, with a budget of $25,000 (located at the Victorian College of the Arts). The second was a design/streetscape project: the Streetscape Project, with a budget of $30,000, located at Randwick Girls' and Leichhardt High Schools (NSW). (C85:9) It appears that the remainder of PNS funds was used for a range of small 'one-off' funded projects. A total of $105,000 was allocated for these projects.

On 14 August 1984, three months prior to the release of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Senator the Hon Susan Ryan, announced the Guidelines for the Commonwealth Schools Commission for 1985-88. (P84:2) The guidelines set out the levels of funding which the government made available to the Schools Commission for its programs. It also contained announcements of new Commonwealth policy initiatives in education. There was no mention of the possibility of a new major Specific Purpose Program for arts education. The Government provided an estimated $1,389m in 1985 for expenditure on Schools Commission programs, which was an increase of $36m or 2.6%, in real terms. In its Guidelines the Government indicated that $1.737m would be available for Projects of National Significance in 1985, the same amount, in real terms as for 1984. Figure 6.2 sets out the recommended
allocations for the components of the program and the elements within them.

**Figure 6.2 Projects of National Significance Program: Proposed Allocation (1985)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Allocation $'(000</th>
<th>$'(000</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Areas, including Development of Commonwealth Programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Education</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Education</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Girls</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented Children</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Community</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Evaluation</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities Research and Development</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Technological Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Commission Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Projects of National Significance</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1985, Education and the Arts was allocated to the Projects of National Significance Program (PNS) again. The Schools Commission proposed for 1985 that the allocation for the PNS Program be increased to $1.765m, with the allocation for Education and the Arts being $0.210m. (P84:4) The total allocation for 1985 amounted to only a $38 000 increase for the Projects of National Significance program and a $2 000 increase for Arts Education. This is highly significant as the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy was planned for implementation during this year and the increase in funds was small indeed.

Early in 1985, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Senator Susan Ryan, on advice from her senior bureaucrats,
initiated the process for the development of the Specific Purpose Program for education and the arts, as outlined in the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

As was the practice, by early February Ministers of Government would make first round budget bids; that is, new proposals were put forward, as well increments on existing programs.

At the time of the proposal for the Specific Purpose Program, the Hawke Labor government, which was in power at the time, had adopted a policy of 'a deficit reduction strategy' and was aiming at a 'zero budget'. Commonwealth Ministers were informed that any new programs were to be funded by cutting back existing programs. In real terms, this meant the only way the proposal to establish an Education and the Arts Specific Purpose Program was to remove an existing program, such as the Disadvantaged Schools Program or the Country Area Program. It was at this level, that the proposal to establish the Specific Purpose Program, which was fought 'strongly' for by the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, was rejected by the Expenditure Review Committee. In interview, the former Minister for Education and Youth Affairs stated that the role of the Committee was in reality, to 'beat the Ministers down... to wind their submissions back'.

According to the former Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, a number of factors were against the proposal. First, the constraints of the economic strategy which had been adopted by the Hawke government; second, the difficulty in cutting back 'high profile politically important' programs such as DSP or CAP; and finally, a 'very hostile attitude' in
Cabinet against the Commonwealth Schools Commission programs. These programs were perceived as being set up in the seventies, 'generously' and 'extravagantly' by the Labor Whitlam government when 'money was no object', where funds were being provided to the States with the Commonwealth receiving no 'kudos'. Many Commonwealth organisations perceived the Commonwealth Schools Commission as a 'friend of the States... not a friend of the Commonwealth'. According to the former Minister of Education in 1985, the Department of Finance had adopted an 'economic rationalist' view and was hostile towards programs, where funds were passed directly to state education departments. (Interview One)

With the rejection of the inclusion of the Specific Purpose Program, the only funding now available to the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was through the Projects of National Significance program, which was not tied specifically to any one program. The rejection from the major funding structure was an important factor in determining the final outcome of the implementation of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy.

In the response to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, the CSC reinforced their reservations about resources and claimed that funding for the major Specific Purpose Program was unlikely. Therefore, the CSC highlighted an alternative strategy for funding. This strategy was closely linked to the objectives of the CDC, which outlined the 'crucial importance of bureaucratic and political structures of authority and influence'. (C85:9) It stated that the Task Force must give attention to defining mechanisms to percolate education and the arts issues through education management; that is, the
implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy must follow closely the CDC structure of influencing state education authorities by providing resources as well as through teacher professional development programs.

The CDC supported the establishment of a federal inter-departmental group to discuss 'appropriate and complementary policy to coordinate the few resources available'. This group, according to the CDC, could provide opportunities for information exchange and act as a consultative mechanism. (C85:9)

According to the CSC the 'arts team' with representatives from Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Curriculum Development Centre, Commonwealth Schools Commission, Arts, Heritage & Environment, Department of Education and federal statutory authorities, involved in the arts and in education, would work as a team on policy and action. Importantly, it could 'move in its influence to ministers and down sideways to management' (C85:9). It is interesting to note that on close examination of this proposal, the arts team would consist of representatives of organisations from both the 'education' and the 'arts' sector, the same organisations represented on the initial Task Force for *Education and the Arts* without the non-portfolio members.

The CSC reinforced it own mandate by suggesting that the interdepartmental group could take as its agenda:

1. the need for a national research project into the arts in schools. (The CSC felt that a definition for the Arts was obscure and this was masking what was happening or what could be happening.)
2. the need to identify national goals for the arts in education leading to the bicentenary.
3. the need to follow up training in the arts in secondary and tertiary education for policy and program development in each agency. (C85:9)

The CSC's response in regard to advocacy of the arts, was that

the bureaucratic and hierarchical nature of Australian schooling is reflected in the dominance of the competitive academic curriculum where the arts are relegated to the practical and personal rather than the intellectual and theoretical (C85:9)

The CSC was signalling a new issue, namely the hierarchical nature of subject disciplines within Australian education. It is important to recall that the CSC was actively promoting the notion of the 'common curriculum' at this time. It could be concluded, that support for arts education could be used by the CSC as a vehicle to reinforce this notion.

They contended that the national educational concerns at the time, were with participation and equity in Australian schooling, which was 'stimulating a re-examination of the values' that underlay the Australian curriculum. This debate, they argued was focusing around a common curriculum. That is, examining complex issues such as choice, equity, credentialing, negotiation, nature of knowledge and learning, school and work, and the problems of change.

Both the Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre admitted that they were leaders in the 'common curriculum' debate and that they were working hard to open the debate further. It stated that within the terms of its act and the priorities established by
the Council of the Curriculum Development Centre, significant emphasis had been given to supporting programs that promote national curriculum objectives. Education and the arts had been identified by the CSC as a priority curriculum area. (C85:9)

Therefore, the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre were willing to support education and the arts, as it had been identified as one of the priority curriculum areas along side others, but only under its own operational guidelines.

The CDC’s operational guidelines placed a strong emphasis on the necessity for professional development of teachers for the success of its programs. The organisations argued that curriculum development and teacher development were inseparable and it was necessary to link the two for effective outcomes. Therefore, the CDC would only support education and the arts projects which focused on the problems of the arts in education in broad educational terms that included a strong element of professional development.

The response from the CSC concerning funding for Education and the Arts was conflicting and confusing. On page five of the response (C85:9), the CSC confirms that 'allocation of resources through a federal specific purpose program is unlikely', two paragraphs further, it stated that the 'Schools Commission and the CDC support the provision of extra funds to establish a Specific Purpose Program'. It was contended that if extra funding was supported, the depth and range of arts education projects would not only 'significantly quicken the rate of change' but would begin to 'redress the imbalance against the arts'. (C85:9)
Mid 1985, the Council of the Curriculum Development Centre, established an 'Education and the Arts Advisory Committee' to advise the Council on the use of available funds, develop a policy for education and the arts based on the *Education and the Arts, 1985* report and organise a two day workshop/conference on curriculum issues arising from the report.

In the financial year 1985/86, a total of $1.993m was disbursed from the Projects of National Significance Program, as recommended by the Commonwealth Schools Commission. Of the one hundred and twenty four grants, from the nine Specific and two General elements, three grants were allocated to Education and the Arts as proposed by the Education and the Arts Advisory Committee. Figure 6.3 outlines these projects.

**Figure 6.3 Commonwealth Schools Commission Projects of National Significance Program Projects Funded by Element (1985)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Educ.</th>
<th>Arts in Australian Schools</th>
<th>$168,000</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Education</td>
<td>Education and the Arts</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office ACT</td>
<td>National Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Education</td>
<td>Education and the Arts</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office ACT</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$223,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, in 1985, $223 000 was allocated through the Projects of National Significance program for education and the arts. This is 11.5% of the total PNS allocation. $168 000 was allocated to the Queensland Department of Education for the Arts in Australian Schools Project, later known as the National Arts in Australian Schools project.
NAAS). The National Seminar Advocating the Arts and the NAAS project will be discussed in the next Chapter.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**

While the work of Goggin et al (1990) relies on the significance of policy implementation at two levels of government, generally federal to state, it was important in this enquiry to examine the inter-organisational behaviour within a particular level, that is, the behaviour between one federal organisation or department to another federal organisation or department. More specifically, one federal organisation (the Commonwealth Schools Commission) as a subsidiary of a larger Commonwealth organisation the Department of Education. This behaviour is significant and worthy of examination for determining possible factors or variables identified by Winter (1990), Goggin et al (1990) and other policy studies could be applied at this level, which could influence implementation.

The related questions developed for this enquiry, which are derived from the 'organisational and inter-organisational behaviour' described by Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990), which were applied at the State/Territory level, were also applied to this phase of the policy process.

*Conflicting interests/incentives:*

- Did the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy have conflicting interests or incentives to the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

In this enquiry, the federal organisation responsible for the implementation of the majority of the *Education and the Arts, 1985*
policy recommendations, was the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC), which included the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC). Through document analysis (the response by the CSC to the Commonwealth Department of Education C85:9) and interview, it was confirmed that the CSC had conflicting interests to the Task Force.

The CSC was critical of the Task Force report and changed the emphasis of the report to align more closely to its own objectives; that is, the initial Task Force brief was to include young people within and outside the formal school system. The recommendations made by the Task Force included unemployed youth. It is important to note that the CSC was a Commonwealth education agency concerned with school curriculum areas. As this federal organisation was given responsibility for the implementation and the funding of the process, it is not surprising that the CSC modified the objectives of the policy to align more closely to its own.

The modified CSC objectives focused more on constraints facing the arts in the curriculum, reallocation of resources to the arts and revaluing the arts as a curriculum priority. Objectives such as the re-examination of the Australian curriculum, choice, equity, credentialling were raised. The issue of professional development of teachers was proposed as a major contribution the CSC and CDC could make to the implementation process, in that there was no mention of teacher professional development in the Task Force recommendations.

More importantly, the CDC proposed the establishment of a Commonwealth arts team which consisted of the same representatives of the federal organisations which had composed the Task Force,
without the non-portfolio members. It was intended this arts team would discuss appropriate and complementary policy (to the CSC's objectives) and co-ordinate the few resources available.

The CSC signalled the proposed recommendation by the Task Force of the establishment of the Specific Purpose program for Education and the Arts, within the CSC, was unlikely. This action had grave ramifications for the implementation of the policy. The Task Force had recommended approximately $6 million per annum for three years. The success of many of the recommendations relied heavily on this amount of funding. In reality, by the end of 1985, the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy had only received $450 000.

**Goal priority:**
• Did the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy give priority to goals which competed with the policy?

The Australia Council, the National Aboriginal Education Committee and the Australian Film Commission were federal arts organisations that replied to the invitation to respond to the Task Force recommendations. These organisations were supportive of the Task Force objectives but each alluded to implementation difficulties for some of the recommendations for which they were responsible. Nevertheless claimed that their organisational objectives, goals or priorities differed from that of the Task Force policy.

The Australian Council stated that it was not responsible for carrying out arts education, nor did it have the funds to do so. The Australian Film Commission, saw its goals as training creative people to work in
production and its budget did not allow for work on Australian school curriculums.

The National Aboriginal Education Committee supported the implementation of the recommendations but argued for 10% of resources used in the implementation of the Task Force recommendations to be allocated to projects in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts education.

It appears that the goals of the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC) and the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC), the federal organisations responsible for the implementation of the majority of the recommendations, also competed with the policy goals.

At the time of the implementation, the CSC and CDC goals focused on the school curriculum or the emergence of a 'common curriculum'. The organisation's response to the recommendations was that it was willing to act on the recommendations which promoted national curriculum objectives. These organisational goals competed with the Task Force goals. The result of this competition was that the CSC and CDC realigned or modified the policy goals to fit their own.

**Co-ordination:**

- Were there any problems with co-ordination between the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy and the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

It appears that there were no problems with the co-ordination of the policy between the two federal organisations. It was the practice within the Commonwealth Department of Education, for the Secretary of the
department to give the Commonwealth Schools Commission responsibility for the implementation of educational policy. The Commonwealth Department of Education passed the implementation over to the Commonwealth Schools Commission.

**Delays:**
- Were there any delays by the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy with the implementation of the policy recommendations?

There were no delays in either accepting the role as implementors by the Commonwealth Schools Commission or in formulating a plan for the implementation process. It could be concluded that the CSC and the CDC moved quite quickly within the implementation phase. The final Task Force report was submitted to the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in December 1984, the Commonwealth Schools Commission responded to the report in early April and the national seminar on Advocacy in the Arts arranged by the CSC, was held in August 1985.

**Inducements:**
- Were any inducements provided by Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy to the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy?

**Constraints:**
- Were any constraints placed on the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy by the Commonwealth organisations responsible for the formulation of the policy?

There were no inducements or constraints placed on the Commonwealth Schools Commission or the Curriculum
Development Centre by the Commonwealth Department of Education, in terms of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The CSC and CDC were able to modify the policy to align more closely with their own objectives and make major funding decisions concerning the implementation of the policy.

As the Commonwealth Schools Commission is located within the Commonwealth education portfolio, the Commonwealth Department of Education and the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs was continually updated concerning the developments of the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, at times directly to the Minister, and at other times to the Secretary of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

**Capacity and propensity to act:**

- Was there variation in the Commonwealth/federal organisations responsible for implementing the recommendations of the policy capacity and propensity to act on the policy recommendations?

On examination of the responses by the Commonwealth/federal organisations, (the Australian Film Commission and the National Aboriginal Education Committee), responsible for the implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy recommendations, there appears to be variation by the organisations in their capacity or propensity to act.

The Australian Film Commission was supportive of all the recommendations but advised that with its limited resources implementation would be difficult. The National Aboriginal Education Committee was supportive of the recommendations but stated that it
would be willing to act if the goals and funding aligned more closely to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people it was representing. The Australia Council was supportive of the recommendations but at this stage not willing to act upon them.

The Commonwealth Schools Commission had the capacity and propensity to act upon the recommendations, as it was given responsibility for implementing the majority of the recommendations and the overall implementation process by the Commonwealth Department of Education. It could be concluded the CSC accepted this responsibility on the condition that the policy would be modified to suit it own objectives or goals.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it has been necessary in this enquiry to examine not only the inter-organisational behaviour from the federal level to the state but the behaviour from organisations within the federal level. Goggin et al, (1990) state that

State-level implementors form the nexus for the communications channels. These implementors are the targets of implementation-related messages transmitted from both federal- and local-level senders. The potential for distortion exists.

From this enquiry it is evident that the role of the federal organisations, as messages are transmitted to other federal organisations, is also worthy of examination. At this phase, the policy recommendations and goals were modified by the Commonwealth/federal organisations which contributed to the implementation's variability.
Another factor, which cannot be overlooked at this phase of the policy process, is the role of funding. It is evident that the decision not to establish a specific purpose program within the Commonwealth Schools Commission for education and the arts but to continue funding through the Projects of National Significance, provided the framework for how the policy process was to proceed and made a major contribution to the failure of the policy achieving its desired outcomes. This factor and its implications to the policy process will be re-addressed in the final chapter.

In keeping with policy studies literature, this enquiry supports the notion that inter-governmental policy implementation is an exceedingly complex process that takes place in a complex environment. The next two chapters describe and examine the process as it unfolds, concentrating more on the outcomes and outputs as a result of the implementation decisions.
CHAPTER SEVEN

OUTCOMES/OUTPUTS AS A RESULT OF THE POLICY PROCESS:
ADVOCATING THE ARTS NATIONAL SEMINAR,
THE NATIONAL ARTS IN AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS PROJECT
AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CULTURAL AND EDUCATION MINISTERS

OVERVIEW

After receiving responses from a large number of inter-governmental organisations, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs passed the implementation of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy to the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC).

The failure to secure funding as a Specific Purpose Program, by the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, resulted in funding the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy through the Projects of National Significance program, at a much reduced level of funding.

The Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC), at its 109th meeting (September 23, 1985), agreed that the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC), a division within the CSC, would have responsibility for administering and implementing the Education and the Arts element. (S85:2)
This chapter outlines the next phase of the policy process, whereby possible outcomes and outputs of the implementation process are identified. Three major outcomes, as a result of direct and indirect recommendations made by the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy are evident. They are the Advocating the Arts national seminar, the National Arts in Australian Schools Project (NAAS) and the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers (JCCEM).

It is important to note that there were thirty four recommendations made by the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. Recommendation 1(a) related to the establishment of a joint standing committee which was subsequently acted upon, resulting in the establishment of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. Recommendation 1(g) related to the establishment of a full-time education and the arts advisor within the department of Education and Youth Affairs. This recommendation was directly acted upon and this position was established. Of the other thirty three recommendations, the governmental and inter-governmental organisations responsible for implementation responded to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs but it appears there was no direct action to implement the recommendations. Three major projects unfolded as a result of Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, namely, the JCCEM (which was a direct recommendation by the Task Force), the Advocating the Arts Seminar (which was a decision by the CDC) and the National Arts in Australian Schools project (which was an outcome of the Advocating the Arts national seminar).

Due to the complex and dynamic nature of the implementation process these three projects unfolded at many organisational levels.
(federal/state, state/state), between 1985 and 1987. Due to the complexity, it is not possible to present details of the three major outcomes in a neat, chronological order. Therefore, for reasons of coherence the National Seminar will be addressed first, followed by the NAAS project and the JCCEM. After each of the outcomes have been detailed, research and related questions will be applied, research findings presented and conclusions drawn.

The three initiatives were significant to this enquiry, as they informed and directed future policy decisions for arts education in Australia. The Advocating the Arts national seminar was developed as a result of the CSC and CDC response to the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The National Arts in Australian Schools project (NAAS) was established as a direct outcome of this national seminar. The Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was a direct result of one of the recommendations made by the Task Force on *Education and the Arts*.

**MAJOR OUTCOME ONE: ADVOCATING THE ARTS - A NATIONAL SEMINAR**

On accepting responsibility for the implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, the Council of the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) decided at its 41st meeting to establish a National Advisory Committee on the Arts (later known as the National Arts Advisory Committee). The committee consisted of the Chairman, Peter Gebhardt, an immediate past principal of Geelong College and former member of the CDC Council; the Executive Officer, Libby Smith, a Senior Curriculum Officer of the Curriculum Development Centre; Dahle Suggett, Assistant Director of the Curriculum Development Centre; Deanna Hoermann, Principal Education Officer with the NSW
Department of Education; Lionel Lawrence, Director of the Victoria College of the Arts and former Director of the Western Australia Academy of Performing Arts; and Andrea Hull of the Australia Council.

The National Arts Advisory Committee had a number of functions. Firstly, to provide advice to the CDC and to develop guidelines for the funding of arts projects. Secondly, to advise the CDC on how to implement the recommendations contained in the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. And thirdly, to develop a national perspective which would be accompanied by 'a national will to speak out on behalf of the arts in schools'. (C86:41) The National Arts Advisory Committee was seen as having an 'evangelistic role' to pressure legislators, community leaders, educational authorities and parents. (C86:41)

The National Arts Advisory Committee recommended holding the national seminar during August 1985, using funds from the Project of National Significance Program (PNS). The Curriculum Development Centre Council agreed to this recommendation at its 43rd meeting and recommended that $35,000 be allocated from PNS funds for the two and a half day residential seminar. (S85:2)

This was the first national seminar on Education and the Arts, sponsored by the Curriculum Development Centre. It took place in Canberra at the Australian National University from August 19 to 22, 1985.

Although the seminar was developed as an indirect response to the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, it was not a direct
recommendation by the Task Force. A booklet, titled *Advocating the Arts, Papers from the National Seminar on Education and the Arts, August 1985*, outlining the seminar proceedings and papers presented, was produced at the conclusion of the seminar. According to *Advocating the Arts* (1986:3), the seminar

was a public affirmation by the Curriculum Development Centre regarding the centrality of the arts in the educational process.

Participants at the national seminar included representatives from all art forms, such as senior education officers from government and non-government education systems, parent and teacher organisations, arts groups, professional artists and the media. The participants were told by the Chairman, Peter Gebhardt, that they represented a wide range of interests and that the seminar would not be an occasion where one could pursue special self interests. Essentially, the CDC was seeking the participants' guidance in the 'development of a coherent and exciting national policy' which would enable projects to proceed which had 'national implications and impact'. The Chairman reminded the participants that

National directions are legitimate outcomes of national aspirations which we must espouse and encourage in the interests of ensuring all children are reached, none left untouched by cohesive and balanced curriculum. We want to give affirmative, palpable and celebratory leadership. We cannot do that if those interested in our directions are greedy for knives and money. Our futures are underpinned by a proposed belief in the work of the arts and pettiness is only a raised drawbridge designed to make us drown. Drown we will not. (Gebhardt, 1986:pp 3-7)
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Susan Ryan presented an opening address. Her address outlined three themes of the seminar: arts in daily life, arts in schools and arts in training and development. She highlighted the importance of 'partnership'. Partnership between the arts communities and education authorities and partnership between funding bodies - the Commonwealth and the States and Territories. (Ryan, 1986:pp9-11)

According to the Minister,

One clear subject the Seminar will consider is how best to use the available resources in education and the arts. To this end the presence here of representatives from the Australia Council, subject associations, parent groups, State Education Departments and the media, can give us confidence that co-operative efforts will be made to get the maximum use of resources. (Ryan, 1986:11)

This seminar was intended to adopt an advocating role for the arts and attempt to bring together the separate art forms as a united body. The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs highlighted the need for 'partnership'. In particular, partnership between the funding bodies - 'the Commonwealth and the States and Territories all playing their part'.

It appears that the seminar was not successful in achieving the outcome of partnership. The Chairman talked of surrendering 'petty interests, jealousies and protectorates for the sake of the common good'. (Gebhardt, 1986:8) From data gathered through interview, it was confirmed that this seminar resulted in conflict and fragmentation, between the art forms it was attempting to unite. (Interviews Two, Four and Twelve) In fact, one senior bureaucrat interviewed believed
that an outcome of the national seminar was 'greater fragmentation' between the artforms. This fragmentation was based on the notion that many of the professional associations represented at the seminar saw themselves as being disadvantaged and often launched 'vitriolic attacks' on the seminar process.

It is interesting to note, that the Acting Director of the CDC, Kerry Kennedy and the Executive Officer, Libby Smith drew to the attention of the seminar participants a number of issues on policy development that are significant to this enquiry. In a paper presented at the seminar, titled 'From Discord to Concord: Creating a CDC Policy for Education and the Arts', Kennedy and Smith stated

The development of policy objectives for Commonwealth educational agencies is a delicate and sensitive process. Constitutionally, education is the preserve of the States although the previous two decades have witnessed increasing Commonwealth involvement. Very often, when tension arises between the Commonwealth and the States over education, it is a reflection of the recency of Commonwealth involvement in the area and the lack of agreed guidelines about such involvement. (Kennedy and Smith, 1986:23)

Kennedy and Smith raise the issue of the role of local actors deliberately thwarting federal policy intentions. According to Kennedy and Smith

Local actors of necessity are responsible to their immediate organisational environment and will always try to enmesh external initiatives with local ones so that local priorities are not threatened. Local actors, after all, are responsible and accountable to local authorities and it is understandable that they should give priorities to local issues. (Kennedy and Smith, 1986:23)
Kennedy and Smith propose some solutions to overcome some of these barriers

It remains now, to chart our way out of these troubled waters. We have to accept that in creating an education and the arts policy for the Curriculum Development Centre we must move beyond the sectional interests of specific groups. At the same time we also have to accept that such groups have legitimate claims. Yet to highlight one set of claims above others will result in non-implementable policy for it will not have the support of all client groups. (Kennedy and Smith, 1986:23)

It is important to note that many of the points raised by Kennedy and Smith, although quite valid, could be applied to the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, in relation to the action they took concerning the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy recommendations. In many ways, these organisations were 'responsible to their immediate organisational environment' and 'enmeshed external initiatives' with their own. In a way, they 'thwarted' one set of federal policy intentions and realigned the priorities and goals to another set of priorities and goals to their own. The outcomes of the national seminar reaffirmed the notion that organisations are responsible to their immediate environments and to the group which gives them the mandate to act. It is important to note, that the Curriculum Development Centre had its own mandate to follow which allowed very little movement for the way in which the implementation process was to proceed.

As a result of the seminar a large number of recommendations were proposed by the participants. The National Arts Advisory Committee met on August 22, 1985, at the conclusion of the seminar to consider
these recommendations. In its deliberations the National Arts Advisory Committee considered the national initiative urged by the seminar, the recommendations of the Task Force on *Education and the Arts, 1985* concerning national leadership and co-operation among federal arts and education agencies, and the role of the CDC in relation to the common curriculum debate about appropriate curriculum for Australian schools.

The committee made eight recommendations to the Curriculum Development Council to:

- establish a national education and the arts initiative in co-operation with the states which would address issues raised at the seminar, in the seminar papers and the Task Force report;
- undertake action-research and research projects about arts in schools;
- strengthen co-operative relationships with the Australia Council in relation to their contribution to the arts in schools;
- strengthen the work of arts subject associations;
- support a national enquiry into arts studies in teacher education;
- investigate and support different ways of improving primary arts and early childhood arts education, with an emphasis on retraining teachers;
- establish an information base/network on arts education across all education systems;
- explore the possibility of vocationally oriented senior secondary courses based on the arts. (S85:2)

It is interesting to note that none of the recommendations made by the National Arts Advisory Committee related directly to the recommendations made by the Task Force on *Education and the Arts, 1985*. 
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The Education and the Arts Advisory Committee also advised the Curriculum Development Council on the disbursement of the remaining funds of $168,000 in the Education and the Arts element of the Projects of National Significance. The Committee considered the national initiatives urged by the seminar and a number of projects but decided that these did not qualify as nationally significant. The Committee felt it was inappropriate to support the "scatter-gun" approach of the past. (S85:2)

The Committee therefore, recommended to Council a major two year national arts in education program titled *Australian Arts in Education Program*\(^1\). This was not one of the recommendations made by the Task Force of *Education and the Arts, 1985* in the policy. According to the National Arts Advisory Committee the purpose of the program would be to identify significant issues in education and the arts across all education systems, provide support to systems where there were shared concerns and highlight the future needs of education and the arts.

At this stage it is important to note that many of the recommendations made by both the seminar and the arts advisory committee deviated from the original objectives of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The new recommendations included emphasis of early childhood and secondary schools, as well as strengthening the arts subject associations and the undertaking of action research. In many ways the national seminar participants and the Committee were 'reinventing' new recommendations and had adopted the role of a 'new' Task Force. This notion and its implications will be explored further in the research

\(^1\)Later known as the National Arts in Australian Schools Project -(NAAS)
findings at the conclusion of this chapter. An outline in detail of the establishment of the NAAS project follows.

**MAJOR OUTCOME TWO: THE NATIONAL ARTS IN AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS PROJECT (NAAS)**

The National Arts Advisory Committee believed that the project proposed should act on those recommendations, (the eight proposed as a result of the Advocating the Arts seminar), that were consistent with the Curriculum Development Centre's national curriculum concerns and hosting model of operation.

The project would be managed by a committee to be nominated by the Curriculum Development Council, advised by a small expert reference group which would include subject associations and implemented by a project team of three, two of whom would be based in a State education department and the third at the Australia Council in Sydney². (S85:2)

According to the CDC Council decision paper, the project team would have three main functions. First, to identify significant issues in education and the arts for early childhood and primary schools, disseminate findings relating to exemplary practice and provide support in areas of mutual concern across education systems. Second, to examine the arts in high school with an emphasis on post-compulsory schooling, disseminate findings relating to exemplary practice and identify future needs across education systems. The project team did not take into account the tertiary sector, as the CDC was responsible for school education only. Third, to identify and disseminate information about exemplary projects funded by the

---

² A fourth project officer, based at the CDC, was proposed later.
Australia Council, liaise with the Boards of the Australia Council concerning their projects in schools, recommend guidelines and evaluation mechanisms for the Boards and the Australia Council in dealing with arts and education projects and recommend co-operative projects that could be undertaken by the Australia Council in association with the CDC and state education authorities.

It was intended three project officers for the NAAS project would work co-operatively and consult regularly on the two year program. According to the CDC Council decision paper, they would

- commission reports, papers and research on pressure points within the designated areas of the program;
- recommend and support development programs in specific areas to nominated groups to be decided through consultation;
- collect and document information about successful arts projects in schools through newsletters;
- provide advice on future expectations to year 2000 about the arts in education, including a statement of minimal experiences to be achieved by the end of primary schooling;
- conduct seminars on appropriate arts in education issues;
- produce and distribute a report of the program.

In keeping with the model adopted by the Curriculum Development Centre at that time, national projects were 'outposted' to state Departments of Education and to be conducted as a State/Commonwealth initiative. The National Arts Advisory Committee, according to the CDC decision paper, suggested that the Queensland Department of Education would be appropriate, given its expertise in early childhood and primary education. (S85:2) According to interview data gathered, an important reason for Queensland's selection was the influence of the Queensland Director-General of
Education\textsuperscript{3}, who was the nominee of the Australian Education Council to the Curriculum Development Council, at the time.

Two project officers were to be located in Queensland in the Division of Curriculum Services. Sukli Finney and Gay Mason were appointed as Education Officers - Special Duties. (S85:5) Because of the involvement and support of the Australia Council to jointly fund a project officer, the committee suggested that at least one project officer be located in the Australia Council. It was recommended that the project was to proceed without the Australia Council if it did not endorse the project. Subsequently, a project officer from the Australia Council, John Deverall (who was seconded for two years from a Melbourne College and relocated in Sydney), was appointed. Later, a fourth project officer, Jo Dougall, was appointed at the CDC to provide administrative support.

According to the Curriculum Development Centre report (C86:40), it was in recognition of the urgency of some of the Task Force recommendations that the following areas were included in the NAAS project: professional development review; feasibility of information network/databank; commissioned papers; Arts and Youth; Australia Council/NAAS Consultancy. It stated that in some respects, the spread of tasks included in the NAAS terms of reference, had given the impression that the project was not conceptually cohesive. The report concluded, that 'the criticism is one that the Advisory Committee preferred to live with rather than ignore the tasks'.

\textsuperscript{3} G. Berkeley
The Management Committee of the NAAS project can be found in Appendix O.

The NAAS Project
From data gathered it appears that through negotiation with the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Queensland Department of Education, it was agreed that the following framework would apply. The project would take a national perspective on three pivotal arts in education areas: early childhood and primary arts education, arts and youth (within the school sector) and the educational impact of the work of federal and state arts agencies or groups. According to the CDC the project aimed to include all State Departments of Education in a collaborative and co-operative way so that the project would be relevant for all systems. (S85:2)

On examination of this framework, it could be concluded that the goals of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy had been modified yet again. There was a conscious shift away from community involvement and catering for the needs of students outside the school system. The project appeared to be focusing much more closely on early childhood, primary and secondary schools and professional development of teachers. It is important to remember that the CDC's main area of responsibility was curriculum in the school sector4.

The priority target audience would be education authorities, in particular policy makers in arts education. The focus of the NAAS project would be on the evaluation of policies and practices in education in the arts, that is, identifying significant policy issues and

---

4 Primary and secondary government and non-government schools.
effective models of practice. Queensland would host the project and liaise with other states and the CDC.

The timeline for the project was two years and the outcomes would be:
- the project would identify, examine, document and disseminate information on effective models of practice in the arts in Australian schools;
- the project would commission a limited number of projects which would investigate arts programs which would have the potential for national implementation in schools
- the project would advocate the case for the arts within the curriculum of Australian schools
- the project would provide guidance and support to educational authorities in the formulation of education policy and development for the arts in Australian schools.

The budget for the NAAS project which was negotiated between the Queensland Department of Education and the Commonwealth Schools Commission was approximately $443 000. The funds were derived from 1985/1986 Projects of National Significance Program funds.

Detailed outline of the funding structures can be found in Appendix P.

The management and organisational structure proposed for the National Arts in Australian Schools Project consisted of four groups.

(a) A Management Committee which had overall responsibility for the project and reported directly to the Curriculum Development Centre Council. It comprised Departmental, Australia Council and CDC representatives and is chaired by the Queensland Director-General of Education. It met approximately two or three times per year.

(b) A Monitoring Committee which had the responsibility for the ongoing management of the project and the monitoring of its progress. It comprised the Assistant Director (Special Subject Services) George Hay (Chairperson and Project Manager); Queensland based project personnel, Sukli Finney and Gay Mason; Principal Education Officer (Curriculum Services Branch), K Fairbairn; Principal Education Officer (Research Services Branch) E Cassin.
(c) A Departmental Committee which consisted of representatives from each Departmental Division and one Region. It met with the view to keeping Divisions and Regions informed.
(d) A Reference Group which was to be called upon as necessary to give advice to the project team concerning specific areas such as the arts in the community, music education, art education, the arts in pre-school, primary, secondary and TAFE sectors. It consisted of personnel with special expertise and experience. (Sn.d.:6)

Detailed outline of the NAAS project management can be found in Appendix O.

Prior to the official launch of the project, during the month of April 1986, the Project Officer Sukli Finney, travelled to each state and capital city throughout Australia, visiting Departments of Education and some representatives of professional arts associations, outlining the project aims and seeking responses. According to the report given by Ms Finney, overall the States were supportive of the project, although a number of concerns were raised. The concerns included the following, that the project was too broad to have effective outcomes, that Youth Arts was not the most useful area for attention, that the criteria being used to identify exemplary practice were not clearly identified and that project participation was an added burden on the State's limited resources. A number of interview informants in this enquiry, expressed the view that many States were not impressed in the manner that this information was collected. Many were critical of the 'whirlwind tour' and resented the Executive Officer's interview approach. (Interview Eight, Ten and Twelve).

The National Arts in Australian Schools project was finally launched in Brisbane with a mini-conference on the 10th and 11th of November 1986.
The final four strands identified for the project to address were: Arts and the Young Child; Arts and Youth; Arts Education Information; Educational Impact of Arts Groups (Australia Council Consultancy) (Sn.d.:6).

The four strands will be outlined briefly, providing a short description of the project, the key players and the final outcomes.

**Strand One of the NAAS Project: The Arts and the Young Child**

Sukli Finney, Senior Education Officer with the Queensland Department of Education was responsible for the first strand of the NAAS project. Ms Finney resigned from the NAAS project (only six months after the launch of the project), without prior notice on 5th May 1987, before completing the brief. No appointment was made to fill Ms Finney's vacancy. The Monitoring Committee of the project requested that outside consultants undertake the research tasks. (S87:9)

The Arts and the Young Child strand comprised two areas, 'Curriculum' and 'Professional Development'. These two areas are outlined.

*Curriculum:*
A major task would be a one-year study of early childhood arts education policies and practices in Australia. This would involve:
- a review of the relevant research literature;
- a survey of existing early childhood arts programs;
- the preparation of monographs, bulletins and stimulus papers;
- the building of an early childhood arts network.
Olive McMahon, Senior Lecturer, Brisbane College of Advanced Education, was commissioned to write a report for the curriculum area of 10-12 000 words. $5 750 was allocated to this consultancy. A further $2 350 was allocated to Dr Susan Wright, Department of Early Childhood Studies, Brisbane College of Advanced Education, to prepare the case study reports. The six case reports described respected and credible arts programs in early childhood education using material received during the course of the NAAS project from ten schools selected from several Australian states. Each report was to be approximately one thousand words with photographs.

The main outcome of this project strand was an eighty page book, published six years later 1991, by the Queensland Department of Education for the Curriculum Corporation. The book was written by Ms McMahon and titled, *The arts and the young child*, it includes six case studies on arts education in primary and special schools. (S87:9)

The second area addressed within the Arts and the Young Child strand was professional development.

*Professional Development:*

A second major task in the area of arts and the young child would involve a review of professional development models and courses in primary arts education in Australia. The information collected would provide a data base for further action in:

- publicising effective professional development models and courses;
- developing a rationale for professional development course design in early childhood arts programs.

Heather Felton, Senior Education Officer, Curriculum Development and Evaluation Section with the Department of Education, Tasmania
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was responsible for the professional development area. The NAAS Project Management Committee Meeting of September 15, 1986, agreed that the Tasmanian Department of Education be commissioned to take responsibility for the tasks involved in implementing the brief. The project agreed to pay the Tasmanian Department of Education $20,000 to implement the brief.

As part of the professional development area, the Department of Education in Tasmania co-ordinated case studies of exemplary practice in South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory and Tasmania. These case studies and the outcomes are briefly outlined.

A video package entitled *The Role of the Artist in Professional Development* was to be developed in South Australia. A video crew was contracted and support print materials were prepared. $4,000 was allocated to this project. According to an interview informant the video was produced but not accepted, it was perceived that it was not satisfactory in quality and that irregularities in the arts practices portrayed were not acceptable.

An evaluator was commissioned in the ACT to evaluate the professional development model in dance/movement education. $3,000 was allocated to this project.

A major study of region-wide professional development program for process approach to arts at primary level in Tasmania was undertaken. $13,000 was allocated to this project. (S86:31)

The Tasmanian study was to extend over a period of thirteen months, October 1986 to October 1987. The outcome of this project was an eighty page book titled *Towards quality learning and teaching* written by Heather Felton, again published six years later (1991) by the Queensland Department of Education for the Curriculum Corporation.
**Strand Two of the NAAS project: The Arts and Youth**

Tony Lenton, Senior Curriculum Officer with the Victorian Education Ministry, was responsible for this project. The Victorian Education Ministry, had through the PEP program, begun work on examining youth arts in relation to the senior school curriculum. Therefore, the Victorian Education Ministry was invited to supervise the Youth Arts component of the NAAS project. (S86:5)

A meeting of the NAAS Advisory Committee was held in February, 1987 where the brief was established:

This project strand was to examine the needs of the post compulsory student population in relation to the arts. In particular, the following areas were to be addressed:

- the role of the artist in post compulsory schooling;
- the linking of the arts with the senior school curriculum
- arts curriculum design in the senior school;
- school links with arts training institutions.

Although the Youth Arts Project was supervised by the Victorian Ministry for Education, it was conducted at the Centre for Program Evaluation, Melbourne College of Advanced Education. A project officer, Simon Pryor, was seconded from the Victorian Ministry of Education and appointed by the Centre for Program Evaluation. The project developed a set of criteria for selecting case studies and examined post-compulsory arts curriculum programs in all States and Territories. The Arts and Youth study team believed that the outcomes should be practical and it should produce a manual rather than a report.
The final report of the Youth Arts project was expected by the end of October, 1987. The budget for the project was $40,000 and transferred from the Queensland Department of Education, which held the NAAS funds, to the Victorian Ministry of Education in January 1987. (S87:19)

The outcome of this project was a book which was published two years later in 1989. Authored by Simon Pryor and Lee Emery.

**Strand Three of the NAAS project: Arts Education Information**

Gay Mason, Senior Education Officer, Queensland Department of Education and NAAS Project Officer, was responsible for this project.

This project strand was to focus on the sharing of information about the arts, through:

- the evaluation of ways in which arts in education information can be made accessible through ACIN or other networks;
- the preparation and wide distribution of short monographs about arts subject areas;
- the commissioning of a paper addressing expectations for education in the arts to the Year 2000;
- the commissioning of a paper related to the arts and innovations in information technology.

A questionnaire was compiled to gather information on advocacy and networking. The questionnaires were sent to individuals and organisations and were included in the NAAS Bulletin No. 2. This information was to be the basis of the establishment of a NAAS Arts Network, a data base and interaction with ACIN.

The ACT Schools Authority submitted a proposal through the Arts Education Information strand for the production of an advocacy video and was successful. The proposal was that the video would present the case for the arts as essential and basic learning for all children. It would
be twenty minutes in length and would have as its target audience educational administrators and school communities. The video would be made by Film Australia under a special agreement the Authority had with them. A total of $3000 was approved and allocated to the video project. It appears that the video was completed but distribution is unknown.

Dr John McLeod, Melbourne College of Advanced Education was commissioned to write a major paper for the Arts education Information strand. It was intended to discuss issues which faced the arts towards the Year 2000. The forty page book was published by the Queensland Department of Education for the Curriculum Corporation in 1991, again six years after the project began.

Les Whelan, Acting Senior Education Officer, Queensland Department of Education was commissioned to co-ordinate the writing of a paper relating to the arts and innovations in information technology. The paper consisted of a number of contributions by subject associations.

The National Arts in Australian Schools Project Management Committee approved a budget of $3000 which was paid to seven national arts subject associations or individuals for the purpose of carrying out project tasks in connection with the compilation of the arts and technology paper. Amounts of $200 were forwarded to associations: Australian Association for Dance Education (AADE), Australian Institute of Art Education (AIAE), Council of Australian Media Organisations (CAMEO), National Association for Drama in Education (NADIE), Design Education Council of Australia (DECA);
The Australian Society for Music Education (ASME), and the Australian Society for the Teaching of English (AATE). (S87:4) (S87:11)

The National Arts in Australian Schools Project Management Committee also approved a budget of $2000 to be paid to the same seven national arts subject associations for the purpose of carrying out project tasks. Each association was asked to develop a brochure which would be an abbreviated version of the position paper.

After Sukli Finney resigned from her position as Senior Education Officer with the Queensland Department of Education and as Project Officer with the NAAS project in May 1987, she was commissioned in June 1987 to co-ordinate the work of the national arts subject associations in preparing the seven position papers and brochures. The National Arts in Australian Schools Monitoring Committee also agreed to appoint Ms Finney to research networking systems which would facilitate the interchange of information about arts personnel and activities and write a report. The consultancy costs totalled $5600. (S87:10)

The outcomes of this project were seven single sheet brochures from each of the associations, published by the NAAS project and distributed in quantities desired by each of the associations. Each association, in turn, passed these on to their members. Also a forty page book titled *The arts and technology*, edited by Les Whelan, was published in 1991 by the Queensland Department of Education for the Curriculum Corporation.
Also within the Arts Education Information strand of the NAAS project was a 'publications program'. The NAAS project team believed that the development of a Publications Program would benefit the project as it would carry forward its aims of advocacy, curriculum debate and information exchange. It was felt that the success of the project would be determined by the strength and impact of the project publications. The publications were intended not only to inform and make the project visible but influence and support the arts education community. There was an emphasis on print media although the project did include the production of a film funded by the CDC and the Australia Council.

The project publications were intended to have a 'distinctive, identifiable project style'. It was intended that Project Liaison Officers in each state and territory would be consulted on suitable distribution systems. Regular dissemination about the project would take the form of newsletters and project bulletins. It was envisaged that five bulletins were to be published from July 1986 to November 1987. In fact, there were only three bulletins published. (S86:21)

Approximately $74 000 was allocated to the publications program to publish and disseminate seven arts subject association position papers, the Early Childhood report, the Primary Professional Development report, the Youth Arts report, the Australia Council Case Studies report, two Education Papers and five Project Bulletins.

By April 1987 the total expenditure for the Arts Education Information strand was $64 645 which left a surplus of $10 000. As only two bulletins had been published and disseminated the Monitoring Committee
suggested that $9000 be allocated to the third bulletin, a further allocation of $1000 to each subject association brochures, a further $1000 towards the ACT Schools Authority video and $10,000 towards a proposed Queensland Department of Education advocacy video. (S86:10)

As stated earlier, the outcomes were three bulletins produced, as well as a number of subject association brochures. According to an interview informant there were constant problems with the data base, such as, organisations changing addresses, overlapping association names. Materials were collected but no system could be organised to enter them onto the data base. The proposed national data base was never successfully developed. The national resource materials collected were placed into the Queensland Department of Education Curriculum library. (Interviews Nine and Ten)

**Joint Consultancy - Curriculum Development Centre and the Australia Council**

A joint consultancy between the Australia Council and the Curriculum Development Centre as part of the NAAS project was arranged in June 1986. It was agreed the appointee would be housed at the Australia Council in Sydney. The responsibilities included examining arts policies and programs of the Australia Council, identifying their educational impact and assessing their educational value; liaising with arts councils, state arts and culture ministries, major arts in education professional bodies to examine their educational impact and suggest future directions; identify key areas for future, joint project development with the NAAS project, particularly in the youth arts
area; undertake a field study with 3-5 distinctive regional areas throughout Australia and provide progress reports and advice to the Management Committee of the NAAS project. (S86:12)

The original budget for the consultancy was $40,000 for 1986 and $40,000 for 1987 with travel allowance being $5,000 and $3,000 respectively. A total of $88,000 was allocated ($40,000 being contributed by the Australia Council and $48,000 by the NAAS project). The result was that these figures were readjusted accordingly: $10,000 over two years for secretarial services to be divided equally, appointment of a consultant at a significantly higher level than originally budgeted. Therefore, the total cost of the consultancy was $124,380 which included wages, relocation expenses, travel. The Australia Council contribution was $45,000 over two years, while the NAAS project contribution was $79,000. This increased cost resulted in the consultancy being 26% of the total budget for the joint consultancy. Originally it was 10%. (S86:10)

Through interviews with key players of the policy process, it appears that the joint consultancy with the Australia Council and the CDC, within the NAAS project, was seen as an important political alliance. In this enquiry it has been difficult to confirm any tangible outcomes. The Australia Council at the time of the NAAS project was going through considerable restructuring, change of General Manager, budgetary cuts, a reduction in the number of Australia Council Boards. These changes inevitably impacted on the NAAS project, for example, the budgetary cuts affected the administrative support given to the NAAS project by the Australia Council. (S8:10)
While the NAAS project was developing at the state and territory level, other significant initiatives were occurring at the Commonwealth level. A minor research review had been commissioned by the Commonwealth Department of Education, using funds from the Project of National Significance Program. Details of the Review of Arts Education in Schools can be found in Appendix Q.

Another major initiative, the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, is examined in detail in this enquiry, as it was a direct outcome of a recommendation by the Task Force on *Education and the Arts*.

**MAJOR OUTCOME THREE - THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CULTURAL AND EDUCATION MINISTERS**

The first recommendation made by the Task Force on *Education and the Arts, 1985* was to establish a joint standing committee to coordinate and monitor the implementation of education and the arts. The establishment and eventual demise of this national Joint Cultural and Education Committee, is particularly significant to this study. As one of the major components in the implementation process of the policy, it provides an example of the behaviour that exists at an intergovernmental level in terms of policy development and implementation. It highlights the importance of the Commonwealth/State relationships in education in Australia, in the implementation process and supports the notion of its importance as a factor or variable which may determine implementation outputs and outcomes.
Establishment of the JCCEM

Following a request from the Conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers with Responsibility for Arts and Cultural Affairs, the Australian Education Council (AEC) in January 1985, endorsed a proposal to establish a Joint Ministerial Committee to co-ordinate and monitor the implementation of policies on education and the arts. The committee was to be known as the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers (JCCEM). (C85:1) The establishment of this Committee was seen as a valuable opportunity for the Commonwealth and the State Ministries to exchange information and to provide mutual support for policies which cut across the concerns of both portfolios.

The Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was to be made up of the Commonwealth Minister responsible for cultural affairs and the Commonwealth Minister responsible for education, together with four Ministers from four different States and Territories, two being responsible for education and two for cultural affairs.

The Committee was to be serviced by an Officers Support Group and the co-ordination of administrative arrangements was to lie with the Joint Executive Officers drawn from the Commonwealth Department of Home Affairs and Environment and the Secretariat of the Australian Education Council.

The terms of reference of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was to

- provide joint State/Territory/Commonwealth leadership and high-level co-ordination in the area of Education and the Arts in
schools, in post-secondary education institutions and in the community;
• consider and advise on policies relating to both Education and Cultural Ministries where co-operation and co-ordination are desirable to achieve objectives of mutual benefit;
• identify priority areas among these policies;
• consider and advise on appropriate action; and
• consider and advise on the development of mechanisms for improved information gathering and sharing in relation to education and the arts, in order to achieve a more efficient use of resources. (C86:32)

Once established the JCCEM would give specific consideration to the recommendations of the report, *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

**First meeting of the JCCEM**

The first meeting of the Joint Committee of Education and Cultural Ministers was held in Canberra on the 26th September, 1986. Participants consisted of Senator Susan Ryan, Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs; Barry Cohen, Commonwealth Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment; Race Mathews, Victorian Minister for the Arts; Bob Pearce, Western Australian Minister for Education; Peter Rae, Tasmanian Minister for Education and the Arts, Mr Winzar of the South Australian Department of the Arts representing Greg Crafter, South Australian Minister for Education. As not all states were required to have representation, according to the terms of reference, there was no representation from New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Northern Territory or Queensland.

Only Ministers and their staff attended. The Secretariats of the Cultural Ministers' Council and the Australian Education Council were not in
attendance. No formal minutes were taken but a report existed which stated that at first meeting of the Joint Committee of Education and Cultural Ministers Senator Ryan chaired the meeting and indicated that she decided to exclude officials from the meeting and cut the agenda substantially "in order to ensure that Ministers could speak directly and frankly to each other"(Cn.d.:1).

At this meeting, Ministers discussed Commonwealth initiatives in the fields of education and the arts. The specific initiatives discussed were the Flying Fruit Circus, youth festivals and a summer school for gifted performing arts students. Senator Ryan stressed that these initiatives had been chosen because of their low cost, their practical benefits and the possibility of co-operative work with the State governments.

Ministers discussed the Commonwealth programs and also examined problems involved in advocacy of the arts and education, in the decline of specialist teaching of the arts and the sorting out of students' aptitude and tests at the primary school level.

Senator Ryan confirmed at this meeting her intention to reserve $100,000 from the Projects of National Significance budget for an education and the arts project in 1987. Ministers concluded that there would be most advantage in an approach focusing on secondary music teaching, based in Western Australia and Victoria. Ministers discussed the model for co-operative state funding used for the Flying Fruit Fly Circus and agreed that there was scope for applying this model on other circumstances for other programs. (Cn.d.:3)
The Commonwealth Department of Education recommended that the Joint Committee may wish to consider establishing a working group of Commonwealth and State Officers to report on recent developments in all States and Territories regarding the Task Force’s recommendations, and advise the Joint Committee on what action it might contemplate to foster further development consistent with the Task Force’s recommendations. The Commonwealth Department of Education was willing to convene the working group. It was proposed that all Ministers who were members of the Joint Committee should, if they wish, nominate officers for the working group. A report to the Joint Committee would be made by the working group by February 1987.

An Officers' Support Group, that is, representatives nominated by the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, (JCCEM) meeting was held in Melbourne in November 1987. At this meeting an agenda was established and a formal meeting of the JCCEM was convened.

Race Mathews, Victorian Minister for the Arts, proposed that Ministers meet again in Victoria in February, to review progress and take further initiatives.

**Second meeting of the JCCEM**

The second meeting of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was held in Melbourne on the 25th March 1988. (C88:2) As this meeting was held two years and six months after the first meeting in September 1986, the Committee had changed from the original
group where only one Minister, Peter Rae, remained. All other members of the Committee were new.

Participants at this meeting included Ian Cathie, Victorian Minister for the Arts (Chair); Gary Punch, Commonwealth Minister for the Arts and Territories; David Buckingham, Deputy Secretary, Department of Employment, Education and Training; Michael Bromilow, Western Australian Principal Private Secretary to the Minister of Education; Barbara Weise, South Australian Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts; Peter Rae, Tasmanian Minister for Education and the Arts. These participants were assisted by a number of senior bureaucrats. An observer was Albert Karo, Papua New Guinean Minister for Culture and Tourism. Secretariat was provided by the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Ministers Council. There was no representation from New South Wales, Australian Capital Territory, Northern Territory, Queensland or Victoria.

As this JCCEM meeting was the first to be formally minuted, Ian Cathie, as Chairman, accepted apologies from the new Commonwealth Minister for Employment, Education and Training, John Dawkins and the Western Australian Minister for Education, Carmen Lawrence. The following information taken from the minutes of the meeting is relevant to this study.

The Committee:

- emphasised the importance of the Joint Committee as a forum for fostering co-operation between the arts and education
- agreed that to improve national co-ordination the composition of the Joint Committee should be broadened to encompass one Arts or Education Minister from each State and Territory and both Commonwealth Ministers
- emphasised that the balance between the State/Territory Education and Arts Ministers should be retained
•agreed that the meetings be held annually unless otherwise decided by the Chairman in consultation with other members (C88:2)

In summary, the JCCEM, at its second meeting discussed the profile of arts in education; the need for advocacy; the need for a register of State resources; noted the work of the National Arts in Australian Schools (NAAS) project and agreed to support it; noted the need for the development of a national arts education policy; the Artists-in-schools program; noted the need for access by students to art events and agreed to the effectiveness of community centres and agreed there was a need for a more co-ordinated State and Commonwealth funding program.

The Joint Committee proposed that the next meeting would be in Perth in March/April 1989, chaired by Dr Carmen Lawrence and serviced by the Secretariat of the Australian Education Council, provided that there was sufficient material of substance to be discussed.

**Third meeting of the JCCEM**

The third meeting of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was held in Melbourne on the October 5th, 1989, eighteen months after the second meeting. The meeting was chaired by Dr Carmen Lawrence, Western Australian Minister for Education and included Evan Walker, Victorian Minister for the Arts; Anne Levy, South Australian Minister for Local Government and the Arts; Peter Patmore, Tasmanian Minister for Education and the Arts; Tom Harris, Northern Territory Minister for Education, the Arts and Cultural Affairs. One observer was Phil Goff, New Zealand Minister of
Education. Secretariat was provided by the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Ministers Council. (C89:1)

The formal minutes taken acknowledged apologies from Paul Clauson, Queensland Attorney General and Minister for Heritage and the Arts; Paul Whalan, Australian Capital Territory, Minister for Education; Clyde Holding, Commonwealth Minister for the Arts and Tourism; John Dawkins, Commonwealth Minister for Employment, Education and Training.

The following matters minuted from the third meeting of the Joint Committee for Cultural and Education Ministers have relevance to this study.

- Ministers endorsed the redrafted National Statement on Education and the Arts noting the changes recommended by various States and Territories and the National Affiliation of Arts Education.
- Dr Daniels on behalf of the Hon Clyde Holding notified the Joint Committee that the Commonwealth Minister for the Arts and Tourism no longer wished to be a member of the Committee.
- Ministers discussed the future of the Joint Committee and made the following points:
  - that annual meetings were required if the Joint Committee was to be effective as an advocacy body and to ensure some continuity of membership;
  - that the value of the Joint Committee would be diminished if both Commonwealth Ministers and a Minister from New South Wales did not attend future meetings;
  - that the current format for Minister's meetings may not be the most appropriate for a body whose primary focus is advocacy and exemplary practice models.
- Ministers agreed to discuss attendance with two Commonwealth Ministers and with the New South Wales Ministers for Arts and Education. Ministers agreed to postpone any amendments to the composition of the Committee or the timing of meetings until an answer had been received from the Commonwealth and New South Wales.
- Ministers agreed that the date and place of the next meeting should be determined when the views of the Commonwealth
Ministers concerning membership of the Committee had been resolved.

- Ministers agreed in principle that the next meeting should be held in conjunction with a Cultural Ministers meeting or an Australian Education Council meeting.

A number of items were discussed and agreed to by the JCCEM at the third meeting. Areas relevant to this enquiry consisted of the Creative Australia Conference, the introduction of pilot projects, namely, Awards for Excellence and State and Territory Pilot Industry Links. Lengthy discussions occurred concerning the National Goals for Design Education, Arts Industry Training Councils, Music Education, Tertiary Arts Education -Incubator Models and training Outcomes, Training Museum Professionals and the establishment of the National Affiliation of Arts Educators\(^5\). (C89:1)

In an extract from the 62nd Australian Education Council meeting (June 1990) minutes it was noted that a verbal report from the Dr Lawrence concerning the meeting of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, that matters arising from the meeting included that the JCCEM would continue to meet at least annually, however, the major work of the Joint Committee will be undertaken by its Officers Support Group; continued Commonwealth participation, both from the arts and education portfolios, is considered highly desirable and inclusion of New South Wales, in either or both portfolios in JCCEM activities is likewise highly desirable.

In the JCCEM report to the 62nd, June 1990, Australian Education Council meeting (C90:2) that

\(^5\) The National Affiliation of Arts Educators consisted of the key national arts associations (AIAE, ASME, CAMEO, NADIE). This affiliation evolved later to the National Affiliation of Arts Educators -NAAE)
1.0 The third meeting of the JCCEM (Melbourne October 1989) requested that the Officers Support Group consider alternative formats for the Joint Committee meetings following the withdrawal of both Commonwealth Ministers. The Hon. J Dawkins MHR suggested in correspondence of 6 September 1989 to the Hon. Dr Carmen Lawrence MLA, then Chair of the JCCEM, that an effective liaison mechanism be put in place to replace the present structure.

At this meeting it was agreed that, upon endorsement, the Officers Support Group meet once a year to prepare an agenda for consideration by the Cultural Ministers Council and the Australian Education Council; the composition of the Officers Support Group reflect the present State and Ministerial representation on the Joint Committee and that one representative from the National Arts Industry Training Council be invited to sit on the Officers Support Group.

The working arrangements for the Officers Support Group have been endorsed by Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, the ACT, Northern Territory and Western Australia. Tasmania did not endorse the meeting of the officers group without a corresponding meeting of the Ministers.

As a result of Tasmania's lack of endorsement, advice was sought from the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Ministers Council, before any further action was taken. The three choices of action proposed for consideration were

1. Re-structure the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers with meetings of Ministers who expressed interest and a desire for the liaison mechanism to continue at a State and Territory level' with an invitation for the incoming Commonwealth Ministers to become members;
2. Re-convene the Officers Support Group with officers from States and Territories that endorsed the arrangements to continue with the action proposed by the OSG or

3. Disband the Joint Committee altogether and hand any further business arising from the previous and third meeting of the Joint Committee to the AEC and CMC.

At the 62nd Meeting of the Australian Education Council it is noted in the Draft Council Resolutions (62 iv) that

Council agreed to the disbandment of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, noting that a similar resolution had been passed at the recent meeting of the Cultural Ministers’ Conference. It was agreed that any future work required in this area would be handled by meetings at officer level. (C90:2)

The Committee was successful for achieving a quota for its first meeting but not for subsequent meetings. An important political event occurred in 1987 which appears to have impacted greatly on the success and continuity of the JCCEM.

The first Hawke Labor government was elected into power at the federal level in March 1983. Senator Susan Ryan, Shadow Minister for the Arts was appointed Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, a portfolio she held for four years. During that period she established the Task Force on *Education and the Arts*. A third federal election in July 1987, saw the Hawke Labor government returned to power, which resulted in Senator Ryan being removed as the Education Minister and replaced by John Dawkins and large scale changes to the public service which included the creation of the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). This was during the crucial implementation period of the *Education and the Arts* policy. Within six months Susan Ryan had resigned from Parliament. According to
Dudley and Vidovich (1995:96) 'with her departure a link with the Whitlam\(^6\) era was gone'.

Since the 1983 election, Dawkins responsibility had been with Youth Affairs, Trade and the Public Service. Within days of the 1987 election, result the Prime Minister announced a major restructuring of the Commonwealth bureaucracy. According to Dudley and Vidovich (1995:pp. 96-97) the 'plethora of government departments was rationalised' into sixteen mega-departments each with at least one senior and junior Minister. Only the senior Minister was to represent the department in Cabinet. The amalgamation of two major portfolios, with the responsibility for education and training and the labour market, became the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) headed by John Dawkins.

With a change of name came a change of focus. Quite different to the previous Minister's priorities, Dawkins considered employment to be the natural focus and priority of education. By October, the Minister, as advised by the Halton Task Force\(^7\), announced new structures. The Commonwealth Schools Commission\(^8\) (CSC) and the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC) were abolished. A National Board of Employment, Education and Training (NBEET) was established. It had four sub-councils: the Schools Council (SC), the Higher Education Council (HEC), the Employment and Skills Formation Council (ESFC) and the Australian Research Council (ARC) to advise the Minister. It is important to note, that the previous

\(^6\) Gough Whitlam was Labor Prime Minister from 1972-1975

\(^7\) The Halton Task Force was established by John Dawkins in mid-87 to consider policy advisory structures within the Department of Employment, Education and Training.

\(^8\) The Curriculum Development Centre was not included in the Halton Task Force restructuring but remained as a branch within the Schools and Curriculum Development Division of DEET.
Commissions, the CSC and CTEC, had been autonomous and independent statutory bodies, with the new restructuring only NBEET would have the statutory power to report publicly. The sub-councils were not to have any statutory powers.

Dudley and Vidovich (1995) contended that the main factor which was relevant to education in the mid to late eighties, was the 'corporate style of administration'. This had been adopted, by the Hawke federal government together with State governments, particularly Labor governments. 'Scientific management' had become the ruling paradigm. Where the Commonwealth Schools Commission was oriented towards educational issues, the new ideology was an 'administration model of managerial efficiency'. Dudley and Vidovich (1995:101) argued that the abolition of the independent and autonomous CSC was because of 'control'. NBEET was potentially a more controllable body. It should be noted that this major restructuring was occurring while the JCCEM was still operating at the national level.

This dramatic change in administration structure and change in administrative paradigm, impacted greatly on continuing existing bureaucracies. For example, the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers had been established through the Australian Education Council with the support of the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Senator Ryan. The Committee was dependent on both the Commonwealth Education and Arts Ministers attending it meetings. John Dawkins became the Minister for Education at the time between the first and second JCCEM meetings. He did not attend the second or final meeting.
Clyde Holding became Commonwealth Minister for the Arts and Tourism between the second and third JCCEM meeting. At the third meeting it was announced that he no longer wished to be a member of the Committee. The writing was on the wall, the decision by the two Commonwealth Ministers not to attend the JCCEM made it impossible for the Committee to continue in its existing form. NSW had also made the decision not to send its Arts and Education Minister which also hindered the Committee's role. It appears that this combined action lead to its disbandment.

A number of possible factors or variables can be identified which impacted upon the success of the implementation process of the outcomes of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The research questions for this enquiry will be addressed to the three major outcomes identified: the national seminar 'Advocating the Arts', the NAAS project and the JCCEM.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**

Research findings for this phase of the enquiry are provided by examining the factors and variables that affected the implementation process, including, the behaviour of the street-level bureaucrats and the target groups.

Research Question Two, which relates to organisational and inter-organisational behaviour is applied to the three major outcomes noted in this chapter (the Advocating the Arts national seminar, the

---

9 NSW had never been a member of the JCCEM
National Arts in Australian Schools project and the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers). The question asked is

**What factors or variables affected the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy in the implementation phase at the organisational or inter-organisational level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?**

As the implementation process was passed to the Curriculum Development Centre, the enquiry will focus on the role of the street-level bureaucrats, as identified by Winter (1990). Research Question Four and related questions are applied and conclusions drawn

**Did street level bureaucrats affect the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?**

Related questions:

**4.1 Coping strategies**
- Did the street-level bureaucrats employ any sub-conscious or conscious coping strategies when implementing the policy recommendations?

**4.2 Objectives**
- Did the street-level bureaucrats vary the main objectives of the policy?

A third socio-political condition identified by Winter (1990), the target group behaviour/changes in socio-economic conditions will be examined. Therefore, Research Question Five and related questions are applied and conclusions drawn

**Did target group behaviour or socio-economic conditions affect the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?**

Related questions:

**5.1 Modification of target group**
• Was the behaviour of the target group modified as a result of the policy implementation?

5.2 Education/social background
• Did the implementation process vary depending on the education and social background of the target group?

5.3 Societal changes
• Were there any unexpected societal changes which affected the implementation process?

To find answers to these questions data was gathered and analysed from written texts and artefacts and through interview technique, with senior bureaucrats, State and Commonwealth education authorities and professional arts association representatives.

The first question applied to this phase of the enquiry is

What factors or variables affected the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy in the implementation phase at the organisational or inter-organisational level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

From the outset of the implementation process, influential participants changed the priority or emphasis of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy. When the policy was passed from the control of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs (DEYA) to the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC), through the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC), the original goals of the policy changed. The emphasis on out of school support for the arts and community involvement became less. The CSC/CDC had to fulfil its own mandate which emphasised school education and curriculum development. The policy of 'outposting' of projects that had been adopted at the time,
meant that it passed the main thrust of the implementation process to the NAAS team in Queensland. Control for implementation now lay in the hands of the Queensland NAAS project team and Management Committee and the emphasis of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was changed. The NAAS project adopted a new focus of arts and the young child, arts and youth, education information about the arts and an examination of the contribution to arts education by arts groups.

It appears that as the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy filtered through the implementation process, the original goals or objectives changed. Each governmental or inter-governmental organisation had to fulfil its own agenda or mandate, regardless of whether this differed or was in conflict with the initial intention of the policy. For example, the Curriculum Development Centre had its own agenda and set of priorities, which influenced the projects it supported; the National Seminar on Education and the Arts had its own agenda and set of priorities, which influenced the remuneration it made; the National Arts in Australia Schools Project had its own agenda and set of priorities, which influenced the way it executed the programs.

In terms of incentives and constraints, the CSC/CDC provided funding through the Projects of National Significance program to the NAAS project and was able to monitor the project by being represented on the Management Committee. The degree to which it could control or its ability to influence the project was minimal.

The success of the implementation process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy relied heavily on the success or failure of the NAAS
project in meeting its objectives. It was confirmed through data gathering, that the overall outcomes of the National Arts in Australian Schools project was minimal. As one senior bureaucrat when interviewed stated, the NAAS project was a 'very unsuccessful initiative, very frustrating... it produced little value'. Many of the original objectives proposed by the project team were either not met or completed well past the proposed completion date, rendering them of little value.

Another recurring factor or variable, in terms of inter-governmental behaviour, was that of conflict; that is, conflict between federal and state organisations and conflict between state organisations. It appears there was resentment by the other States and Territories that Queensland had been awarded the NAAS project. According to a number of key players interviewed, there was a perception by some State and Territory organisations and professional associations, that they considered themselves to be far more developed in terms of arts education than Queensland, therefore more worthy of the project. (Interviews Eight, Ten and Twelve). A Queensland project Officer from the NAAS project agreed, and in fact confirmed, 'this could probably have been the case' and that 'some of the other States could have brought better resources to it'.

Many of the objectives of the NAAS project, according to a project officer, 'could not be fulfilled', it was impossible, because it was 'everything for everyone'. A senior state bureaucrat claimed that within the project there was 'insufficiently focused action'. In terms of co-ordination problems, at the time of the implementation there were
continual changes of personnel, both within the Curriculum Development Centre and the NAAS project.

The main tangible outcomes appear to be the documents published as a result of the NAAS projects. The majority were published between four and six years after the proposed completion date. The delay in publishing of these final documents was due to a number of factors. First, the Queensland Department of Education was undergoing restructuring, with drastic cuts to personnel, secondly the Curriculum Development Centre's funds were being withdrawn and it was 'winding down' and the project officers responsible for the publications had resigned or changed portfolios. According to one senior Queensland bureaucrat interviewed, the booklets were eventually published through the Curriculum Corporation because there was a 'commitment' by the Queensland Department of Education. At the time of publishing after a delay of an average of five years, the status of the booklets was not definable and it appears that dissemination was minimal. (Interview Nine).

According to a project officer interviewed, the NAAS project was also operating at a time in a 'climate of financial tightening, of shrinkage and stringency with an attitude which was not really conducive to putting money and resources into arts education'.

At the same time, the establishment and eventual disbandment of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers (JCCEM) is also highly significant to this study, in relation to further understanding the governmental and inter-governmental behaviour in the implementation process. The success of the implementation of this
initiative relied on support by influential participants, such as the Commonwealth Minister for Education and the Commonwealth Minister for the Arts. In fact, these Ministers were giving priority to goals which conflicted with the policy recommendations. Their 'inaction', that is their decision not to attend the JCCEM, is as important as their action. To understand how this occurred it is necessary to establish the possible factors which lead to the eventual disbandment of the JCCEM.

Through written documentation and interview data, it appears that the JCCEM was successful initially in achieving its objectives but continuing to succeed proved to be more difficult. When the Committee was established it was proposed that it would consist of the two Commonwealth Ministers responsible for Arts and Education and four Ministers from four different States and Territories, two being responsible for education and two for cultural affairs.

The actions by the two Commonwealth Ministers and the NSW Minister in not attending was detrimental to the JCCEM. The non-attendance and eventual disbandment of the JCCEM was proof of the lack of commitment to either the arts education and innovations which had been established by Susan Ryan, by the new Minister for Education. According to interview informants, John Dawkins was perceived as being not committed to arts education and having different priorities from Susan Ryan. John Dawkins was giving priority to goals which conflicted with the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy recommendations.
The Commonwealth Ministers' inaction through their non-attendance at the JCCEM had imposed constraints to the point where the Committee had to fold. What appeared to be a successful co-operative venture between the States and the Commonwealth had been downgraded from a Ministerial representative Committee, through the absence of Commonwealth and State Ministers, to merely a meeting of bureaucrats, an Officers Support Group. This led to its final disbandment.

The new Commonwealth Ministers for Education and the Arts, in 1987 had, different priorities. The successful implementation of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was affected by these priorities. The new Ministers were protecting their departments' policy interests, which in turn impacted on the implementation process of the policy.

Another factor or variable worthy of examination is the role of the street-level bureaucrats. According to Winter (1990:31) the policy making process had been turned on its head, after Lipsky (1980) suggested that street-level bureaucrats could be the real policy makers. Winter (1990) suggests that laws and programs are nothing but statements and have no social existence until they are translated into action and that most programs require street-level bureaucrats to perform the delivery or control functions. Winter (1990:31) defines street-level bureaucrats as public officials who in their work interact directly with members of the target groups and who often enjoy discretionary powers.

It is possible to identify street-level bureaucrats at many levels of the policy process, but in this enquiry the street-level bureaucrats have
been identified as the participants in the Advocating the Arts national seminar and the players involved in the National Arts in Australian Schools project, as these players were the closest to the target group and responsible for the implementation of the policy.

In relation to the behaviour of street-level bureaucrats, this enquiry asked

Did street level bureaucrats affect the policy process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

According to Winter (1990) street-level bureaucrats employ subconscious or conscious coping strategies when implementing policy recommendations. These include strategies such as, limiting information, making clients wait or making access difficult. On examination of the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, this did not appear to be the case. There were delays evident in the process, but these could be attributed to other factors, such as poor management strategies, change of staff and organisational restructuring. These factors tended to be out of the arena of the street-level bureaucrats.

It is important to recall, that the majority of the NAAS strand projects were ‘outposted’ to individuals or organisation at the state/territory level, through submission or negotiation. In a sense, the street-level bureaucrats at this level were never really confronted with the process of implementation. Enthusiasm and commitment for the projects was evident, as would be expected of a group which had applied to undertake the project and who had been provided with resources.
Another factor raised by Winter (1990), is asked as a related question: Did the street-level bureaucrats vary the main objectives of the policy? The answer would appear to be yes. At each stage of the process, the original objectives of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy were modified to better suit the implementing organisation's own agenda and the street-level bureaucrats made their contribution to the modification of the policy.

A third area, target group behaviour and changes in socio-economic conditions, identified by Winter (1990), should also be examined. Did target group behaviour or socio-economic conditions affect the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

According to Winter (1990), implementation is very much affected by the way in which target groups respond to the policy. Target group behaviour constitutes the focus of most policies, as it is the target group behaviour that the particular policy wants to change. In this case, the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy identified the target group as all young people both within and outside the school system. A related question posed for this enquiry examined the modification of the target group behaviour. That is, was the behaviour of the target group modified as a result of the policy implementation?

From the data gathered and analysed, it appears that the policy had minimal success in achieving the outcomes of changing the target group behaviour. For a number of reasons, which will reviewed in detail in the final chapter, the policy did not appear to reach the target group it had identified. It is also difficult to ascertain what the long
term outputs of the policy implementation were, as the target group is so large.

Another related question which was developed for this enquiry from the policy studies literature, examined the education and social background of the target group and its impact on the implementation process. It appears that in this enquiry, this question becomes redundant, as the policy did little to modify or change the behaviour of teachers and children in classrooms.

Winter (1990) describes another factor to which most implementation research has paid little systematic attention, that is, unexpected societal changes and its impact on implementation. From this factor or variable another related question was developed and applied to this enquiry. Were there any unexpected societal changes which affected the implementation process?

Further, the decision to fund the implementation process through the Projects of National Significance program and not as a Specific Purpose Program, as discussed in the last chapter, was a major factor in determining how the implementation process was to succeed. The socio-economic and political conditions prevailing at the time of the implementation process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy were important to the outcomes of the process. The changing economic climate, high unemployment, change of key political personnel and the economic rationalist approach adopted by the Commonwealth government, also impacted at each level of the policy process.
Therefore, an additional question could be posed: were there any other factors or variables which may have contributed to the success or failure of the three major outcomes, the 'Advocating the Arts' national seminar, the NAAS project and the JCCEM, of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy other than those already identified?

From interview data gathered, the bureaucratic nature of the NAAS project was highlighted as a possibility for its lack of successful outcomes. As one State senior bureaucrat put it, in relation to the lack of outcomes of the NAAS project, 'people have too much faith in the influence of society through bureaucratic action'. A non-portfolio member of the Task Force felt that during the policy process there was a 'distance' between a bureaucratic type of organisation and what's going on at the grass-roots level in schools or organisations.

In summary, the research findings from the data gathered signal that the poor achievement of the NAAS objectives were likely to stem from five factors. They were, lack of continuity, leadership problems with the project team, changes in personnel at both the project level and the CDC level, constant restructuring of organisations such as the Queensland Department of Education and the CDC and technological problems with the inadequate data base software. These factors resulted in delays to proposed time-lines or dead-lines.

It appears that although resources in terms of human, financial and time were allocated to the National Arts in Australian Schools project for a number of years, there is little evidence of significant impact at the target group level, that is, students in schools. The NAAS project was the only innovation to receive major funding for the *Education*
and the Arts, 1985 policy. As the former NAAS project officer acknowledged during interviews for this study, 'I think the money could have been better spent by putting it into those grass roots enterprises which were really good.'

A factor which appears to be under estimated in its importance, in the policy studies literature, is the role of the individual in affecting policy. At this phase of the implementation process, as with the formulation phase, Susan Ryan, the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, played a pivotal role in keeping the arts high on the political agenda due to her personal commitment to the project.

Susan Ryan, throughout the formulation and implementation process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was committed to the improvement of arts education in Australia. She was the impetus behind its formulation and she strongly supported its implementation. When she was removed as Minister, so was the continuity for successful implementation.

The establishment of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers is a prime example of the importance of individuals, in this case, of individuals of significance attending meetings.

When John Dawkins, the Minister for Education, Employment and Training became Minister for Education, he brought to the office another agenda, another ideology. A paradigm steeped in scientific management; it was obvious that he wanted reforms and change with an emphasis on employment. Many existing bureaucracies suffered, including the JCCEM. Dawkins' change of priorities were at odds with
the recommendations of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, which ultimately resulted in minimal implementation outputs and outcomes and the final disbandment of this co-operative Commonwealth/State venture.

**CONCLUSION**

The implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy has proven to be a complex and multi-layered process. Three major outcomes have been identified and examined in this chapter, the national seminar titled Advocating the Arts, the National Arts in Australian Schools project and the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers.

The results of this enquiry show that it has been difficult to identify a large number of positive outcomes/outputs as a result of the formulation and implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

This enquiry, has examined in detail the formulation and implementation process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy and a number of research questions addressed. This examination has revealed a number of significant issues, not only for arts education but also for the area of policy studies. The next and final chapter will revisit some of these issues, by examining what this means for advocating arts education, what it means for policy studies (implementation studies, in particular) and will then draw some final conclusions will be drawn.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS

OVERVIEW

The concluding chapter has a number of purposes. It summarises and restates the main questions and findings of the enquiry; it examines the methodological approach used as a result of the enquiry; it provides answers to the final research question relating to policy theory; it discusses the implications of the enquiry for the future of arts education and proposes areas for further research.

RESTATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND FINDINGS

This analysis of the policy process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy has sought to answer six research questions and a number of related questions. The broad research questions were derived from two models which describe the implementation process. These models were developed by Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990).

Research Questions Restated

1. What factors or variables affected the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy at the formulation phase? And to what extent did they affect the degree of success of the implementation?

2. What factors or variables affected the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy at the implementation phase at the State/Territory level?
And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

3. What factors or variables affected the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy at the implementation phase at the Commonwealth/federal level? And to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

4. Did street-level bureaucrats affect the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

5. Did target group behaviour or socio-economic conditions affect the policy process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy? And if yes, to what extent did they affect the success of the implementation?

6. What does the implementation process of the *Education and the Arts (1985)* policy tell us about policy theory?

**METHODOLOGY RESTATED**

The enquiry uses research methods which are located predominantly in the qualitative research paradigm. The enquiry employs multiple methods of data collection, which includes document analysis, elite unstructured interviews and semi-structured interviews.

The data collected provides the researcher a context within which to analyse the policy process. Therefore, the policy process is not removed from its social, historical or political frame of reference. The methodological conception chosen for this enquiry is justified in terms of its ability to confirm and validate findings.
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

According to Winter (1990:21), there are three main kinds of behaviour that can be identified when looking for an evaluation standard: process, output and outcome/impact or changes in society. Most implementation studies compare behaviour with official policy goals, while others use the goals or interests of the various actors in the formulation and implementation process. Alternatively, policy evaluation examines the extent to which implementation contributes to solving the problem in society addressed by the policy. However, Winter (1990) highlights the lack of agreement concerning the proper standard of evaluation when deciding whether the implementation was a success or a failure.

In this enquiry, the behaviour (process) was compared to official recommendations (goals) made by the Task Force, followed by an examination of the outcomes/outputs (outcome of action taken to achieve the goals and their impact on the target group, that is. youth within and outside the education sector).

Overall, it appears that the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was unsuccessful in achieving its desired outcomes. In truth, some successful outcomes occurred, such as the establishment of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, the appointment of a full-time project officer for arts education with the Commonwealth Department of Education and Youth Affairs and the placement of arts education on the educational agenda for a number of years. However, these outcomes and outputs were minimal in their impact on youth. A number of possible reasons for this lack of success can be identified. The complex and dynamic nature of the implementation process can
be tracked and described. On examination of the policy process of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, many layers existed, allowing identification of a number of factors which could have contributed to the lack of success.

**Formulation Process**

Current research interest in the policy process has recognised 'policy design' or formulation as a variable which can affect the implementation outcome.

**Conflict**

This enquiry has reinforced the claims of Winter (1990:24), that it is impossible to ignore the link between the policy formation and implementation phase. Based on Winter's set of hypotheses about the impact of the policy formation process on the implementation outcome, this enquiry has supported his claim that successful implementation is likely to be negatively related to the degree of conflict in the policy formation phase. In this enquiry, the smooth operation of the policy formulation was often marred by the tensions and conflicts that arose during the deliberations of the Task Force members. Some Task Force members followed their own interests and at times agreement about goals and objectives was difficult. It appeared outside non-portfolio members of the Task Force formed coalitions, and were at times, concerned with the level of commitment displayed by the bureaucratic members.

**Self interest**

Another factor identified by Winter (1990:25), which is relevant to this enquiry is that policy proponents may engage in structuring or
obstructing the implementation process because of self interests. During the formulation phase, the Policy Branch of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs proposed an alternate plan of action to the preliminary Task Force report, which was at odds with the philosophy and ideology of the report. This alternate plan of action was closely aligned to the goals of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs which caused disharmony within the Task Force and impacted upon the future direction of the implementation process.

**Causal theory/symbolic reasoning**

Another possible variable which should be considered according to Winter, is that successful implementation is more likely if the policy reflects a valid causal theory. In this enquiry, it was difficult to ascertain whether a causal theory existed. At face value, it can be concluded that the Task Force considered the consequences of the policy decision, although it must be remembered that lack of consensus on theoretical bases between groups in the Task Force was evident. The Task Force identified the possible causes and consequences of the poor state of education and the arts in Australia at the time, so therefore it appears that the Task Force did not develop the policy for purely symbolic reasons. The interview informants, including non-portfolio members and senior government bureaucrats, agreed that the report was developed for genuine reasons with the expectation that it would be instrumental in improving the state of arts in education in Australia. Possibly, this expectation could have had a positive influence on implementation.

**Level of attention/commitment**

Winter (1990:25) argued that successful implementation is positively related to the level of attention afforded by the policy proponents in the
policy formation phase. In the case of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* such level of attention varied greatly over time, especially on the part of its three Chairmen. It could be concluded that due to the lack of full-time commitment and time afforded the Task by the Chairmen, the policy formulation may have suffered. Tension and conflict within the operation of the Task Force could be attributed to this factor. Interview informants claimed that some Task Force members were not fully committed to the process.

**Lack of consensus**
Lack of consensus by the Task Force members existed in the formulation phase of the policy process. Interview informants highlighted the tensions which arose concerning discussions between the portfolio and non-portfolio members of the Task Force in relation to the development of the objectives and structure of the report. There was a perception that some Task Force members were not giving the arts a high enough priority during the deliberations.

**Coalitions**
Strong coalitions formed among the Task Force members. Two 'camps' were formed, the portfolio or bureaucrats and the non-portfolio or arts administrators. During interview it was revealed that each group saw the need to collectively support each other for progress to occur.

**Implementation Process**
On completion of the development of its recommendations the Task Force submitted its report for implementation. Winter (1990) highlights the importance of organisational and inter-organisational behaviour in the implementation process.
*Inter-governmental behaviour*

In this enquiry, this factor refers more closely to the governmental and inter-governmental behaviour, as many of the recommendations made by the Task Force were implemented through either federal government organisations or a state government organisations. According to Goggin et al (1990), implementation outputs and outcomes can be explained by the way governmental or inter-governmental organisations respond to the policy mandates or, as in this enquiry, the policy recommendations.

At the implementation phase of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, the organisation responsible for the formulation of the policy, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, accepted responses from a large number of federal and state/territory organisations. (see Appendices K and J). These responses however, were never acted upon. The original policy recommendations were passed unchanged to another federal organisation, the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC), which directed the implementation process in another direction. Apart from perhaps signalling to the CSC which organisations showed a positive/negative interest, the researcher cannot find any tangible follow-up or outcome to the responses.

As with any implementation process, one policy required the participation of several organisations. The main federal players in the process were the Department of Education and Youth Affairs in the formulation phase and the Commonwealth Schools Commission (CSC) and the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) (which were within the same portfolios) at the implementation phase. The CDC
organised a national seminar, 'Advocating the Arts' and managed the National Arts in Australian Schools (NAAS) project. Funding for the major project, NAAS, was through the Projects of National Significance, from within the Commonwealth Schools Commission. The CSC and the CDC had the mandate to implement the policy.

The inter-relationship of the CSC and CDC in terms of this siting of the program for action, served to strengthen the differences between the combined view of these organisations and the intent of the recommendations of the Task Force. In turn, this reinforced the change of direction in terms of eventual outcomes. The *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy recommended among others, community involvement and strengthening arts education for youth outside the formal education sector, while the CSC and CDC confined the scope of the policy within the sector by advocating early childhood and primary education and teacher professional development.

According to Winter (1990:26), the organisations responsible for the implementation process may be in accord with the objectives or mandate of the policy but often influential participants in the implementation process give priority to goals that conflict with the policy. This was the case in the implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

When the policy was passed from the Department of Education and Youth Affairs to the Curriculum Development Centre for implementation, the policy direction was modified to fit more closely the priorities and mandates of the CDC and the CSC. The national seminar Advocating the Arts, set its own priorities which differed from
the original Task Force recommendations and served to move the policy even further in the direction proposed by the CSC and CDC. As these organisations conducted the seminar it is not unreasonable to speculate that the seminar was structured towards this end. The outcome of these actions was a new set of players with a new set of rules.

When the National Arts in Australian Schools Project was established, another set of priorities and goals was formulated which moved yet further away from the original intention of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The original Task Force recommendations concentrated on youth not only within the formal school sector but outside as well, (targeting unemployed youth), as well as recommending increased community involvement. When the policy passed to the CSC and CDC for implementation the focus was modified towards youth in schools and teacher professional development, and by the time it reached the NAAS project the emphasis was on young children and arts advocacy.

According to Winter implementation actions can lead to problems of co-ordination, delays, implementation failures and the spending of public funds for purposes other than those prescribed. In the current case, although delays were not evident at the initial phase, large funds were provided for the NAAS project which provided minimal outcome. Problems with delays and co-ordination were experienced in the latter stages, with the publication of the outcomes of the NAAS project.

Another factor which was highlighted in this enquiry was that of organisations protecting their own interests. Winter (1990:27) argues
that policy implementation often involves state and local governments headed by politicians who disagree with the objectives of programs. Federal and state bureaucracies often have interests of their own to protect. These factors can affect the implementation outcomes. On two occasions, this factor influenced the successful outcomes of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy.

The responses by State and Territory organisations to the Task Force recommendations varied considerably. This enquiry has noted variation not only at the State/Territory level but variation between individual organisations within the level. The variation highlighted by this enquiry, between the Victorian Education Department and the Western Australian Department of Education to the Task Force recommendations, is a prime example.

**NEGLECTED POLICY FACTORS/VARIABLES**

The significance of this enquiry to contribute new knowledge in policy studies is confirmed, in that, a number of other factors, not given prominence by Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990), have been identified as important in shaping the implementation process. These factors are

1. the composition/choice of policy proponents
2. the role of the individual in influencing policy
3. the effect of time on the policy process
4. the importance/reliance on funding
5. the importance of 'fall back' or contingency plans and control of the implementation process by the policy proponents
6. the impact of predetermined/existing implementation structures

Each of these factors will be discussed briefly.
Composition of policy proponents

A factor or variable not specifically identified by Winter (1990), but important to this enquiry, was the composition of the group responsible for the formulation, that is, the Task Force. The group, was supposed to represent the arts in education in Australia and was hand-picked by the Minister of Education and Youth Affairs. Interview informants attributed some of the negative responses, received from State/Territory education authorities, to the composition of the Task Force, in that, they expressed concerns about the lack of State education representation. On examination of the Task Force, it was evident that there was a lack of education/teaching representatives in the non-portfolio group and overly high representation by one Commonwealth department in the bureaucrat group; namely, the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. It is important to note, that no state/territory education groups, professional arts associations or interest groups were represented on the task force, even though they would be responsible for implementing many of its recommendations. Representatives from interest groups, such as the Australian Association for Dance Education and the National Aboriginal Education Committee expressed concerns, in written form, about their lack of representation.

The composition of the National Advisory Committee on Arts in Education, which was established as a direct recommendation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, can also be examined closely. The Task Force recommended that, this Committee should comprise two representatives from Commonwealth government departments, representatives from state/territory education authorities, both government and non-government, artists with experience in young
people's arts and teachers of the arts. Importantly, it stated that teachers must comprise fifty percent of the Committee.

There was no representation from non-government organisations, no teachers and no artists on the committee, which raises the question: would the direction of the implementation process have varied if the composition of the Task Force and the National Committee was different?

*Role of the individual*

The role of the particular individual in affecting policy was another factor of importance. Winter (199:31) contended that it is often impossible to explain the role of an individual in the implementation process. In this enquiry, however, the roles played by some individuals were clearly linked to progress or decline in the policy process. One of these individuals was Senator Susan Ryan, the former Minister for Education and Youth Affairs who played a significant role in both the formulation and implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. It appears that Senator Ryan was the main impetus behind the initial establishment of the Task Force. Her role in the selection of the Task Force members and relationship with the non-portfolio members cannot be overlooked.

The Minister also played a major role in influencing the recommendation of the funding structures which was adopted in the Task Force report. She was instrumental in appointing the final Chairman of the Task Force, Garth Boomer, who made a significant contribution to the closure of the Task Force proceedings. Senator Ryan, before losing her Ministerial portfolio to John Dawkins, was the
initiator of the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. It appears from this enquiry, that many of the failures in implementation could be attributed to the demise of Senator Ryan from the policy process, in that, the impetus and continuity of the implementation process waned when she became less active. Her passion and commitment to the improvement of arts education in Australia influenced the policy process and when that impetus and commitment at the highest level disappeared, so did many of the policy initiatives.

Other important roles, unsupportive ones this time, were played by the two new Commonwealth Ministers, for Education (J Dawkins) and Arts (C Holding). Their key decision was not to attend the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers (which eventually lead to the disbandment of it). The establishment of the Committee was a major recommendation of the Task Force. Had it been successful, it would have helped to cement Commonwealth/State education authority relations and increase the success of implementing further Task Force recommendations. The change of Commonwealth Minister for Education throughout this process was critical in the demise of the Committee. Susan Ryan, as Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, had provided a strong impetus to the policy process. Her successor, John Dawkins' inaction at implementation time had a substantial negative effect on the policy's future.

*Time*

Time is another factor which could be linked to the success of a policy, in achieving its objectives or goals. From the time of the establishment of the Task Force by Senator Ryan, to the final outcome, the publication of the NAAS booklets, approximately eight years had elapsed. During
this time, key actors changed, government structures were abolished, political parties both at the State and Commonwealth level came in and out of power, funding was cut, ideologies changed, major societal changes occurred and commitment and enthusiasm for the policy waned. It appeared that the process continued for far too long, in that little action was taken and/or action was delayed along the way, with major adverse effect on the implementation of the policy.

**Funding**

Funding, it appears was the greatest single factor which impacted on the output/outcomes of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy. The success of the implementation of the majority of the policy recommendations was dependent on securing, at the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs suggestion, additional funding of a new Specific Purpose Program, similar to PEP, DSP and CAP\(^1\) of approximately eighteen million dollars. Unfortunately, the Minister was unsuccessful in her funding bid. In the end, funding granted totalled only $447 000 from the Projects of National Significance program, which fell well short of the recommendations made by the Task Force. Many of the State/Territory education authorities made it clear to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, that involvement in the implementation process was dependent on extra funding. The result: no extra funding, no involvement.

Funding recommendations by the Task Force, of three million dollars for the out-of-school programs for the unemployed to have access to arts facilities was also unsuccessful. The result: no action and a

---

\(^1\) The Participation and Equity Program (PEP), the Disadvantaged Schools program (DSP) and the Country Area Program (CAP) were Specific Purpose Programs funded by the Commonwealth Schools Commission.
redirection of priorities, by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs away from unemployed youth. Recommendations by the Task Force for $300 000 for the Curriculum Development Centre to develop arts education materials again, was unsuccessful. The result: no funding, no action.

It appears that the failure to establish the Arts in Education as a Specific Purpose Program was due to a number of reasons, in particular, the changing economic conditions that existed in Australia at the time. By the mid eighties Australia was entering a period of economic restraint and recovery and the education portfolio was not spared. At the time, substantial cuts were made to existing Commonwealth Schools Commission programs, and it was impossible for the Minister to introduce any new major programs. The decision not to fund the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy as a Specific Purpose Program, but only as one item in the Projects of National Significance list, had an extremely limiting effect on the Task Force recommendations being implemented as intended.

Contingency plans
The failure to secure funding leads to another factor identified as possibly important in determining the policy outcomes: the lack of 'fall back' or contingency plans. Although, the Task Force had developed a highly structured implementation plan for the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, with identification of the organisations responsible and funding needed, it presumed that the organisations would be willing to be involved and that funding would be secured, which, in both cases did not eventuate. The policy did not indicate what should occur if these important proposals were refused. Therefore, the success of the
implementation process was minimalised and modification made necessary because no contingency plans were identified.

Implementation structures

Once the Task Force had completed the formulation of the policy it was passed to another organisation for implementation. The policy intentions were modified and the Task Force had lost control of the implementation process. This issue raises other questions concerning the final factor identified by this enquiry: what is the use of a Task Force making a variety of recommendations, if there is no administrative route available for the implementation of the recommendations? Why make a recommendation which cannot be implemented? In other words, what is the impact of predetermined/existing implementation structures on the implementation process?

On examination of the 'big picture' of the policy process, we find that the implementation process was restricted, with only one administrative route to follow. The CSC/CDC was responsible for the implementation of the majority of recommendations, while other recommendations were to be aligned to Commonwealth/State organisations, which had neither the funding nor the motivation for implementation. The result was that the CSC/CDC modified the intentions of the policy to better suit its own mission. It is important to recall, that the majority of the Task Force members, the folio or bureaucrat members, had prior knowledge of how the implementation would possibly proceed, in terms of which group/organisation would be assigned responsibility for action. Perhaps, the development of objectives and recommendations more closely aligned to the pre-
determined implementation route in the formulation phase would have contributed to greater success.

The examination of factors derived from studies by Mazmanian and Sabatier, (1981), Winter (1990) and Goggin et al (1990), and other possible factors highlighted by the researcher, leads the enquiry to ask the final research question:

5. What does the implementation process of the Education and the Arts (1985) policy tell us about policy theory?

Policy theory as a phenomenon can be difficult to specify and outline because of the myriad of contributing factors. The understanding of policy as a process can contribute to clarifying the phenomenon. The analysis of the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy has contributed to such understanding.

To understand or to analyse the policy process a policy must be placed within a context. The context for this enquiry was arts education in Australia from 1984 to 1991. Not surprisingly, this policy framework was complex by nature. Factors such as chronological events, identification of influences and patterns of decision making were considered. As were many other factors or variables.

The policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy was also dynamic in nature. Each level, layer or stage of the policy process could be viewed or analysed from a variety of viewpoints.

A time lapse is required to analyse the outcomes/outputs of any policy. In this enquiry, a decade had passed from the formulation phase to the
time of this enquiry, which allowed sufficient time to analyse the success of the policy implementation in achieving its goals.

From a myriad of factors or variables that may have affected the implementation of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, the researcher can confirm that some of the variables which are incorporated in the four main socio-political factors identified by Winter (1990), as well as other possible factors or variables not given prominence in policy studies, affected the implementation of the policy.

A number of factors can be identified which affected the policy process during the formulation phase. It appears that while these factors caused some difficulties and delays, other factors, namely, the reliance on one funding structure and the lack of contingency plans when the funding was not forth coming, had a greater effect on the lack of success of the policy process.

At the organisational and inter-organisational phase at the State/Territory level, one of the largest problems confronted by the policy for successful implementation was Commonwealth/State relations. The unique situation in Australia, where constitutionally education is the responsibility of the States and Territories, while its financing depends in part on Federal monies, continually hampered the possibility of success during the implementation process. Problems between the States and Territories with conflicting interests or incentives were evident, organisations gave priority to their own goals. Although there appeared to be no problems with co-ordination or delays at this early stage of the implementation process, it was clear that
the States and Territories varied in their capacity or propensity to act on the recommendations.

In relation to variables or factors affecting the policy process at the Commonwealth/federal level, it was evident that the organisations responsible for the majority of the recommendations, the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, were willing to act but in the process modified the original intentions to align with their own priorities. This action was understandable as the organisational mandate for these organisations was school education. Once the major funding issue, the Specific Purpose Program was abandoned, and replaced with the Projects of National Significance program, these organisations had little choice but to proceed in the manner they did.

The *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy implementation process halted at many levels. The process did not follow Winter's (1990) model concisely. Of the four sociopolitical processes or conditions outlined by Winter (1990:20), i.e. the character of the policy formation prior to the law or decision to be implemented; the organisational and inter-organisational behaviour; street-level bureaucratic behaviour; and the response by target groups and other changes in society; the two conditions which appear to have played the most significant role in the process was the first two. That is, the policy formation phase and the organisational and inter-organisational behaviour. In fact, their role was important enough to hamper the implementation from running its full course.
Many of the recommendations made by the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy were not implemented. Many of the recommendations did not reach either the street-level bureaucrats, or the target group for implementation. Target groups identified in the policy, that is, students within and outside the schooling system, did not get the opportunity to react or respond to the policy objectives. Therefore, it could be concluded, that the outcomes of the implementation process had little effect on the behaviour of the target group.

The final major factor which could not be overlooked is the changing socio-economic conditions of the time. The *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy was established and implemented at a time when economic conditions nationally were less than favourable. It is difficult to acquire funding for a subject area often placed low on the educational agenda in times of economic growth but is it surely impossible, as Senator Ryan discovered, to acquire extra funding in times of economic restraint. The changing socio and political climate at the time made it virtually impossible for the implementation of this policy to be successful. With the government moving more towards a managerial and vocational style and the Treasury calling for the cuts to successful existing programs, *Education and the Arts, 1985* had little hope for success.

**Towards a Theory of Implementation**

This enquiry has confirmed the significance of implementation in the policy process. It has confirmed that a relationship exists between the formulation phase and the implementation phase and that they are neither conceptually nor empirically separated. It has confirmed that
the policy process is not rational or linear; instead, the policy process is dynamic and complex.

This enquiry has also confirmed that some policy outcomes are shaped by the implementation process. It has recognised the influence of implementation on policy outcomes and outputs.

This enquiry confirms the notion that success or failure of a policy is a complex affair involving the inter-relationship of many factors: political, economic, organisational and social. Success in achieving desired outcomes involves recognising the complexity of the process and the connections between these factors and planning accordingly.

This enquiry supports the research of Winter (1990) in that successful implementation is multi-linear and depending on the inter-relationships among actors in the various stages of implementation. Winter assumes that implementation is a series of interactions and interpretations between the outputs of policy formulation and the effects of organisational and inter-organisational impacts, between street-level bureaucratic behaviours and target group behaviours.

Other factors which were found to be prominent in this enquiry, but not highlighted by Winter (1990), could be examined more closely in future policy studies. That is, the role of the individual in affecting policy, the combination of the policy proponents and their continuing role at the implementation phase, the importance of funding, the effect of time and the setting of limits, and the importance of alternate implementation plans or structures.
This enquiry supports the contention by Palumbo and Calista (1990:9) that implementation success cannot be objectively examined solely by measuring differences in policy intentions. 'Policy intentions are a matter of perceptions and implementation is not a matter of technical fulfillment of some clearly stated policy objectives'. As was the case in this enquiry, policy was continually being redesigned during implementation.

This enquiry has proved that public policy models, which explain the policy process, can be successfully applied in an educational setting. More importantly, these models are applicable to Australian arts education, an area neglected in policy studies. The knowledge gained in this enquiry may not only benefit researchers of policy studies but also be relevant to formulators and implementors of arts policy.

**SOME FINAL ADVICE FOR ARTS ADVOCATES...**

A decade later and the education community is still receiving national reports\(^2\) on the state of education and the arts, which are still painting bleak pictures. The Senate enquiry into arts education (1995:6) acknowledged that most of the submissions the enquiry heard complained, 'more in sorrow than anger, that arts in schools is widely regarded as a frill'. The time has arrived for arts educators to 're-paint' the bleakness and give the prominence arts education deserves.

In terms of this enquiry and the implementation of the *Education and the Arts, 1985* policy, what insights does it provide for arts advocacy?

---

\(^2\)Educational Enquiry: a Report by the Senate Environment, Recreation, Communications and the Arts References Committee, October 1995
There are a number of factors which the arts education community should be either aware of, or involved in, to improve this situation.

First, the role of the advocate is important. It is evident from this enquiry, that arts educators at all levels, from the classroom to the most senior bureaucrat, must become actively involved in the policy process. Before becoming involved, it is important to understand the process so they can individually or collectively influence it. Those players in the policy process in this enquiry who had the greater knowledge appeared to have greater influence.

Using Bardach's (1977) game analogy, it is important to become a 'player', know the 'rules' of the game to be able to score points. Those involved in the policy process must work together as a 'team'. It was evident that many times during the policy process of the Education and the Arts, 1985 policy, arts educators were not prepared to unite for a 'common cause'. They appear to be aware of the need to have a common cause, in order to influence policy direction.

When opportunities were provided to influence policy and a united front was necessary, such as at the national seminar 'Advocating the Arts', arts education interest groups became more fragmented, which in turn achieved little. Interview informants cited occasions where tensions existed and arts organisations were concerned with their own interests and goals.

It appears that a compounding problem is that art education tended to span a range of disciplines, that is, arts disciplines and the education discipline. In 1985, there was a perception by some state education
authorities that the Task Force was dominated too much by the 'arts' rather than by 'education' members.

A decade later these tensions still exist. In the *Thematic Summary of Submissions* prepared by Brenda Foran for the 1995 Senate Enquiry, she argues

> Underlying the issues raised in the submissions are the myriad tensions between key agencies and bodies, and a degree of incoherency associated with arts education. Responsibility for policy initiatives and implementation is difficult to assign to departments or government levels.

The arts education community should reflect upon problems encountered in the eighties and again in the mid nineties, revealed by this enquiry. The problems pertain to a lack of a common theoretical foundation about art education - they relate also to a lack of understanding of policy theory and in particular, about the role of individuals and agencies in policy formulation and implementation.

The report by the Senate, Environment, Recreation, Communications and the Arts Reference Committee for Arts Education (1995:32) concluded that 'enlightened leadership from society's opinion-formers is important'. This enquiry highlights the need for arts educators to adopt the equally important role of advocates and opinion-formers. To fulfill these roles, it is imperative that art educators develop a common voice and make themselves familiar on how policy processes operate.

From the results of this enquiry it is evident that arts educators should actively attempt to position themselves in areas where maximum influence or impact is possible, such as, task forces, inquiries or
national studies. While still attempting to keep their 'diversity' and 'uniqueness' arts education organisations or groups, should attempt to identify the issues that are critical to influence government policy and present a consistently common position in their interaction with policy-makers and policy-influencers. Level of attention and commitment over time are crucial and coalitions need to be used in a positive manner to impact on policy.

It is important that arts education advocates recognise the importance of the 'neglected' variables highlighted in this enquiry. Factors such as the influence of an individual, the effect of time and the power of funding should be considered. Advocates should recognise the necessity of working within, and using to their advantage, existing/pre-determined governmental and inter-governmental frameworks.
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APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT, RECREATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS REFERENCES COMMITTEE FOR ARTS EDUCATION

Recommendation 1
The Commonwealth, in consultation with the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee and State education authorities, should review the influence of university entrance arrangements on the school curriculum to discover whether they are having a detrimental effect on humanities and arts.

Recommendation 2
The Commonwealth, as part of the outcomes of the competency standards element of the national Project for the Quality of teaching and Learning, should encourage the States and Territories to give priority to the development of more detailed competency standards both for specialist arts teachers and for generalist primary teachers teaching arts.

Recommendation 3
As part of the National Curriculum for schools project, the Commonwealth should survey university teacher training courses to identify any deficiencies or systematic biases between disciplines. The Commonwealth, in consultation with the States and territories, the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee and teacher organisations, should develop guidelines to remedy any deficiencies so that all the Key learning Areas of the national Curriculum can be taught with equal high quality.
Recommendation 4
The Department of Employment, education and Training and the Department of Communications and the arts should establish a forum of relevant government agencies and peak-government bodies to facilitate consultation on matter of mutual interest to do with arts education so as to prevent initiatives relevant to both from 'falling between the stools'.

Recommendation 5
The Commonwealth's National Professional Development program for teachers (NPDP) should continue beyond the end of the current 1993-96 three year plan.

Recommendation 6
To better target the expenditure of NPDP money the Department of Employment, Education and Training, in consultation with State education authorities, teacher organisations and the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee, should investigate the current state of inservice professional development (including by discipline) and identify areas of need for priority action.

Recommendation 7
The National Report on Schooling in Australia should report on the inputs to school education (such as enrolments, lesson time, teachers employed) broken down by the various subjects and key Learning Areas and level of schooling, to allow a measure of the place of the arts (or other subject areas) in the school curriculum.

Recommendation 8
The National Report on Schooling in Australia should record educational outcomes for all Key Learning Areas, not only literacy and numeracy.
Recommendation 9
In any further consideration or development of the national Curriculum documents the purpose of education must be clearly and strongly asserted, with a well rounded and liberal education being the benchmark, so that education will be an effective instrument by which children become socialised, participating, informed and creative adults.

Recommendation 10
Further development of national curriculum initiatives at State level should adapt the National Curriculum framework to take account of the particular needs of each discipline, paying particular regard to the creative and unpredictable elements of arts learning which cannot easily be accommodated in a framework of pointers and outcomes.

Recommendation 11
In light of this the Commonwealth and the States should monitor the implementation of national curriculum initiatives to assess whether changes are relatively disadvantaging the arts, and should devise pre-emptive or remedial strategies.

Recommendation 12
Professional development programs for teachers relating to national curriculum initiatives, including those funded by the Commonwealth's National professional development Program, should pay due attention to the particular problems and needs of each discipline in implementing national curriculum initiatives.

Recommendation 13
In increasing the profile of vocational training in schools, the Education Ministers should pay particular attention to the need to ensure that a broad general education is not marginalised. Monitoring the implementation of Key Competencies projects must address this question. Commonwealth special purpose funding of key Competencies related projects should be conditional on this.
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Recommendation 14
Professional development programs for teachers (including the national Professional development Program) should address the relationship between the Key Competencies and broader educational aims, so the Key Competencies are not misused outside their proper sphere.

Recommendation 15
The Education Ministers should initiate a project of comparable status and focus to the present Key Competencies project to clarify the broad purposes of school education and re-assert their importance beside the employment-related purposes which are the focus of the Mayer report.

Recommendation 16
Projects to integrate the Key Competencies into the school curriculum should monitor the effects on the various disciplines, paying particular regard to the creative and unpredictable element of arts learning which cannot easily be accommodated in a framework of measurable behavioural outcomes. Commonwealth special purpose funding of key Competencies related projects should be conditional on this.

Recommendation 17
In light of this the Commonwealth and States should monitor the integration of the key Competencies into the school curriculum to assess whether they have effects that are relatively disadvantaging the arts, and should devise pre-emptive or remedial strategies.

Recommendation 18
A competency relating to aesthetic awareness should be added to the head list of key Competencies.

Recommendation 19
The Commonwealth and the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee, as part of the Quality Assurance Program in higher education, should monitor the effects of the United National System reforms to universities on a discipline by discipline basis. They should report on any trends which are disadvantaging some disciplines relative to others.
They should suggest strategies for ameliorating these trends.

**Recommendation 20**
The department of Employment, Education and Training should carry out further investigation of arts teaching costs promised when the Relative Funding Model was introduced, with a view to establishing the extent of any relative advantage to the arts under the current model.

**Recommendation 21**
The information base of the Relative Funding Model should be disaggregated and published, so that universities' internal budgeting decisions may be informed by detailed information rather than by the approximate and possibly misleading information contained in the present clusters and weightings.

**Recommendation 22**
The Commonwealth should update the Relative Funding Model now and each five years to ensure it continued accuracy, and should use the information as one of the inputs to ongoing recalculation of the allocation of Commonwealth funding among universities.

**Recommendation 23**
The Commonwealth should investigate the general question of whether current research funding arrangements have the effect of discriminating systematically against particular disciplines in unintended ways.

**Recommendation 24**
The Australian Research Council and the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee should form a working party to address the problems of university research in the arts; including, to investigate whether current definitions of research are appropriate in the light of Australia's goals for cultural development; to consider whether there are activities that ought to be funded by one or other but are now funded by neither; to consider whether current research funding arrangement have the effect of discriminating systematically against the arts; to suggest remedies to any problems.
Recommendation 25
The Commonwealth and the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee should investigate whether there are any biases in the universities' behaviour in supporting research, biases that could be attributed to the 'research quantum' arrangements, and if so whether the biases affect particular disciplines systematically or specifically disadvantage the arts.
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### NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE EDUCATION AND THE ARTS (1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken McKinnon</td>
<td>Chairman, Schools Commission and Deputy Chairman, (Australia Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros Bower</td>
<td>Acting Director, Community Arts, Australia Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Davies</td>
<td>Political Science Department, Melbourne University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Godfrey-Smith</td>
<td>Member, Theatre Board, Australia Council, Australian Youth Performing Arts Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Lemercier</td>
<td>Chairman, South Australian Crafts Authority, Member, Crafts Board, Australia Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Lett,</td>
<td>Reader in Education, La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Shaw</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Kelvin Grove College of Advanced Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Winder</td>
<td>Assistant Director-General, NSW Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Milton</td>
<td>Inspector of Schools, NSW Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
LIST OF INFORMANTS INTERVIEWED AND AREA OF EXPERTISE, POSITION OR INSIGHT

Commonwealth policy formulation/implementation:
Interview One:
Susan Ryan*  Former Commonwealth Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

Interview Two:
Vanessa Crimmins*  Former Executive Officer, Education and the Arts, Commonwealth Department of Education and Youth Affairs

Interview Three:
Libby Smith  Former Senior Curriculum Officer (Education and the Arts program), Curriculum Development Centre, Commonwealth Schools Commission

Interview Four:
Kerry Kennedy  Former Acting Director of the Curriculum Development Centre, Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Task Force (Education and the Arts 1985) member
Interview Five:
Robyn Gordon*  Artist, Craftsperson, Arts Educator

Interview Two:
Vanessa Crimmins*  Executive Officer, Department of Education and Youth Affairs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Six:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Vickery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Director General of Education, Western Australia Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interview Seven: |
| Ray Sampson*    |
| Former Art Superintendent, Western Australia Department of Education |

| Interview Eight: |
| Terry Hodge      |
| Former Arts Education Curriculum Officer, Western Australia Department of Education |

| Interview Nine: |
| Tony Lenton*    |
| Former Senior Curriculum Officer, Arts Education, Victorian Ministry of Education |

| National Arts in Australian Schools Project (NAAS) |
| Interview Ten: |
| Ann Carroll   |
| Senior Curriculum Officer, Arts Education, Queensland Department of Education |

| Interview Eleven: |
| Gay Mason*       |
| Former Project Officer, NAAS Project, Queensland Department of Education |

| Interview Twelve: |
| Lee Emery*        |
| Arts Education, University of Melbourne |

| Professional Associations/state involvement |
| Interview Thirteen: |
| Phil Perry*       |
| Former President, Australian Institute of Art Education |

| Interview Fourteen: |
| Marlene Stafford*  |
| Former Vice President, Western Australia, Australian Institute of Art Education |

*chosen for 'elite' status
MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE:
EDUCATION AND THE ARTS (1985)

The members of the Task Force identified in the report were:

Max Bourke  Assistant Secretary, Policy Coordination Branch, Department of Home Affairs and Environment, ACT
Roger Chapman  Director, Carclew Youth Performing Arts Centre, SA
Robyn Gordon  Artist, Craftsperson, Arts Educator, NSW
Hunter Grahame  Assistant Commissioner, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, ACT
Richard Letts  Director of the Music Board, Australia Council, NSW
Bob McNamara  First Assistant Commissioner, Commonwealth Schools Commission, ACT
Beth Moran  Assistant Director, Curriculum Development Centre, ACT
Robert Perrier  Artistic Director, Murray River Performing Group Ltd, Victoria
Chris Westwood  Director, Understudies Pty Ltd, Theatre producers and consultants in the arts
Vanessa McKenzie  Executive Officer, Department of Education and Youth Affairs, ACT

Chairperson:
Mr Ted Rolfe  August 1983 - March 1984
Mr Bob Kinnaird  4 October 1984 -
Mr Garth Boomer  11 October 1984
### APPENDIX E

OTHER PEOPLE WHO SERVED WITH THE EDUCATION AND ARTS TASK FORCE (1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Batt</td>
<td>Director, General Policy Branch, Department of Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bowler</td>
<td>First Assistant Secretary, Department of Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Grimmond</td>
<td>Executive Branch, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Kennedy</td>
<td>Acting Director, General Policy Branch, Department of Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kinnaird</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary, General Policy Branch, Department Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Miland</td>
<td>Full-time Member, Commonwealth Schools Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Orr</td>
<td>Education and Project Officer, Commonwealth Schools Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Rolfe</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary, Research and Statistics Branch, Department of Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Libby Smith</td>
<td>Education and the Arts Project Officer, Commonwealth Schools Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirich Stefanik</td>
<td>General Policy Branch, Department of Education and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. A proposal for the establishment of a joint Commonwealth/State Cultural Affairs/Education Ministers Working Party was endorsed by the Commonwealth/State Cultural Affairs Ministers in February 1984, and by the equivalent Commonwealth/State body in the education area, the Australian Education Council (AEC), at its meeting in July 1984.

2. The Curriculum Development Centre which had been reactivated within the Commonwealth Schools Commission had been allocated as one of its priority tasks: the area of curriculum development in relation to education and the arts.

3. A new position had been established within the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, at the Class 9 level that was concerned specifically with policy development and co-ordination on education and the arts.

4. Under the Commonwealth Schools Commission Projects of national Significance Program for 1984 (which had provided $208 000 for education and the arts) several recommendations of the Task Force had been adapted and implemented. For example, a joint project of video production of exemplary arts/education projects involving both the
Australia Council and the Commonwealth Schools Commission; and a schools cluster project.

5. The Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority had surveyed schools and sought community opinion with a view to go further developing arts education programs in ACT government schools.

6. The Commonwealth Schools Commission had allocated for 1985, under the projects of National Significance Program $210 000 to education and the arts.

7. A number of arts education projects were mounted utilising funds from other programs of the Commonwealth Schools Commission, e.g. specific purpose programs of which the Disadvantaged Schools Program and the Country Area Program were two examples.
APPENDIX G

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE TASK FORCE FOR
EDUCATION AND THE ARTS (1985)

Recommendations

1. First and foremost among our recommendations is the vital requirement that mechanisms be set up by Ministers to ensure that the development of arts education gains rather than loses momentum over the coming years. To this end we recommend:

(a) That a joint standing committee be established by the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Minister’s Council to coordinate and monitor the implementation of policy on education and the arts and to report regularly on progress to the Councils.

Action
Already taken (The Task Force)

1(b) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs publishes annually a report on progress in the arts and education.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

1(c) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to establish national goals in the arts and education. As a simple concrete measure to ensure that progress is made, schools should aim for 20 per cent of school time to be devoted to the arts in primary school and to Year 8 of secondary school, and a minimum of 10 per cent of time in Years 9 and 10. This should be achieved by the Bicentenary.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Minister of Education.

1(d) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the agreement of State and Northern Territory Ministers in developing a mechanism to facilitate uniform monitoring of progress in the collection of Commonwealth, State and Territory statistics in arts education. There should be published annually statistical collections, desirably computer based, indicating in objective form the level of effort in arts education, (Note: this may be done in conjunction with the Minister’s annual report mentioned in recommendation 1c).

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Ministers for Education.
1(e) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the agreement of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to develop a mechanism for an information sharing system for education and the arts. Included in this information would be materials on curriculum innovation, school community projects and resources generally. The information should be readily accessible to schools and education groups and to be made available through a combination of existing networks and possible some co-ordinated clearing-house function.

**Action**
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and territory Minister for Education.

1(f) That State and Territories give priority to providing arts in education curriculum information to the Curriculum Information Network which is to be established by the Curriculum Development Centre.

**Action**
Curriculum Development Centre Council in partnership with State and Territory systems.

1(g) That as a matter of urgency, a person be appointed to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs at a senior position. This person would act as education and the arts adviser/coordinator to the Minister.

**Action**
The Minister for education and Youth Affairs.

2. That funds for establishing and subsidising arts access centres and arts schools in the community be allocated by the Commonwealth in the 1986 Budget as a matter of priority and that guidelines for the function, nature and operation of such centres and schools be provided by consultants.

**Action**
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Education and Cultural Ministers.

3. That the Minister for education and Youth Affairs seeks the co-operation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to encourage educational institutions to make their facilities Available outside regular hours for arts activities.

**Action**
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Education Ministers.
4. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs supports the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment in seeking the provision of funds to maximise the use of existing buildings and facilities for cultural and creative purposes.

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

5. That funds be provided as a matter of priority for the training of community arts workers, and that the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission be asked to advise on the appropriate levels of funds required by tertiary and/or community institutions to provide this training.

*Note: This recommendation should be forwarded to the Review of Arts Education and Training (CTEC) for consideration.*

**Action**

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission on advice from their Ministers.

6. That Aboriginal arts, both traditional and contemporary, be promoted and developed by the employment of Aboriginal specialists to work within education programs at school and post-school levels and in formal and informal community-based activities. The content of such courses should be determined by Aboriginal people.

**Action**

Curriculum Development Centre, National Aboriginal Education Committee, Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs, State and Territory education authorities.

7. That the arts of ethnic groups in the community be brought prominently into the school curriculum and that experience of these art forms be made available at arts centres and schools (out of school hours) and through weekend and evening courses at technical and further education (TAFE) institutions. The content should be determined by the participants.

**Action**

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and funding agencies.
8. That women be involved, both in schools and in community arts centres, in the design and implementation of courses and activities which value and promote the arts traditionally and currently practiced by women.

**Action**
Commonwealth Schools Commission, Curriculum Development Centre, State and Territory curriculum sections, women's advisory groups.

9. That the Commonwealth provide funds to support major youth arts festivals in International Youth Year 1985 and in later years.

**Action**
Commonwealth Ministers for education and Youth Affairs and Home Affairs and Environment. (Action already taken for 1985)

10. That the Commonwealth introduce and fund a craft traineeship program along the lines suggested jointly by the Crafts Council of Australia and Crafts Board of the Australia Council. Further, that traineeships on other arts and arts related areas be introduced along similar lines.

**Action**
Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (especially TAFE), Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

11. That the Commonwealth provide funding under the Participation and Equity Program and earmark it for unemployed and underemployed young people to undertake practical training in the crafts, other art forms, and arts related areas.

**Action**
Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

12. That the review of youth support schemes currently undertaken by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs should proceed as quickly as possible. It is also recommended that there should be financial incentives for young unemployed and underemployed people to undertake training in the arts and part-time employment in arts related jobs.

**Action**
Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

13. That a study be made of the implications for arts education of the developments in communications technology

**Action**
Commonwealth and State Advisory Committee on the Educational Use of Communications Technology
14. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs have investigated the possibility of:
(a) introducing a scheme to provide self-instruction video tapes in the arts for use by children in remote areas

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.

14(b) establishing an 'arts caravan' in 1985 to take arts and education projects to geographically remote areas and appointing a consultant to advise in the function, nature and operation of the 'arts caravan' (or similar service such as the museum train)

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.

14(c) providing additional funds so that geographically isolated young people (both within and outside the school system) can attend arts events or camps in capital cities, and touring arts can be taken to them.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.

15. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs establish through TAFE (and at a later stage through arts access centres in the community) a system whereby young people can learn about arts industry matters such as business administration, production and marketing so that they can learn to support themselves financially by arts activities.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, The Department of Education and Youth Affairs and the Commonwealth tertiary Education Commission (specifically the Technical and Further education Council).

16. That the Commonwealth establish an arts education grants program. The aim of the grants program would be to encourage teachers and schools to apply for funds to introduce innovative arts programs into schools and across schools at the grass-roots level.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory government and non-government systems.
17. That a high priority be given to providing funding of a K-12 cluster school program for dance/movement, preferably in a disadvantaged area. This pilot scheme should be documented in detail and the documentation, including evaluative reports, should be distributed to all relevant State and Territory authorities. In order to ensure that dance/movement is incorporated as a significant component of curriculum, it is essential that pilot programs are designed to run for a minimum of three years.

**Action**
Already implemented and funded by the Curriculum Development Centre

18. That a significant proportion of Participation and Equity Program (PEP) funds, distributed to the States through the Commonwealth Schools Commission be earmarked for the development of innovative arts-focused curriculums with particular emphasis on involving young people over the compulsory school leaving age as the needs of this groups are not being met by existing curriculums.

**Action**
State PEP Committees

19. That in all appropriate programs administered by the Commonwealth Schools Commission funding priority be given to achieve the goals for education and the arts stated in this report, and that particular emphasis be given to meeting the needs of disadvantaged groups such as the establishment of arts camps for isolated children, Aborigines and children from disadvantaged socio-economic areas.

**Action**
Commonwealth Schools Commission in partnership with State and Territory authorities.

20. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to immediately and substantially increase arts advisory and consultancy services in schools.

**Action**
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Ministers.

21. That Commonwealth funds for professional development, made available to the States through the Commonwealth Schools Commission be increased for 1986 and that a significant portion be earmarked for in-service courses in arts education for primary teachers, and training for arts advisers. These programs should be aimed to inspire teachers’ personal and professional interest in the arts.

**Action**
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and Commonwealth Schools Commission.
22. That the Commonwealth Schools Commission implement Recommendation 2.47 a) and b) of the 1977 report, Education and the Arts:
   a) 'that the Schools Commission provide guidance on design and standards to schools and education authorities with respect to arts facilities, with special attention to the needs of music, drama, dance and film and television'
   Action
   Commonwealth Schools Commission on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

22(b)'that the Schools Commission provide funds within the general capital program to allow for allocation in all States of some pilot arts facilities which reflect desirable design features.'
   Action
   Commonwealth Schools Commission on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

23. That the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations be requested to develop materials on employment opportunities in the arts and related fields in conjunction with the Department of Home Affairs and Environment and the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. The materials should be suitable for use by school careers counsellors and the Commonwealth Employment Service.
   Action
   Departments of Employment and Industrial Relations, Home Affairs and Environment and Education and Youth Affairs.

24. That the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in implementing Paragraph 25 of the 'Funding Guidelines for 1984' investigate and report on:
   a) the means for promoting the provision of teacher education courses in colleges which give due weight to arts education
   Action
   Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

24(b) the means for establishing new or modified courses designed to provide a broader background in the arts for students seeking to become specialist arts teachers
   Action
   Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

24(c) the means for encouraging a limited number of institutions to mount external and part-time courses in the arts suited to the needs of teachers.
   Action
   Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission
25. That the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, in consultation with the States, develops a scheme of awards to assist practising artists to undertake teacher education programs. The scheme should be prepared for consideration in the context of the 1985-86 Federal Budget.

**Action**
Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in partnership with State and Territory authorities.

26. That the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission give priority to the further development of programs such as theatre-in-education, youth arts (such as youth theatre), artists-in-schools and dance-in-education, and other avenues for promotion to the community of education and the arts which would benefit young people.

**Action**
Australia Council and Australian Film Commission.

27. That funds be made available to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs to commission research into the best methods of evaluating achievements in arts education and to conduct a national conference for establishing other priorities for research into arts education.

**Action**
Department of Education and Youth Affairs on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

28. That the Curriculum Development Centre be asked to develop curriculum programs and activities arising from consideration of this report with emphasis on an integrated curriculum including arts.

**Action**
Curriculum Development Centre Council and Secretariat in partnership with State and Territory government and non-government education systems.

29. That a designers-in-schools program, similar to the pilot architects-in-schools program, be developed by the Design Arts Board of the Australia Council in consultation with the appropriate education authorities.

**Action**
The Australia Council. (a project of this type is currently being funded by the Curriculum Development Centre).
30. That funds be made available in 1984, through the Commonwealth Schools Commission Arts Education element of the Projects of National Significance Program, for the production of an audio visual kit (video/slide-tape) describing five outstanding arts projects. This kit is to be produced for widespread distribution.

   Action
   Commonwealth Schools Commission (Project in progress).

31. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to inform artists working in schools of current arts curriculum policy and, where necessary, establish courses and workshops so that the artists may develop their work to complement current educational thinking at system and schools levels.

   Action
   The Minister for education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Ministers for Education.

32. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment appropriately fund all subsidised arts organisations so that they can provide encouragement, opportunities and facilities for young people to express arts interests, for example through youth exhibitions, youth theatre, youth film.

   Action
   The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

33. That the Australia Council encourage all arts organisations funded by them to make provision in their annual programs for project which involve young people at all levels of the creative process.

   Action
   The Australia Council.

34. That film, video and radio, among the most influential contemporary art forms of interest to young people, be promoted and developed as a priority area in school curriculums.

   Action
   Australian Film Commission, Australian Film and Television School, Curriculum Development Centre.
OTHER MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

That nominees from all interested Commonwealth departments form an interdepartmental communications and liaison group on education and the arts.

That a National Advisory Committee on the Arts in Education is established having the following general composition:

a) two representatives of appropriate Commonwealth Government departments one of whom shall be the chairperson
b) representatives of education authorities (government and non-government) from States and Territories
c) artists with experience in young people's arts
d) teachers of arts

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

That a specific purpose program be supported at the level of $5 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88

Action
The Commonwealth Schools Commission

The sum of $1 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88 be allocated to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs for the national support of out-of-school initiatives in education and the arts.

Action
Department of Education and Youth Affairs

That the Minister approve an additional $100,000 per annum to the Curriculum Development Centre for the specific purpose of arts in education curriculum projects related to the recommendations of the report.

Action
Minister for the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, the Curriculum Development Centre.
APPENDIX H

TASK FORCE REPORT: OBJECTIVES

LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION

Objectives
To encourage leadership shown by the Commonwealth Ministers in the areas of education and the arts by the establishment of mechanisms which ensure continued action and coordination in arts education by Commonwealth, State and regional education and arts authorities.
To seek to commit educational leadership to a constructive response to arts education initiatives from the community.

COMMUNITY ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS

Objectives
To win acceptance of the value and importance of arts education through vigorous presentation to the community.
To encourage community groups and agencies in the arts to press the formal education system to provide adequate arts education.
To support community initiated arts and education programs.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITIES

Objectives
To ensure that all people have access to the tools of artistic expression, including both those of the dominant culture and of the cultural forms of personal or local relevance.
To enable all young people to have the opportunity for experience of, and active participation in, a broad range of the arts from an early age.
To press for affirmative action in allocation of the arts education resources for people who have traditionally lacked access to the means of artistic expression and participation.
To develop means for access and participation in settings which are most beneficial to different groups achieving their arts education objectives, which might include the school system and community access centres.
To urge that arts vocational training for disadvantaged groups be designed to meet their particular needs.
OVERCOMING INADEQUACIES OF ARTS EDUCATION IN THE PRESENT SYSTEMS

Objectives
To ensure provision of high quality, relevant teacher education in the arts areas.
To ensure provision of arts education resources which will facilitate a high quality arts education for all.
To stipulate minimum requirements for arts education in schools.
To support curriculum development.
To foster co-ordination between arts education programs at all levels, in the school and in the community.
To encourage optimum use of the skills of artists and community arts resources in the service of arts education.
To ensure the optimum quality of arts education in the formal education system and the integration of the arts as an intrinsic part of the total curriculum.

CULTURAL IDENTITY
Objectives
To support the development of Australian cultural identity through arts processes which relate to life experiences of Australians and through Australian studies projects in primary, secondary and tertiary education institutions.
To provide for the revival, protection and development of the cultures of specific groups in Australia.
APPENDIX I

LIST OF DEPARTMENTS AND ORGANISATIONS IDENTIFIED BY THE TASK FORCE AS BEING RESPONSIBLE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE NUMBER OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Task Force report provided nineteen objectives, relating to five themes. Each theme then provided recommendations and indicated with whom the responsibility for action lay.

State and Territory education authorities 1(c) (d) (e) (f), 2, 3, 6, 8, 16, 19, 20, 25, 28, 31.
State and Territory cultural authorities 2.
State PEP Committees 18
Non-government school authorities 16, 28.
Women's advisory groups 8
Australia Council 5, 26, 29, 33.
Australian Film Commission 5, 26, 29, 33
Australian Film and Television School 34
Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission 8, 11, 19, 21, 22, 30.
Curriculum Development Centre 1(f), 6, 8, 17, 28, 34.
National Aboriginal Education Committee 6, 14.
Department of Aboriginal Affairs 6, 14.
Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment 4, 9, 10, 23, 32.
Department of Employment and Industrial relations 23
Advisory Committee of Educational Use of Communications Technology 13.
APPENDIX J

FUNDING STRUCTURES PROPOSED BY THE TASK FORCE FOR EDUCATION AND THE ARTS (1985)

National Advisory Committee on Education and the Arts

Minister for Education and Youth Affairs Policy and funding

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (especially Technical and Further Education)

Department of Education and Youth Affairs

Commonwealth Schools Commission

Curriculum Development Centre national Curriculum projects $100 000 p.a.

Action in the curriculum materials/program

Specific purpose program State and Territory Committees $5m p.a.

Action in the Schools

State and Territory Cultural/Education Ministers funds

Action in the Community

Funding from the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission

State and Commonwealth Cultural/Education Ministers Committee
The report was divided into two parts. Part One, encompassed the issues, the recommendations for action and the structures suggested by the Task Force. Part Two, contained an explanation of how the Task Force had developed its conclusions and provided a description of arts education in Australia since 1977. The report made thirty four recommendations for action and nominated those who would be responsible for putting each recommendation into effect.

While the Task Force acknowledged that a ‘good deal of initiative will need to come from the Commonwealth' it envisaged that the Commonwealth, States and Territories would need to enter ‘into a productive partnership’ to implement the recommendations.

According to the Task Force report, arts education had been inadequately supported in the past. In support of this notion, the report contended that ‘artistic endeavour is fundamental to the development of a creative and productive nation and that the arts are vital to the nation's future’. (1985:1)

**Issues and need for action identified by the task force report**

The report recognised that little of the 1977 Education and the Arts report’s recommendations had been implemented. It stated that if the
1977 recommendations had been implemented, they would have
broken new grounds in the arts and education in Australia.

The Task Force (1985:1) report recognised that the most powerful
statement from the 1977 report was that

at every level, school, local, regional, State and national,
the absence of leadership and coordination machinery
limits the effectiveness of even the most energetic and
passionate grass-roots action.

In this regard the Task Force report acknowledged the leadership
offered so willingly from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs
and recognised the co-operation between the community and the
education authorities. Senator Ryan's commitment and involvement
to arts education is highly significant to this study and will be discussed
in detail later.

The Task Force report (1985:1) stated that the recommendations had
been framed by a 'commitment and endorsement that within and
outside the formal education system' the arts must be 'equitably
distributed and provided for'.

The Task Force identified a number of features of contemporary
Australian society which impacted on arts in education and believed
was in urgent need for immediate action. The features included
constraints and pressures in education, structural unemployment,
rapid cultural change, increased community participation and
involvement, increasing recognition of the value of Australian artists
in articulating Australian culture.
The Task Force proposed that the recommendations for action should take into account the general issues affecting education at this time. It identified these issues as: the undesirably low participation rate in schools beyond the period of compulsory schooling, especially in some government secondary schools, the disaffection of some young people with school curriculums which have not met their needs in a time of increased anxiety about the pattern of life in the future, evidence that many students are not proceeding to tertiary studies, inadequate facilities for the arts in education institutions, inadequate teacher education in the arts (both artists as teachers and teachers of the arts).

The Task Force recognised that the arts was an industry with an annual turnover of $2-3 billion and employs some 35 000 full time workers, therefore, the arts as much as any other area could help to regain a sense of self and self esteem to the unemployed. The Task Force acknowledged that education for employment in the arts is an important objective for the rapidly developing labour intensive industry.

**Defining the arts**

The report stated that at the first meeting it was agreed that the arts should be defined broadly and included categories listed in the 1977 report: visual arts, crafts, music, drama, dance, film, television and radio, and creative writing.

At a later meeting it was decided that dance should be interpreted as dance/movement. Design was also accepted by the Task Force, both for its potential as a distinct category and for its important contribution to
other arts and crafts. It was also agreed that architecture should not be excluded.

Rationale

As the underlying rationale for the arts education recommendations the Task Force report accepted the functions of the arts as set out in Arts in Schools, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Report, (1982:141). The functions identified were to develop the full variety of human intelligence, to develop the capacity for creative thought and action, the education of feeling and sensibility, to develop physical and perceptual skills, the exploration of values, to develop an understanding of the changing social culture.

Objectives

In planning the recommendations for future action the Task Force set immediate objectives which were dominated by the overarching aim that 'arts education should make an important contribution to the resurgence of the arts'. The Task Force endorsed and sought to develop the objectives from the 1977 Education and the Arts report. These were repeated in the Education and the Arts (1985) report:

- **Access** - every young person should have access to experience in the arts;

- **Participation** - every young person should actively experience a range of arts forms to at least the end of mid-secondary schooling;

- **Confidence and commitment** - every young person should be encouraged to develop and retain enthusiasm for continued involvement in the arts as part of their lives;

---

"Education and the Arts" was given as the Task Force's field of reference. In the report the expression 'arts education' was frequently used but it was also taken to be the equivalent of 'education and the arts'. 'Education' and 'arts' was used in a comprehensive fashion.
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Excellence - every young person should be encouraged to extend the quality and range of their participation in the arts and surpass their own previous best efforts.

Apart from the four main objectives, previously outlined, nineteen specific objectives related to the five themes or issues (Leadership and Co-ordination, Community Attitudes and Actions, Equality of Opportunities, Overcoming Inadequacies of Arts Education in the Present Systems, Cultural Identity) were developed. The nineteen objectives can be found in Appendix ?.

**Criteria for recommendations**

The Task Force developed a general guiding criteria to determine what sort of conclusions should be presented to the Minister. The criteria was that a recommendation would need to contribute to the achievement of one or more of the Task Force's long or short term objectives and would have to be practical and capable of implementation. The cost involved for the recommendation would have to be warranted and the outcome would have to be acceptable to those affected by it. Any recommendation would have to allow for a Commonwealth initiative.

Other factors which were taken into account were that the recommendation had been sufficiently supported by factual information. That through this any existing shortcoming would be substantially or completely remedied and it would be the best means of achieving the desired outcome. A recommendation would not result in the inequitable treatment for one area of the arts over others and
finally the selection of a recommendation should follow up a recommendation made in the 1977 report.

**Funding Recommendations**

According to the Task Force report (1985:13) the following funding proposals were to be seen 'as the major but not the only funding initiatives' necessary to achieve its objectives:

1. *the government allocate in total $6.1 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88.*

2. *a Specific Purpose Program be supported at the level of $5 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88.*

It was the firm view of the Task Force that this amount represented the minimum allocation necessary to achieve 'long lasting improvement and worthy national objectives'. The Task Force noted that the Computers in Education Project was funded at $6.2 million per annum and the Basic Learning in Primary Schools Project was funded at $5.7 million per annum.

3. *the Arts in Education program be administered as a joint Commonwealth/State program for both government and non-government schools*

The Task Force advocated strongly that to provide for a significant improvement in arts activities in schools, additional funding support must be allocated by government and non-government authorities. Therefore, the Task Force recommended that the Arts in Education Program be administered as a joint Commonwealth/State program for both government and non-government schools.
4. government and non-government authorities in States and territories be required progressively to achieve an equal partnership with the Commonwealth government in real terms by 1988. A condition of a grant should be the establishment of joint agreements on funding from 1986.

5. Funds will be disbursed to the States and Territories on the basis of $200 000 base grant to each plus an allocation calculated on the basis of total enrolments.

6. the likely allocations would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>$1 359 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic.</td>
<td>$1 120 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>$ 740 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>$ 485 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>$ 495 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>$ 291 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>$ 230 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>$ 264 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Task Force proposed that the Commonwealth contribution, outlined above, would be supplemented by resources by government and non-government schools. The program in each State and Territory would be administered on the advice of representative committees. These committees would be appointed by State Ministers for Education in consultation with the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs. The committees would have representatives from government education authorities, non-government education authorities, arts groups including community arts, teachers of arts, artists with experience in young people's arts and Commonwealth agencies. Fifty per cent of membership of these committees should be practitioners in the field of arts and education.

7. a sum of $1 million per annum for the triennium 1986-88 be allocated to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs for the national support of out-of-school initiatives in education and the arts

The Task Force contended that the Commonwealth initiatives should also support practices which promoted increased community
involvement, address problems of structural unemployment among young school leavers and give young people greater access to arts facilities and resources.

8. the Minister approve an additional $100 000 per annum to the Curriculum Development Centre for the specific purpose of arts in education curriculum projects related to the recommendations of the report.

The Task Force acknowledged that there were many curriculum needs in the arts in education which were not being met. For example, information about the provision and content of arts in the curriculum was inadequate. It was stated that while the re-activated Curriculum Development Centre, had in its present budget given priority to arts in education, to undertake the recommendations of the Task force report it had to been given a 'strong and separate mandate to address central arts in education curriculum matters', especially in the area of dance/movement and matters relating to the arts and assessment, credentialing and the common curriculum.

Therefore, the Task Force recommended that a total of $6.1 million per annum (i.e. $18.3 million in total, for the triennium 1986-88) would be required to achieve 'tangible and lasting improvements in arts and education by the Australian Bicentennial Year in 1988'.

The Task Force report was submitted to Senator Ryan, Minister for Education and Youth Affairs by Garth Boomer, Chairman, on behalf of the Task Force on Education and the Arts on 1 November 1984.
Recommendations

1. First and foremost among our recommendations is the vital requirement that mechanisms be set up by Ministers to ensure that the development of arts education gains rather than loses momentum over the coming years. To this end we recommend:

(a) That a joint standing committee be established by the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Minister’s Council to coordinate and monitor the implementation of policy on education and the arts and to report regularly on progress to the Councils.

Action

Already taken (The Task Force)

Response

Following a request from the Conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers with Responsibility for Arts and Cultural Affairs, the Australian Education Council endorsed a proposal to establish a Joint Ministerial Committee to co-ordinate and monitor the implementation of policies on education and the arts. The Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was to be made up of the Commonwealth Minister responsible for cultural affairs and the Commonwealth Minister responsible for education together with four Ministers from four different States and Territories, two being responsible for education and two responsible for cultural affairs.

(Statement from the 49th (January 1985) Australian Education Council Meeting)

Recommendation

1(b) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs publishes annually a report on progress in the arts and education.
Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

Response
Supported by the Victorian Department of Education. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation
1(c) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to establish national goals in the arts and education. As a simple concrete measure to ensure that progress is made, schools should aim for 20 per cent of school time to be devoted to the arts in primary school and to Year 8 of secondary school, and a minimum of 10 per cent of time in Years 9 and 10. This should be achieved by the Bicentenary.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Minister of Education.

Response
The South Australian Department of Education stated that an Arts Education Team had been established to provide on-site assistance to schools and were available to the Task Force to assist. The Department felt that the setting of national goals in the arts and education was achievable. The Department warned the goals must be realistic and the breakdown of the time allocation for the arts within the curriculum should be regarded as a target figure only. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

The Northern Territory Department of Education did not support this recommendation as it stated that if a prescriptive approach of 20% of curriculum time is devoted to arts in primary school it limited the freedom of schools to respond to individual needs. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The Tasmanian Department of Education informed the Task Force that the goals outlined in the recommendation were already being achieved in their State. (response to the Task Force report by the Tasmanian Department of Education, dated 11 April 1985)
Recommendation

1(d) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the agreement of State and Northern Territory Ministers in developing a mechanism to facilitate uniform monitoring of progress in the collection of Commonwealth, State and Territory statistics in arts education. There should be published annually statistical collections, desirably computer based, indicating in objective form the level of effort in arts education, (Note: this may be done in conjunction with the Minister’s annual report mentioned in recommendation 1c).

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Ministers for Education.

Response

The South Australian Department of Education welcomed this recommendation, stating that the development of a quantitative database would be of assistance in determining the level and nature of resource allocation. The Department was happy to examine the feasibility of setting up a mechanism for statistical collection. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

The Queensland Department of Education stated that the collection of additional statistics should in the first instance be considered by the Education Statistics Co-ordination Committee of the Australian Education Council. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The Tasmanian Department of Education suggested that the developments of appropriate mechanisms for gathering statistics should be referred to the AEC’s statistics committee. (response to the Task Force report by the Tasmanian Department of Education, dated 11 April 1985)
Recommendation 1(e) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the agreement of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to develop a mechanism for an information sharing system for education and the arts. Included in this information would be materials on curriculum innovation, school community projects and resources generally. The information should be readily accessible to schools and education groups and to be made available through a combination of existing networks and possible some co-ordinated clearing-house function.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and territory Minister for Education.

Response

The NSW Department of Education supported, in general, the further development of information sharing mechanisms but the implications of these activities for staffing and funding would depend on the outcomes of the recommended consultation between the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Education. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education accepted the notion of information sharing on a National basis and believed it had considerable merit and was willing to support this recommendation. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

Recommendation 1(f) That State and Territories give priority to providing arts in education curriculum information to the Curriculum Information Network which is to be established by the Curriculum Development Centre.

Action

Curriculum Development Centre Council in partnership with State and Territory systems.

Response
Recommendation

1(g) That as a matter of urgency, a person be appointed to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs at a senior position. This person would act as education and the arts adviser/coordinator to the Minister.

Action

The Minister for education and Youth Affairs

Response

Supported by the Victorian Department of Education. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

2. That funds for establishing and subsidising arts access centres and arts schools in the community be allocated by the Commonwealth in the 1986 Budget as a matter of priority and that guidelines for the function, nature and operation of such centres and schools be provided by consultants.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Education and Cultural Ministers.

Response

The Office of the Minister for the Arts, NSW, responded to the Task Force report in relation to this recommendation by stating that the use of school facilities for arts purposes is actively pursued by the NSW Department of Education but there had been difficulties associated with security, therefore, further discussion with the Department was necessary. With respect to the use of school facilities and the proposal for Commonwealth-funded arts access centres, reference should be made to the NSW Cultural Grants Advisory Council, as it was desirable to ensure that there was no unnecessary duplicating of funds under this program and Commonwealth funding arrangements. (Response to the Task Force from the Office of the Minister for Arts, NSW, dated 27 March 1985)
The **South Australian Department of Education** supported this recommendation taking into account that in relation to a comprehensive school, the art programme should be an integral part of the total school curriculum; the involvement of the community is critical in terms of planning management; the Education Department would need to be involved in the setting up and management of the schools; the initiative should come from the local communities. (*response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)*

The **Western Australian Education Department** stated that given the patterns of educational spending by the Commonwealth on education in Government schools in real terms in recent years this recommendation inevitably means the ear-marking of existing funds for a specific Commonwealth-determined purpose. It was consistent with the Commonwealth's recent practice but it felt would be opposed by all State Governments. (*responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)*

The **Tasmanian Education Department** was supportive of this recommendation in principle but felt that priority should be given to providing funds for the training of teachers especially through in-service training. (*response to the Task Force report by the Tasmanian Department of Education, dated 11 April 1985)*

### Recommendation

3. That the Minister for education and Youth Affairs seeks the co-operation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to encourage educational institutions to make their facilities available outside regular hours for arts activities.

### Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Education Ministers.
Response
The NSW Department of Education responded to this recommendation by stating that the use of school buildings for arts activities outside regular hours occurs on a limited basis. The response stated that should arts access centres be established (and make use of Departmental buildings) the continued funding basis and management structure would require further detailed discussion. The Department highlighted problems associated with security, cleaning and associated costs and agreed that these problems needed to be examined in detail. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education stated that community access to school and Departmental facilities is encouraged and in recent times had been taken into account. It felt that providing access allowed for better use of government owned facilities. It provided the school with a capacity to generate income and it assists the schools in establishing itself as the focus point of the community. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

Recommendation
4. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs supports the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment in seeking the provision of funds to maximise the use of existing buildings and facilities for cultural and creative purposes.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

Response
Recommendation

5. That funds be provided as a matter of priority for the training of community arts workers, and that the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission be asked to advise on the appropriate levels of funds required by tertiary and/or community institutions to provide this training.

Note: This recommendation should be forwarded to the Review of Arts Education and Training (CTEC) for consideration.

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission on advice from their Ministers.

Response

Recommendation

6. That Aboriginal arts, both traditional and contemporary, be promoted and developed by the employment of Aboriginal specialists to work within education programs at school and post-school levels and in formal and informal community-based activities. The content of such courses should be determined by Aboriginal people.

Action

Curriculum Development Centre, National Aboriginal Education Committee, Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs, State and Territory education authorities.

Response

The NSW Department of Education was generally in support of the overall aim of promoting the involvement and representation of the specified groups. The Department expressed some concern that children with Special Education needs had not been clearly identified. The Department was hopeful that the Newtown High School project would include Aboriginal Music and Dance courses. Some activities of this type were being funded through other programs such as D.S.P. and Multicultural Ed. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)
The South Australian Department of Education supported this recommendation stating that the Department would continue to work with the Aboriginal Community through groups such as the Aboriginal Education Unit and the Centre for Studies in Aboriginal Music. It cited a number of projects already undertaken in this area. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

**Recommendation**

7. That the arts of ethnic groups in the community be brought prominently into the school curriculum and that experience of these art forms be made available at arts centres and schools (out of school hours) and through weekend and evening courses at technical and further education (TAFE) institutions. The content should be determined by the participants.

**Action**

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and funding agencies.

**Response**

The NSW Department of Education response to this recommendation was that the Department’s Live Performances in Schools Program enabled groups specialising in ethnic music to perform for schools. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The Western Australian Education Department was critical of this recommendation and stated that it showed the absence of a system-related TAFE representative who would have been able to reflect the present position. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

**Recommendation**

8. That women be involved, both in schools and in community arts centres, in the design and implementation of courses and activities which value and promote the arts traditionally and currently practised by women.
Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission, Curriculum Development Centre, State and Territory curriculum sections, women's advisory groups.

Response

The NSW Department of Education response to this recommendation was that the promotion of more equitable access for women and girls to the arts in general, and to specific art education programs in schools is in accord with the Department's non-sexist education policy. The Department had two booklets which dealt with Visual Arts and Music. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The ACT Schools Authority expressed some reservations concerning this recommendation. It stated that the recommendation suggested a stereotyping of certain artforms which it believed to be quite inappropriate. (response to the Task Force report by the Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority, dated 2 May 1985)

This recommendation was strongly endorsed by the South Australian Department of Education stating that it had a policy on Equal Opportunity which was binding and impinges on all curriculum committees. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

Recommendation

9. That the Commonwealth provide funds to support major youth arts festivals in International Youth Year 1985 and in later years.

Action

Commonwealth Ministers for education and Youth Affairs and Home Affairs and Environment. (Action already taken for 1985)

Response
Recommendation 10. That the Commonwealth introduce and fund a craft traineeship program along the lines suggested jointly by the Crafts Council of Australia and Crafts Board of the Australia Council. Further, that traineeships on other arts and arts related areas be introduced along similar lines.

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (especially TAFE), Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

Response

The TAFE, South Australia, drew to the attention of the Task Force the Kirby Report in relation to arts traineeship scheme as an alternative to the PEP Program. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian TAFE, dated 23 may 1985)

Recommendation 11. That the Commonwealth provide funding under the Participation and Equity Program and earmark it for unemployed and underemployed young people to undertake practical training in the crafts, other art forms, and arts related areas.

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

The NSW Department of Education response to this recommendation was that this is seen as a response area for TAFE or other post secondary bodies. The Department stated that there was no scope within the NSW Department of Education's PEP Program for reallocation of existing funds to such a recommendation. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985).
Recommendation

12. That the review of youth support schemes currently undertaken by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs should proceed as quickly as possible. It is also recommended that there should be financial incentives for young unemployed and underemployed people to undertake training in the arts and part-time employment in arts related jobs.

Action

Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

Supported by the Victorian Education Department. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

13. That a study be made of the implications for arts education of the developments in communications technology

Action

Commonwealth and State Advisory Committee on the Educational Use of Communications Technology

Response

Supported by the Victorian Department of Education. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

14. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs have investigated the possibility of:

(a) introducing a scheme to provide self-instruction video tapes in the arts for use by children in remote areas

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.
Response
The NSW Department of Education responded to this recommendation by stating that it supported the recommendation. A proposal from the Department to develop self-instructional video tapes in music was submitted as a Project of National Significance in late 1984. Although unsuccessful, it was then under consideration by the Curriculum Development Centre. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation
14(b) establishing an 'arts caravan' in 1985 to take arts and education projects to geographically remote areas and appointing a consultant to advise in the function, nature and operation of the 'arts caravan' (or similar service such as the museum train)

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.

Response
The South Australian TAFE response noted that the establishment of the Arts Caravan had been tried in South Australia and had been found to be very expensive to set up and maintain. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian TAFE, dated 23 May 1985)

The NSW Department of Education responded to this recommendation by stating that the 'Arts' caravan concept is supported and that while the Musica Viva performances already provided opportunities the concept could be extended. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation
14(c) providing additional funds so that geographically isolated young people (both within and outside the school system) can attend arts events or camps in capital cities, and touring arts can be taken to them.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.
Response
The NSW Department of Education response to this recommendation was that Aboriginal culture camps had already been held in some regions of NSW and that the concept was very popular with the NSW Aboriginal Education Consultation Group. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation
15. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs establish through TAFE (and at a later stage through arts access centres in the community) a system whereby young people can learn about arts industry matters such as business administration, production and marketing so that they can learn to support themselves financially by arts activities.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, The Department of Education and Youth Affairs and the Commonwealth tertiary Education Commission (specifically the Technical and Further education Council).

Response
Supported by the NSW Department of TAFE. Courses on small business administration were already being provided. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Supported by the Victorian Department of Education. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation
16. That the Commonwealth establish an arts education grants program. The aim of the grants program would be to encourage teachers and schools to apply for funds to introduce innovative arts programs into schools and across schools at the grass-roots level.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory government and non-government systems.
Response

The NSW Department of Education responded to this recommendation by stating that the concept is supported but there was some concern that submission based funding can, in some cases, operate against equity, in that, funding is distributed on the basis of the quality of the submission rather than the level of need. In addition, the Department felt that the limited period of grants did not allow for a sequenced continuum of learning over an extended period of time. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The ACT Schools Authority expressed some reservations concerning this recommendation. It stated that encouragement of innovative programs is certainly important but unless such programs include provision for long term system and school support and appropriate mechanisms for extending the program beyond the initial context, then lasting system-wide improvement was limited. (response to the Task Force report by the Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority, dated 2 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education strongly supported this recommendation and stated that there was a need to increase the level of Commonwealth funding to arts education programmes and noted that the Australia Council, while providing limited funding in this area, did not regard it as a high priority. The Department noted that if the programme was established, government education authorities would be represented in the decision making process and it would, quite clearly, wish to be represented. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

The Victorian Education Department felt that guidelines, criteria and staffing etc would be required to ensure that funds are effectively spent. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The Tasmanian Department of Education supported this recommendation in principle but felt that without sufficient staff and requisite training and skills a grants program was unlikely to produce any long term benefits. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The Victorian Non-Government Schools PEP Committee felt that the establishment of an arts education grants program should not be supported as co-ordination of separate programs which would overlap existing programs would create confusion. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, by the Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)
Recommendation

17. That a high priority be given to providing funding of a K-12 cluster school program for dance/movement, preferably in a disadvantaged area. This pilot scheme should be documented in detail and the documentation, including evaluative reports, should be distributed to all relevant State and Territory authorities. In order to ensure that dance/movement is incorporated as a significant component of curriculum, it is essential that pilot programs are designed to run for a minimum of three years.

Action

Already implemented and funded by the Curriculum Development Centre

Response

The Victorian Department of Education fully supported this recommendation. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

18. That a significant proportion of Participation and Equity Program (PEP) funds, distributed to the States through the Commonwealth Schools Commission be earmarked for the development of innovative arts-focused curriculums with particular emphasis on involving young people over the compulsory school leaving age as the needs of this group are not being met by existing curriculums.

Action

State PEP Committees

Response

Both the Qld and the NT Department of Education PEP Committees strongly opposed this recommendation because it further fragments the program and because the program was for total school improvement not for specific needs of a particular group. (Responses to the Task Force Report by the Qld Dept. of Education and the NT Dept. of Education, dated 26 March 1985 and 11 April 1985)
The Victorian Schools non-government PEP Committee expressed some reservations concerning this recommendation. (Responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The NSW Department of Education responded to this recommendation by stating that there was no scope for such earmarking of PEP monies without additional funds. (Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation

19. That in all appropriate programs administered by the Commonwealth Schools Commission funding priority be given to achieve the goals for education and the arts stated in this report, and that particular emphasis be given to meeting the needs of disadvantaged groups such as the establishment of arts camps for isolated children, Aborigines and children from disadvantaged socio-economic areas.

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission in partnership with State and Territory authorities.

Response

The NSW Department of Education responded to this recommendation by stating that the intent of the recommendation was supported but the mechanisms would require a lot of discussion at the State level. For example, the Disadvantaged Schools Program and the Country Area Program were based on local identification of needs. A central decision to make the arts a priority needs area could be seen as contradictory to the intent of those established programs.(Response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education supported the priorities stated in the recommendation and cited a number of programmes it had established which supported them. (Response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)
Recommendation

20. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to immediately and substantially increase arts advisory and consultancy services in schools.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Ministers.

Response

The NSW Department of Education strongly supported the extension of consultancy services in the arts. The need for increased school level support in this area was also recognised. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education stated that it gives a high priority to the arts in the curriculum and provides an example of this priority by recognising the level of school support staff provided. Fourteen officers at the state central level are identified. The Department states that although the recommendation is supported in principle, the capacity to respond would be determined by the limitations of budget, the competing claims on this budget and the corporate plan which reflected the curriculum priorities of the Department. The Department was willing to maintain and increase the level of school support staff, insofar as the budget would allow. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

According to the Western Australian Education Department most of the art, music and drama activities were undertaken by specialist staff. Therefore, the Department believed that the recommendation was of less value to them than the other states. It stated that without wishing to labour the point the national committees were unlikely to attempt to find generic solutions to the situations of individual states. Therefore, such solutions were likely to be unsuccessful. (response to the Task Force by the Western Australian Department of Education, dated May 7 1985)

The Tasmanian Department Education stated that this proposal was supported but consultancy services cannot substitute for the training of teachers in schools and in times when the education budget is under great pressure in-service training should be given the highest priority. (response to the Task Force report by the Tasmanian Department of Education, dated 11 April 1985)
Recommendation

21. That Commonwealth funds for professional development, made available to the States through the Commonwealth Schools Commission be increased for 1986 and that a significant portion be earmarked for in-service courses in arts education for primary teachers, and training for arts advisers. These programs should be aimed to inspire teachers’ personal and professional interest in the arts.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Response

The NSW Department of Education strongly supported the recommendation for increased professional development funds in 1986. It noted that there was a reduction in the level of funding in 1984 and that this had reduced the professional development provision in a number of areas. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation

22. That the Commonwealth Schools Commission implement Recommendation 2.47 a) and b) of the 1977 report, Education and the Arts:
   a) 'that the Schools Commission provide guidance on design and standards to schools and education authorities with respect to arts facilities, with special attention to the needs of music, drama, dance and film and television’

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

The NSW Department of Education supported this recommendation and noted that much good work had occurred as part of the Newtown High project and that it would be in a position to advise the Commission, with respect to its facilities. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)
Recommendation

22(b)'that the Schools Commission provide funds within the general capital program to allow for allocation in all States of some pilot arts facilities which reflect desirable design features.'

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

Recommendation

23. That the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations be requested to develop materials on employment opportunities in the arts and related fields in conjunction with the Department of Home Affairs and Environment and the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. The materials should be suitable for use by school careers counsellors and the Commonwealth Employment Service.

Action

Departments of Employment and Industrial Relations, Home Affairs and Environment and Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

The NSW Department of Education strongly supported this recommendation stating that careers advisers would benefit by audio-visual and print materials in the area of the arts. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation

24. That the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in implementing Paragraph 25 of the 'Funding Guidelines for 1984' investigate and report on:
   a) the means for promoting the provision of teacher education courses in colleges which give due weight to arts education
Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

Response

The NSW Department of Education supported this recommendation and stated that it is increasingly important for teacher education institutions to provide teachers with broadly based competencies in arts education. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

Recommendation

24(b) the means for establishing new or modified courses designed to provide a broader background in the arts for students seeking to become specialist arts teachers

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

Response

The Victorian Department of Education strongly supported this recommendation. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

24 (c) the means for encouraging a limited number of institutions to mount external and part-time courses in the arts suited to the needs of teachers.

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

Response

Recommendation

25. That the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, in consultation with the States, develops a scheme of awards to assist practising artists to undertake teacher education programs. The scheme should be prepared for consideration in the context of the 1985-86 Federal Budget.
Action

Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in partnership with State and Territory authorities.

Response

The NSW Department of Education supported this recommendation as a means of increasing the pool of artistic talent available to the arts education in schools. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education supported this recommendation but stated it needed to be examined closely as it could be argued that much would be lost if artists were to become 'teaching artists'. It agreed that while the Department would wish to provide every support for artists wishing to undertake teacher education programmes it did not wish for artists without training, in the longer term, to be excluded from being involved in the school programs. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

Recommendation

26. That the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission give priority to the further development of programs such as theatre-in-education, youth arts (such as youth theatre), artists-in schools and dance-in-education, and other avenues for promotion to the community of education and the arts which would benefit young people.

Action

Australia Council and Australian Film Commission.

Response

Recommendation

27. That funds be made available to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs to commission research into the best methods of evaluating achievements in arts education and to conduct a national conference for establishing other priorities for research into arts education.
Action
Department of Education and Youth Affairs on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

Response
The NSW Department of Education supported this recommendation for researching evaluation achievements in arts education, as it stated that it was important that decisions regarding arts education were made on a firm data-base. *(response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)*

The ACT Schools Authority strongly supported this recommendation and felt that commissioning research into the best methods of evaluating achievements in the arts is a major issue. *(response to the Task Force report by the Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority, dated 2 May 1985)*

The Western Australian Department of Education felt that there was merit with the recommendation but stated it would duplicate what had been happening in the TAFE area in WA for years. *(response to the Task Force by the Western Australian Department of Education, dated May 7 1985)*

Recommendation
28. That the Curriculum Development Centre be asked to develop curriculum programs and activities arising from consideration of this report with emphasis on an integrated curriculum including arts.

Action
Curriculum Development Centre Council and Secretariat in partnership with State and Territory government and non-government education systems.

Response
The NSW Department of Education supported this recommendation acknowledging that the new primary Music curriculum and the draft Visual Arts and Drama document were in line with it. *(response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)*
The South Australian Department of Education supported this recommendation and wished to have input into the development and was also be happy to trial the materials. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian Department of Education, dated 19 April 1985)

The Tasmanian Department of Education was supportive of this recommendation but expressed some warnings concerning the difficulties for implementing it. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

29. That a designers-in-schools program, similar to the pilot architects-in-schools program, be developed by the Design Arts Board of the Australia Council in consultation with the appropriate education authorities.

Action

The Australia Council. (a project of this type is currently being funded by the Curriculum Development Centre).

Response

The Victorian Department of Education supported this recommendation but stated that there was a need to look at the problem of running pilot programs if there is no prospect of establishing on-going programs. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation

30. That funds be made available in 1984, through the Commonwealth Schools Commission Arts Education element of the Projects of National Significance Program, for the production of an audio visual kit (video/slide-tape) describing five outstanding arts projects. This kit is to be produced for widespread distribution.

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission (Project in progress).
Response
The Victorian Department of Education supported this recommendation but stated that criteria for selection must be spelt out. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation
31. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to inform artists working in schools of current arts curriculum policy and, where necessary, establish courses and workshops so that the artists may develop their work to complement current educational thinking at system and schools levels.

Action
The Minister for education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Ministers for Education.

Response
The NSW Department of Education supported this recommendation, as it was felt that artists operating in schools should be fully conversant with current educational thinking at system and school levels. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The South Australian Department of Education believed that the issue embraced in this recommendation was critical to the success of the artist-in-schools programmes and that the department would continue its practice of artists support.

The Western Australian Department of Education was unsure what was meant by this recommendation. It stated that it understood, under the Constitution, States have the responsibility for curriculum policy and that the Department was at a loss to determine what role the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs would have in this regard. It suggested that if on the other hand some newsletter to teachers working in the field was intended then the department would see the place for such a publication. (response to the Task Force by the Western Australian Department of Education, dated May 7 1985)

The Northern Territory Education Department specifically did not support this recommendation but commented that the non-institutionalised approach was refreshing. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, by the Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)
Recommendation
32. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment appropriately fund all subsidised arts organisations so that they can provide encouragement, opportunities and facilities for young people to express arts interests, for example through youth exhibitions, youth theatre, youth film.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

Response
The NSW Department of Education gave general support for the recommendations, although, it noted that they are stated in very general terms. The Department felt that it would be very useful to specify some sub-cultural groups that were worthy of particular attention when providing facilities and devising programs. (response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

The Victorian Department of Education supported this recommendation in general but expressed concerns that the general aim to fund all subsidised arts organisations was too ambitious. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, by the Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Recommendation
33. That the Australia Council encourage all arts organisations funded by them to make provision in their annual programs for projects which involve young people at all levels of the creative process.

Action
The Australia Council.

Response
The Victorian Department of Education supported this recommendation. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)
Recommendation

34. That film, video and radio, among the most influential contemporary art forms of interest to young people, be promoted and developed as a priority area in school curriculums.

Action

Australian Film Commission, Australian Film and Television School, Curriculum Development Centre.

Response

OTHER MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation

That nominees from all interested Commonwealth departments form an interdepartmental communications and liaison group on education and the arts.

Response

Recommendation

That a National Advisory Committee on the Arts in Education is established having the following general composition:

a) two representatives of appropriate Commonwealth Government departments one of whom shall be the chairperson
b) representatives of education authorities (government and non government) from States and Territories
c) artists with experience in young people’s arts
d) teachers of arts

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

Response

The South Australian TAFE, supported this recommendation and proposed that membership include a representative from each State Department of TAFE. (response to the Task Force report by the South Australian TAFE, dated 23 May 1985)
A summary of responses have been extracted from a document compiled by the Commonwealth Education Department titled, *Responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7* as well as specific documentation submitted by particular education authorities and agencies.

**New South Wales Department of Education**

The NSW Department of Education was in general, supportive of the Report's recommendations. There were only two reservations concerning the report. The first was that the recommendations would duplicate, to a degree, some of the actions already being undertaken as part of existing special purpose programs. The second, funding and administrative structures for implementing the report should take greater account of the need for a continuum of learning experiences in the arts over an extended period.

The NSW response suggested that close consultation between the Commonwealth and the State is needed to ensure the greatest possible integration between existing Departmental programs and structures. It agreed that the implications of the recommendations for staffing and funding would depend on the outcomes of the recommended consultation between the Commonwealth and State Ministers for Education.

While there was general support for many of the recommendations, for example, Recommendations 6-15, the Department of Education reminded the Task Force that a number of existing programs already cater for specified groups, such as the Country area Program and the Disadvantaged Schools Program.

In summary, the NSW Department of Education was prepared to cooperate with other States and the Northern Territory in developing mechanisms for an information sharing system for education and the arts. The Department was also willing to provide arts in education curriculum information to the Curriculum Information Network (CIN) established by the Curriculum Development Centre.

The Department was prepared to make available school facilities for arts in education outside of school hours provided that a suitable
funding basis and management structure was agreed to by the Commonwealth.

The Department was willing to participate in formal discussions initiated by the Commonwealth to explore additional ways of promoting the involvement and representation of Aborigines, ethnic groups and women in arts education. The department also agreed to expand its existing programs to provide greater access to arts education for children in remote areas but such expansion would be contingent on receiving additional funds for this purpose.

The Department was willing to set up procedures to support an arts in education grants program established by the Commonwealth. The Department would have been willing to increase the levels of arts advisory and consultancy services to schools if additional Commonwealth funds were available.

Similarly, if Commonwealth funds were increased for Professional development the department would undertake to provide additional inservice courses in arts education for primary teachers and training arts advisors.

The Department was willing to participate in a Commonwealth funded program to pilot art facilities which reflected desirable design features and collaborate in any program which will enable teachers to undertake courses in the arts. (from response to the Task Force report by the NSW Department of Education, dated 7 May 1985)

NSW Department of Technical and Further Education (TAFE)
The NSW TAFE Department supported the general thrust of the report. The NSW Department of TAFE wanted involvement in any implementation of the recommendations affecting TAFE.

Victorian Education Department
In general, strongly supportive of the recommendations of the report with only minor reservations.

Queensland Department of Education
Accepts and supports particular recommendations of the report but had some reservations with other recommendations. It was felt that such agreement would result in a distortion of policy within the Queensland Department of Education.

In the response the Department stated that it was a matter of concern that Commonwealth funding could be directed towards priorities which have not been selected by the State. From a Queensland point
of view it would be preferable to receive Commonwealth funds to support ongoing programs. The allocation of funds to provide for administrative structures or to establish a senior position which would duplicate what already exists in this State cannot be supported. The concept of developing infrastructures to duplicate the activity of the States in the field of Education cannot be endorsed.

Reservations must be expressed about the other recommendations for reasons already stated or because it is envisaged that their adoption would result in diminution of this State's constitutional duty towards Education or because agreement could result in a distortion of policy within the Department of Education. (Response to the Task Force Report by the Queensland Department of Education, dated 9 April 1985)

The Queensland Department of Education PEP Advisory Committee had reservations concerning Recommendation 18, which is concerned with earmarking funds for innovative arts-focused curricular. The Committee felt that earmarking of PEP funds by the Commonwealth for specific needs groups and/or for activities in specific areas was not in the best interests of the program, given that the focus of the PEP program is on total schools improvement with an emphasis on participatory decision making at the school level. (Response to the Task Force report by the Queensland Department of Education PEP Advisory Committee, dated 26 March 1985)

Education Department of Western Australia

The WA Department of Education was critical of the lack of representation on the Task Force Committee of school or system administrators, therefore stated that the report was of little value to the States. The WA Education Department also believed that the upgrading of the place of the arts in the school curriculum was a shared value position of most of the committee members. In conclusion, the WA Education Department's response is that the Report is of dubious value, because of the Task Force's inability to receive advice from school or system administrators and its 'centralist perspective'.

Excerpts, which are particularly relevant to this study, have been taken from the response by the WA Education Department's Deputy-Director General..

At the outset I would like to voice grave reservations about the composition of the Committee. By failing to include either a school or a system administrator the Committee was denied the benefit of a person who
could consider the administrative implications of any proposed changes. The result is clear in the Report.

The composition of the Committee also ensured that the upgrading of the place of the arts in the school curriculum was a shared value position from the outset. While I, personally, have sympathy for this point of view it adds yet another demand upon schools which are already under siege in regard to improved literacy, the extension of the teaching of foreign languages, the introduction of aboriginal studies and so on. In this respect the report is similar to the many reports on pre-service teacher education which have focused on the need to do more about a variety of areas but do not suggest aspects of curriculum which can be reduced in coverage or omitted altogether.

In relation to the recommendations
(1) The first recommendation reflects a view commonly held by those not involved in the direct provision of education that what happens in the schools of the nation is determined by agreements between Ministers, monitored by national committees and imposed on schools. The composition of the Committee made this view almost inevitable.
(2) ..the ear-marking of existing funds for specific Commonwealth-determined purpose. It is consistent with the Commonwealth's recent practice but would be opposed by all State governments.
(31) I am not sure what is meant by this Recommendation. What is meant by "current arts curriculum policy". I understand that, under the Constitution, States have the responsibility for curriculum policy and I am at a loss to determine what role the Minister for education and Youth affairs would have in this regard.

In conclusion
the Committee has sought to achieve its aims through the school sector. Its inability to receive advice from a person expert in that sector and the Committee's centralist perspective have combined to make its Report of dubious value in achieving its aims.

The Northern Territory Department of Education
The Northern Territory Department of Education was generally supportive of the Task Force report. The Department responded by identifying specific recommendations which it felt it could support. The only recommendation not supported was Recommendation 31,
(That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to inform artists working in schools of current arts curriculum policy and, where necessary, establish courses and workshops so that the artists may develop their work to complement current educational thinking at system and school levels.) The Department had found that in the case of the Artist-in-schools program, which had been operating in Northern Territory for five years, that it was the non-institutionalised approach by artists within the school environment that was so refreshing. The Department does qualify its positive position at times by stating while important, the Arts is but one focus of educational concern. It contends that Literacy, Numeracy, Health and Physical Education, Languages Other than English and Computer Education were all current priorities at that time and given that it is not possible, within existing resources, to provide all curriculum areas comprehensive personnel support at all times, some flexibility was necessary. (Response to the Task Force report by the Northern Territory Department of Education, dated 2 April 1985)

A response by the Northern Territory Department of Education PEP Committee concerning Recommendation 18, that a significant proportion of PEP funds should be earmarked for the development of innovative arts-focused curricula, caused some concern. The Deputy Secretary of Schools (NT), responded by stating that while the NT PEP Committee recognised the value of the arts but the recommendation appeared to represent another 'add on' focus to the program which may have lead to a further fragmentation of the program and would not assist in clarifying or focusing the complex and difficult aims of the project, especially in relation to the particular population of Aboriginal students. (response to the Task Force report by the Northern Territory Department of Education on behalf of the PEP Committee, dated 11 April 1985).

South Australian Department of Education
The South Australian Department of Education was very supportive in principle of the recommendations it particularly referred to. The department would like to be involved in the implementation of these recommendations.

Tasmanian Education Department
The Tasmanian Department of Education was generally supportive as a whole, however, it did state that the report did not emphasise sufficiently the importance of staff training. The Department believed that this aspect should be the highest priority of all the recommendations provided in the report.

Another major concern of the Tasmanian Department was that budgetary restrictions would make it difficult to allocate sufficient
funds to bring about significant improvement in the immediate future. (responses to the recommendations of the Task Force report by the Tasmanian Department of Education, dated 11 April 1985)

ACT Schools Authority
The ACT Schools Authority in general supported the thrust of the recommendations affecting schools. The Authority singled out the strong need for improvement in both pre-service and inservice education. The Authority believed that an awareness program should have been undertaken in all states and territories to inform parents, teachers and students concerning the importance of the arts.

PEP Committee responses from four states

NSW PEP Committee
NSW did not support recommendation 18 (the earmarking of PEP funds for the development of innovative arts focused curricula).

Victorian Schools Non-government PEP Committee
The Victorian Schools Non-government PEP Committee strongly rejected recommendation 16 as it would overlap existing programs and may create confusion. The Committee also had reservations concerning recommendation 18.

Queensland State PEP Committee
The Queensland State PEP Committee generally accepted the report but did not accept recommendation 18. The Committee felt that it would not be in the program's best interest.

Northern Territory Government PEP Committee
The Northern Territory Government PEP Committee was generally supportive except for recommendation 18.

The Catholic Education Office of Western Australia
The Catholic Education Commission welcomed the focus on education and the arts but raised the following points in relation to the introduction of a special purpose program for 1986-1988 and funding issues. Firstly, it was concerned with the administration of the program at the state level and stated that the Catholic Education Commission sees a difficulty in the establishment of one body to administer program funds on behalf of government and non-government schools.

Secondly, the Commission made reference to the funding made available through the PEP Program for 1985 and stated that the
Western Australian Non-Government PEP Committee had limited funds generally and in 1985 has committed the greater part of these.

Also, in relation to funding, it appeared that the report was based on the expectation that states would make a substantial contribution. The Commission reminded the Task Force that Catholic schools had limited resources and any funding options would need to take this into account. (responses to the Task Force report by the Western Australian Catholic Education Office, dated 8 May 1985)
APPENDIX N

SPECIFIC RESPONSES BY COMMONWEALTH/FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND ORGANISATIONS TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE TASK FORCE

Recommendations

1. First and foremost among our recommendations is the vital requirement that mechanisms be set up by Ministers to ensure that the development of arts education gains rather than loses momentum over the coming years. To this end we recommend:

(a) That a joint standing committee be established by the Australian Education Council and the Cultural Minister’s Council to coordinate and monitor the implementation of policy on education and the arts and to report regularly on progress to the Councils.

Action

Already taken (The Task Force)

Response

A Working Group established by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, comprising officers from Commonwealth, State and Territory Departments of Education and the Arts considered the composition and terms of reference of the proposed joint standing committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

Following a request from the Conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers with Responsibility for Arts and Cultural Affairs, the Australian Education Council endorsed a proposal to establish a Joint Ministerial Committee to co-ordinate and monitor the implementation of policies on education and the arts. The Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers was to be made up of the Commonwealth Minister responsible for cultural affairs and the Commonwealth Minister responsible for education together with four Ministers from four different States and Territories, two being responsible for education and two responsible for cultural affairs.
The Commonwealth Schools Commission stated that the proposed joint Committee should include membership which is sex-equitable and be informed regarding sex bias in the arts. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers first met on 26 September 1986. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

1(b) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs publishes annually a report on progress in the arts and education.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

Response

The Report was under review according to the Commonwealth Education Department, as at, September 1986. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

1(c) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to establish national goals in the arts and education. As a simple concrete measure to ensure that progress is made, schools should aim for 20 per cent of school time to be devoted to the arts in primary school and to Year 8 of secondary school, and a minimum of 10 per cent of time in Years 9 and 10. This should be achieved by the Bicentenary.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Minister of Education.
Response
This recommendation was referred to the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

The commissioned paper included in the NAAS project, a discussion of the arts in schools to the Year 2000 was directly related to this recommendation. The commissioned paper had been cast in a way so that there could be an element of speculation in dealing with what was contested in the school curriculum as being important. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

Recommendation

1(d) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the agreement of State and Northern Territory Ministers in developing a mechanism to facilitate uniform monitoring of progress in the collection of Commonwealth, State and Territory statistics in arts education. There should be published annually statistical collections, desirably computer based, indicating in objective form the level of effort in arts education, (Note: this may be done in conjunction with the Minister’s annual report mentioned in recommendation 1c).

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Ministers for Education.

Response
According to the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Environment, if a statistical advisory group was established there should be co-operation with any mechanism developed to facilitate uniform monitoring of progress in the collection of Commonwealth, State and Territory statistics in arts education. The Department suggested that the report of the Commonwealth/State Task Force on Culture/Leisure Statistics, which was established by the Cultural Ministers in June 1983, and considered at the Cultural Ministers Council late in 1985, should be considered. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)
This recommendation was referred to the **Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers**. *(Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)*

This recommendation was being addressed by the NAAS project. *(Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)*

**Recommendation**

1(e) That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the agreement of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to develop a mechanism for an information sharing system for education and the arts. Included in this information would be materials on curriculum innovation, school community projects and resources generally. The information should be readily accessible to schools and education groups and to be made available through a combination of existing networks and possible some co-ordinated clearing-house function.

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and territory Minister for Education.

**Response**

The **Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment** suggested to the Task Force that other relevant Commonwealth cultural authorities, e.g. the Australia Council, the Australian Film Commission and the Australian Film and Television School, be given the opportunity to participate in this mechanism. *(response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)*

This recommendation was referred to the **Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers**. *(Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)*

The **NAAS project** included a task which was directly related to this recommendation. The task was to examine the feasibility of an information network and recommend how it could be established.
Recommendation

1(f) That State and Territories give priority to providing arts in education curriculum information to the Curriculum Information Network which is to be established by the Curriculum Development Centre.

Action

Curriculum Development Centre Council in partnership with State and Territory systems.

Response

According to the response by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, the expectations that CIN (Curriculum Information network) could be used for purpose outlined in the recommendation could not be met given its state of development at that time. (Response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, undated)

This recommendation was referred to the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force, dated December 1985)

The NAAS project included a task which was directly related to this recommendation. The task was to examine the feasibility of an information network and recommend how it could be established. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

1(g) That as a matter of urgency, a person be appointed to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs at a senior position. This person would act as education and the arts adviser/coordinator to the Minister.
Action

The Minister for education and Youth Affairs

Response

A permanent position was established by the Commonwealth Department of Education as a result of the Task Force report. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)

Recommendation

2. That funds for establishing and subsidising arts access centres and arts schools in the community be allocated by the Commonwealth in the 1986 Budget as a matter of priority and that guidelines for the function, nature and operation of such centres and schools be provided by consultants.

Response

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Education and Cultural Ministers.

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment responded to this recommendation by stating that it would ensure that it is drawn to the attention of the Cultural Minister's Council meeting in August or September, 1985. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

The Australia Council agreed for the need for facilities for arts activities. It stated that the Council and the AETT have jointly initiated a project to document all performing arts venues throughout Australia. About 2,300 venues were identified. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

This recommendation was to be referred to the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)
Recommendation

3. That the Minister for education and Youth Affairs seeks the co-operation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to encourage educational institutions to make their facilities available outside regular hours for arts activities.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Education Ministers.

Response

This recommendation was to be referred to by the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

4. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs supports the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment in seeking the provision of funds to maximise the use of existing buildings and facilities for cultural and creative purposes.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

Response

According to the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, the States would have needed to agree to the multiple use of the facilities and there would need to be a Budget appropriation for that purpose. According to the Department, at the time, the 'present climate' did not make it seem likely for this to succeed. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)
Recommendation

5. That funds be provided as a matter of priority for the training of community arts workers, and that the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission be asked to advise on the appropriate levels of funds required by tertiary and/or community institutions to provide this training.

Note: This recommendation should be forwarded to the Review of Arts Education and Training (CTEC) for consideration.

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission on advice from their Ministers.

Response

In response to the Task Force recommendation, the Australian Film Commission stated that the Australian Film and Television School would be more appropriate in terms of training. The Commission was supportive, however, only to the extent that funds be provided for tertiary training. (Response by the Australian Film Commission to the Task force dated 26 March 1985)

The Commonwealth Schools Commission believed that the training of community arts workers and funding of provisions and facilities should be developed along lines that promoted sex equity in the arts. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The Australia Council's Community Arts Board agreed that tertiary institutions might have a role to play in the training of community arts workers. The Council stated that advice on the appropriate level of funding and the development of new resources would be matters arising from the inquiry by the CTEC into arts training in Australia. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

Funding was not made available for this recommendation. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

6. That Aboriginal arts, both traditional and contemporary, be promoted and developed by
the employment of Aboriginal specialists to work within education programs at school and post-school levels and in formal and informal community-based activities. The content of such courses should be determined by Aboriginal people.

Action

Curriculum Development Centre, National Aboriginal Education Committee, Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs, State and Territory education authorities.

Response

The Australia Council stated in relation to this recommendation that while it attached great importance to this area, it is the Council's belief that the continuing support of a good number of cultural education or arts-in-education programs is most properly the responsibility of education authorities. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

The NAAS project was to consult with the NAEC on aboriginal arts in the curriculum. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

This recommendation was referred to the Joint Committee for Cultural and Education Ministers. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

The National Aboriginal Education Committee (NAEC) fully supported the implementation of this recommendation. It was suggested that the Arts Education Fund of the Curriculum Development Centre, the Projects of National Significance, Participation and Equity Program and Aboriginal Capital Works Program should accommodate this recommendation in their funding allocations. The NAEC considered it would be reasonable to allocate about 10% of all resource allocated to implementation of the Task Force report to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts education. response from the NAEC to the Department of Education dated 22 March 1985)
Recommendation

7. That the arts of ethnic groups in the community be brought prominently into the school curriculum and that experience of these art forms be made available at arts centres and schools (out of school hours) and through weekend and evening courses at technical and further education (TAFE) institutions. The content should be determined by the participants.

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission and funding agencies.

Response

The Australia Council was supportive of this recommendation but stated that while Education Departments maintain a narrow view of what goes into schools and where accreditation hinges on academic status, the arts of ethnic groups cannot be brought more prominently into the community. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

This recommendation was a Curriculum Development Centre policy issue and the NAAS project was obliged to examine its work in relation to gender and multicultural issues. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

This recommendation was referred to the Joint Committee for Cultural and Education Ministers. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

8. That women be involved, both in schools and in community arts centres, in the design and implementation of courses and activities which value and promote the arts traditionally and currently practised by women.

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission, Curriculum Development Centre, State and Territory curriculum sections, women's advisory groups.
Response

The Equity Programs, Commonwealth Schools Commission, response to this recommendation was that educational leadership and participation by women is a concern of the CSC. The Commission has attempted to encourage this notion by requiring committees disbursing funds to have a member who was an Equality of Opportunity Officer. The Commission felt that the way the recommendation was worded was inadequate. (response to the Task Force report by the Equity Programs, Commonwealth Schools Commission, dated 22 April 1985)

The Australia Council stated that the emphasis of women's arts activities in the school curriculum is essentially a State responsibility. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

This recommendation was a Curriculum Development Centre policy issue and the NAAS project was obliged to examine its work in relation to gender and multicultural issues. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

Recommendation

9. That the Commonwealth provide funds to support major youth arts festivals in International Youth Year 1985 and in later years.

Action

Commonwealth Ministers for education and Youth Affairs and Home Affairs and Environment. (Action already taken for 1985)

Response

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment noted at the time of the recommendation, the Australia Council has established in Inter-board committee to examine the possibilities for youth art festivals, where more than two art forms were represented. The Commonwealth had already taken that initiative in 1985 and further developments were planned. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

The Department of Education and Youth Affairs in 1984 allocated substantial funds to youth festivals and also administered a national CEP project which employed 4 young people in each State and Territory to work on the festivals under the supervision of festival directors. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)
This recommendation was referred to the Joint Committee for Cultural and Education Ministers. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

**Recommendation**

10. That the Commonwealth introduce and fund a craft traineeship program along the lines suggested jointly by the Crafts Council of Australia and Crafts Board of the Australia Council. Further, that traineeships on other arts and arts related areas be introduced along similar lines.

**Action**

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (especially TAFE), Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

**Response**

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment supported the Australia Council’s proposal that the Department of Education fund a training program in the Crafts. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

The Australia Council recommended that the Department of Education and Youth Affairs consider funding thirty training programs in the crafts over three years at a total of $392,000. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

No specific action was taken; there was a possibility that arts traineeships could be established under the Kirby report. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)

**Recommendation**

11. That the Commonwealth provide funding under the Participation and Equity Program and earmark it for unemployed and underemployed young people to undertake practical training in the crafts, other art forms, and arts related areas.

**Action**

Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Department of Education and Youth Affairs.
Response
In the response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre is stated that the PEP program was considering funding a national arts project in keeping with the sentiment of the report through its national management committee. The decision was to be made by April 1985. (Response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, undated)

According to the Commonwealth Department of Education funding for this recommendation was not available. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation
12. That the review of youth support schemes currently undertaken by the Department of Education and Youth Affairs should proceed as quickly as possible. It is also recommended that there should be financial incentives for young unemployed and underemployed people to undertake training in the arts and part-time employment in arts related jobs.

Action
Department of Education and Youth Affairs.

Response
The Commonwealth had announced general revised income support arrangements. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation
13. That a study be made of the implications for arts education of the developments in communications technology

Action
Commonwealth and State Advisory Committee on the Educational Use of Communications Technology

Appendix N
Response
Supported by the National Aboriginal Education Committee. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

Supported by the Australia Council. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

The NAAS project was to incorporate this recommendation in the commissioned paper on the arts and technology. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

According to the Commonwealth Department of Education funding was not available for this recommendation. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

14. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs have investigated the possibility of:

(a) introducing a scheme to provide self-instruction video tapes in the arts for use by children in remote areas

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.

Response
Specific curriculum projects were referred to the Arts Advisory Committee and considered during the Curriculum Development Centre sponsored conference. (response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, undated)

The Australia Council stated that ongoing reviews of Council and Board's programs will include a reference to quality pilot schemes in the areas mentioned in the recommendation. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)
According to the **Commonwealth Department of Education** a long distance music education program was being developed in NSW as a pilot for nation release. *(Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)*

The **National Aboriginal Education Committee (NAEC)** fully supported the implementation of this recommendation. It was suggested that the Arts Education Fund of the Curriculum Development Centre, the Projects of National Significance, Participation and Equity Program and Aboriginal Capital Works Program should accommodate this recommendation in their funding allocations. The NAEC considered it would be reasonable to allocate about 10% of all resource allocated to implementation of the Task Force report to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts education. *Response from the NAEC to the Department of Education dated 22 March 1985*

**Recommendation**

14(b) establishing an 'arts caravan' in 1985 to take arts and education projects to geographically remote areas and appointing a consultant to advise in the function, nature and operation of the 'arts caravan' (or similar service such as the museum train)

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.

**Response**

Specific curriculum projects were referred to the Arts Advisory Committee and considered during the **Curriculum Development Centre** sponsored conference. *Response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, undated*

**Recommendation**

14(c) providing additional funds so that geographically isolated young people (both within and outside the school system) can attend arts events or camps in capital cities, and touring arts can be taken to them.

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and National Aboriginal Education Committee.
Response
Specific curriculum projects were referred to the Arts Advisory Committee and considered during the Curriculum Development Centre sponsored conference. Response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, undated

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment stated that the Commonwealth was seeking to have 'Youth Arts' placed on the agenda for the August/September meeting of the Cultural Ministers Council. The purpose of the item was to advise the States and Territories of Commonwealth activities in this area and to seek their advice on current or proposed programs. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

According to the Commonwealth Department of Education funding for this recommendation was not available. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

15. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs establish through TAFE (and at a later stage through arts access centres in the community) a system whereby young people can learn about arts industry matters such as business administration, production and marketing so that they can learn to support themselves financially by arts activities.

Action
The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, The Department of Education and Youth Affairs and the Commonwealth tertiary Education Commission (specifically the Technical and Further education Council).

Response
The Commonwealth Schools Commission felt that advice in this area should be included in schools as career information, not only from TAFE. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)
The **Australia Council** was supportive of this recommendation. *(responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)*

According to the **Commonwealth Department of Education** this recommendation was referred to the CTEC and was under consideration. *(Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)*

**Recommendation**

16. That the Commonwealth establish an arts education grants program. The aim of the grants program would be to encourage teachers and schools to apply for funds to introduce innovative arts programs into schools and across schools at the grass-roots level.

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory government and non-government systems.

**Response**

According to the **Commonwealth Department of Education** the funding for this recommendation was not available. *(Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)*

**Recommendation**

17. That a high priority be given to providing funding of a K-12 cluster school program for dance/movement, preferably in a disadvantaged area. This pilot scheme should be documented in detail and the documentation, including evaluative reports, should be distributed to all relevant State and Territory authorities. In order to ensure that dance/movement is incorporated as a significant component of curriculum, it is essential that pilot programs are designed to run for a minimum of three years.

**Action**

Already implemented and funded by the Curriculum Development Centre
Response

The **Australia Council** responded to this recommendation by stating that the relatively low esteem accorded dance in education should be redressed. The pilot scheme suggested should be expanded. *(response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)*

A project similar to the recommendation had been funded by the Curriculum Development Centre during 1984/85. *(Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)* and *(Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)*

According to a paper from the Commonwealth Schools Commission to the Department of Education, the CSC had acted on this recommendation with variable success. *(Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)*

**Recommendation**

18. That a significant proportion of Participation and Equity Program (PEP) funds, distributed to the States through the Commonwealth Schools Commission be earmarked for the development of innovative arts-focused curriculums with particular emphasis on involving young people over the compulsory school leaving age as the needs of this groups are not being met by existing curriculums.

**Action**

State PEP Committees

**Response**

The Youth Arts element proposed by the **NAAS Project** related directly to this recommendation. The Arts Advisory Committee decided that the NAAS project would make it a major component as was an important school/work area for development not able to be undertaken by other Commonwealth initiatives. The NAAS project was criticised for this emphasis. *(Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)*
According to the Commonwealth Department of Education this recommendation was referred to the State PEP Committees which disagreed with the recommendation. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

**Recommendation**

19. That in all appropriate programs administered by the Commonwealth Schools Commission funding priority be given to achieve the goals for education and the arts stated in this report, and that particular emphasis be given to meeting the needs of disadvantaged groups such as the establishment of arts camps for isolated children, Aborigines and children from disadvantaged socio-economic areas.

**Action**

Commonwealth Schools Commission in partnership with State and Territory authorities.

**Response**

The Commonwealth Schools Commission response to these recommendations was that although it is an area that the Schools Commission could play a significant role its initiatives are limited by resources. The process was passed to the CSC Advisory Committee on Education and the Arts. (Response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, undated)

In a second response from the Commonwealth Schools Commission is was stated that Education and the Arts was recognised as a priority area in a number of programs. It could be strengthened further but only after assessment of its relevance in the overall context of each program. According to the CSC, this also depends on the willingness of the States to comply. (second response to the Task Force report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, dated 20 May 1985)

Arts education was recognised within the Commonwealth Schools Commission as a priority area. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)
According to a paper from the Commonwealth Schools Commission to the Department of Education, the CSC had acted on this recommendation with variable success. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

**Recommendation**

20. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of State and Northern Territory Ministers to immediately and substantially increase arts advisory and consultancy services in schools.

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs in partnership with State and Territory Ministers.

**Response**

This recommendation was to be referred to the Joint Committee of Cultural and education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)

This recommendation was referred to the **Joint Committee for Cultural and Education Ministers**. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

**Recommendation**

21. That Commonwealth funds for professional development, made available to the States through the Commonwealth Schools Commission be increased for 1986 and that a significant portion be earmarked for in-service courses in arts education for primary teachers, and training for arts advisers. These programs should be aimed to inspire teachers' personal and professional interest in the arts.

**Action**

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and Commonwealth Schools Commission.
Response

The Commonwealth Schools Commission responded to this recommendation by stating that it depended upon the final outcome of the ERC, QERC, the 1985/86 Budget and CSC review of its Program Guidelines for 1986. (second response to the Task Force report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, dated 20 May 1985)

According to the Commonwealth Department of Education funding for this recommendation was not available. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

22. That the Commonwealth Schools Commission implement Recommendation 2.47 a) and b) of the 1977 report, Education and the Arts:
   a) 'that the Schools Commission provide guidance on design and standards to schools and education authorities with respect to arts facilities, with special attention to the needs of music, drama, dance and film and television'

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

The Commonwealth Schools Commission noted that the cost of providing the facilities is often extremely high and beyond the capacity of many school authorities. The Commission suggests for this reason consideration should be given to devising ways in which facilities may be shared or schools gain access to community facilities. The funding and mounting of the study had been listed for consideration by the CSC in the 1985-86 financial year and after the proposed School Building Advisory Committee had been established. (second response to the Task Force report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, dated 20 May 1985)

According to the Commonwealth Department of Education no action was taken on this recommendation. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)
Recommendation

22(b)'that the Schools Commission provide funds within the general capital program to allow for allocation in all States of some pilot arts facilities which reflect desirable design features.'

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

The Commonwealth Schools Commission responded to this recommendation by stating that the proposal that the Commission provide funds within a Capital Grants Program specifically for pilot art facilities would not accord with the current policies on funding capital projects. The Commission acknowledged that if implemented, it might also create expectations of future Commonwealth funding that cannot be fulfilled. It noted that the CSC is a relatively minor contributor to capital projects in the government and non-government school sectors (government 30% and non-government 20%) (second response to the Task Force report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, dated 20 May 1985)

According to the Commonwealth Department of Education no action was taken on this recommendation. (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

23. That the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations be requested to develop materials on employment opportunities in the arts and related fields in conjunction with the Department of Home Affairs and Environment and the Department of Education and Youth Affairs. The materials should be suitable for use by school careers counsellors and the Commonwealth Employment Service.

Action

Departments of Employment and Industrial Relations, Home Affairs and Environment and Education and Youth Affairs.
Response

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment advised the Task Force that it would like to co-operate with the departments of Employment and Industrial Relations and Education in the development of the materials on employment opportunities in the arts and related fields. The Department felt it was important to involve Commonwealth, State and Territory cultural authorities in the development of these materials. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

The Department of Employment and Industrial Relations did not accept this recommendation as it believed that the existing range of information in the "Artistic and Creative" field in relation to the CES's total information store, is substantial given the need with limited resources to provide information on the whole range of occupations relating to work. (responses to the Recommendations of the Task Force on Education and the Arts, Department of Education, Attachment C, pp. 1-7)

No action was taken with this recommendation as the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations did not accept it. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

24. That the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in implementing Paragraph 25 of the 'Funding Guidelines for 1984' investigate and report on:
   a) the means for promoting the provision of teacher education courses in colleges which give due weight to arts education

Action

Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

Response

This recommendation was awaiting the publication of the Joint CTEC/Australia Council Review of the Arts Education and Training. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)
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Recommendation
24(b) the means for establishing new or modified courses designed to provide a broader background in the arts for students seeking to become specialist arts teachers

Action
Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

Response

Recommendation
24 (c) the means for encouraging a limited number of institutions to mount external and part-time courses in the arts suited to the needs of teachers.

Action
Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission

Response

Recommendation
25. That the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, in consultation with the States, develops a scheme of awards to assist practising artists to undertake teacher education programs. The scheme should be prepared for consideration in the context of the 1985-86 Federal Budget.

Action
Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in partnership with State and Territory authorities.

Response
This recommendation was to be referred to the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)
Recommendation

26. That the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission give priority to the further development of programs such as theatre-in-education, youth arts (such as youth theatre), artists-in schools and dance-in-education, and other avenues for promotion to the community of education and the arts which would benefit young people.

Action

Australia Council and Australian Film Commission.

Response

In response to the recommendation the Australian Film Commission stated whilst in agreement with the thrust of the recommendation with its limited resources it would be difficult to address this issue as a matter of priority. (Response by the Australian Film Commission to the Task Force dated 26 March 1985)

The Australia Council responded to this recommendation by stating that support would be subject to the Board’s budget proposals and that much depended on broadening the base of support through Education Departments (both State and federal) and long term systemic changes within education structures. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

Recommendation

27. That funds be made available to the Department of Education and Youth Affairs to commission research into the best methods of evaluating achievements in arts education and to conduct a national conference for establishing other priorities for research into arts education.

Action

Department of Education and Youth Affairs on advice from the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs.

Response

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment stated that it would like to be involved in this conference. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)
A research programme was established by the Commonwealth Department of Education to investigate the effectiveness of arts courses (School/TAFE) 1985. Also a review and evaluation of current arts programs was to be undertaken in 1986. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

A national seminar on arts education was held in August 1985 by the Curriculum Development Centre. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985)

**Recommendation**

28. That the Curriculum Development Centre be asked to develop curriculum programs and activities arising from consideration of this report with emphasis on an integrated curriculum including arts.

**Action**

Curriculum Development Centre Council and Secretariat in partnership with State and Territory government and non-government education systems.

**Response**

According to the response to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre, 'while common curriculum issues are an overall concern of the CDC and the 'integrated curriculum' is part of the discussion, projects of an action-research nature are needed to demonstrate the strength of the arts in education case. (response to the Task Force report by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, undated)

The Curriculum Development Centre planned a national 2 year arts education program to embrace this recommendation. The NAAS project also embraces this recommendation. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)
Recommendation

29. That a designers-in-schools program, similar to the pilot architects-in-schools program, be developed by the Design Arts Board of the Australia Council in consultation with the appropriate education authorities.

Action

The Australia Council. (a project of this type is currently being funded by the Curriculum Development Centre).

Response

The Australia Council suggested that providing the Board received the funding it sought it could allocate $35,000 to introduce the programs to schools in all states. The program would be ready to commence in 1986. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

A project of this type was funded in 1985 by the Curriculum Development Centre. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

30. That funds be made available in 1984, through the Commonwealth Schools Commission Arts Education element of the Projects of National Significance Program, for the production of an audio visual kit (video/slide-tape) describing five outstanding arts projects. This kit is to be produced for widespread distribution.

Action

Commonwealth Schools Commission (Project in progress).
Response

The Australia Council stated that officers of the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Australia Council had already implemented a series of proposals based on the priorities of this recommendation. The Curriculum Development Centre, Film Australia and education resource centres throughout Australia would be involved in making, marketing and distributing the resource kit. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

During 1985 this project was organised jointly by the Schools Commission/Australia Council initiative. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

According to a paper from the Commonwealth Schools Commission to the Department of Education, the CSC had acted on this recommendation with variable success. (Task Force and NAAS report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission from the Curriculum Development Centre, dated 9 July 1986)

In a letter from the Executive Officer, Department of Education to the Secretary of the Department of Education, dated 9 July 1986, it was stated the carriage of the recommendation was the joint responsibility of the CDC and the Australia Council. Each agency had committed $50 000 to the project and the money allocated in 1984 was being held by the NSW Arts Council. She stated that continued consultation between the CDC and the Australia Council had produced little progress. There was an impasse between the CDC and the Australia Council on the choice of a producer as well as other disagreements. She concluded that with the apparent continuing stalemate the portfolio was vulnerable to questioning on implementation of this project. (letter from Executive Officer to the Secretary, Commonwealth Department of Education, dated 9 July 1986)

Recommendation

31. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs seeks the cooperation of the State and Northern Territory Ministers to inform artists working in schools of current arts curriculum policy and, where necessary, establish courses and workshops so that the artists may develop their work to complement current educational thinking at system and schools levels.
Action

The Minister for education and Youth Affairs in consultation with State and Territory Ministers for Education.

Response

The Australia Council commented that there was an obvious corollary to the suggestion that artists working in schools be informed of current arts curriculum policy. (response to the Task Force report by the Australia Council, dated 10 April 1985)

This recommendation was to be referred to the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers. (Action on recommendations of the Task Force by the Department of Education, dated December 1985) and (Attachment D, Agenda Item for the Joint Committee of Cultural and Education Ministers, circulated by Commonwealth Education, September 1986)

Recommendation

32. That the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment appropriately fund all subsidised arts organisations so that they can provide encouragement, opportunities and facilities for young people to express arts interests, for example through youth exhibitions, youth theatre, youth film.

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment.

Response

According to the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, the Australia Council and the Australian Film Commission were the vehicles through which the Government provides funds to such organisations in this portfolio. The internal allocation of their respective Budget appropriations is, of course, a matter for the Council and the Commission. In this regard, the Department noted, that the Australian Film Commission already provided support for young people to express arts interests and that the Australia Council's ongoing review of Council and Board's programs of support and budget proposals were relevant to this recommendation. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)
Recommendation

33. That the Australia Council encourage all arts organisations funded by them to make provision in their annual programs for projects which involve young people at all levels of the creative process.

Action

The Australia Council.

Response

Recommendation

34. That film, video and radio, among the most influential contemporary art forms of interest to young people, be promoted and developed as a priority area in school curriculums.

Action

Australian Film Commission, Australian Film and Television School, Curriculum Development Centre.

Response

In response to this recommendation, the Australian Film and Television School reported that notwithstanding it's principal responsibility for training creative people to work in production and the stringencies of its budgetary situation, the School was pleased to see the Task Force report and confirmed that it will do all it could to assist the development of film, video and radio as contemporary art forms in school curricula. (Australia Film and Television School response to the Task Force, March 25, 1985)

The Australian Film Commission responded by stating that it wholeheartedly endorsed this recommendation and would be happy to contribute to the formulation of a curriculum and the production of adequate resources. (Australia Film Commission response to the Task Force dated March 26, 1985)

OTHER MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation

That nominees from all interested Commonwealth departments form an interdepartmental communications and liaison group on education and the arts.
Response
The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment supported the proposed formation of the interdepartmental communications and liaison group on education and the arts and stated that it wished representation on the body. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

Recommendation

That a National Advisory Committee on the Arts in Education is established having the following general composition:

a) two representatives of appropriate Commonwealth Government departments one of whom shall be the chairperson
b) representatives of education authorities (government and non government) from States and Territories
c) artists with experience in young people’s arts
d) teachers of arts

Action

The Minister for Education and Youth Affairs

Response

The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment noted the proposed National Advisory Committee, which was to be established by the Minister for Education, and including, inter alia, two representatives of appropriate Commonwealth Government departments nominated from the proposed interdepartmental communications and liaison group, as well as artists with experience in youth arts. It was the Department’s view that as one of it’s Ministers portfolios, was responsibility for the arts, that it would be appropriate for the Department to provide one of the two Departmental representatives on the Advisory Committee. It also considered that it should be consulted in regard to the artist nominations. (response to the Task Force report by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, dated 8 August 1985)

At the February 1985 meeting of the Council of the Curriculum Development Centre decided to establish an Education and the Arts Advisory Committee to advise Council on the use of available funds, develop a policy for education and the arts based on the report and organise a two day workshop/conference on curriculum issues arising from the report. (Responses to the Task Force by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development centre, undated)
APPENDIX O
MANAGEMENT AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE
NATIONAL ARTS IN AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS PROJECT

The NAAS Management Committee

George Berkeley, Director-General of Education (Qld) - later replaced by Ian Matheson;

Amos Dixon Director of Curriculum (Qld);

John Pollock (nominee Gus Henry) Superintendent Curriculum (NT);

Bill Hannan Office of the Minister for Education (Vic);

Peter Gebhardt Flynn, Murone and Co.;

Rob Adams (nominee Terrence Warry) Deputy General Manager, Australia Council;

Dahle Suggett, Assistant Director Curriculum Development Centre (ACT);

Libby Smith Senior Curriculum Officer, Curriculum Development Centre (ACT);

Lionel Lawrence Victorian College of the Arts (Vic),

Andrea Hull Director Australia Council (NSW);

Deanna Hoerman NSW Department of Education.

The Advisory Committee (Policy Advice)

Peter Gebhardt Chair, CDC Council;

Bill Hannan CDC Council;

Dahle Suggett Assistant Director, CDC;

Deanna Hoerman DEO, NSW;

Andrea Hull Director, Australia Council;

Libby Smith CDC
APPENDIX P

NATIONAL ARTS IN AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS PROJECT
FUNDING STRUCTURES

The Budget
The budget negotiated/agreed between the Queensland Department of Education and the Commonwealth Schools Commission was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>1984/85</th>
<th>1985/86</th>
<th>1986/87</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(remaining funds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. of Nat. Sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>1985/86</th>
<th>1986/87</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Project Officers</td>
<td>83 000</td>
<td>99 000</td>
<td>182 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy (including travel)</td>
<td>65 490</td>
<td>58 890</td>
<td>124 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes basic salary rate V9 Qld Department of Education, increase of salaries 6% over 2 year period, 25.20% on cost expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Travel and Allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Project Officers</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>22 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 Officers around Australia, 18 days approx. $7,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 meetings per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single day meetings</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>14 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Art and Youth Commission</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>40 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Subject Associations</td>
<td>21 000</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Professional Development</td>
<td>9 500</td>
<td>9 500</td>
<td>19 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Early Childhood</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>10 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Information and Dissemination</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>40 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contingency</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>40 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was recommended that the Curriculum Development Centre of the Commonwealth Schools Commission, would disburse the following funds: $176 000 for 1985/86 and $217 000 for 1986/87 to the Queensland Department of Education and $40 000 to the Australia Council, while $14 000 would be retained to meet Management Committee expenses for two years.
APPENDIX Q
PROJECT SUMMARY:
REVIEW OF ARTS EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

Title of Project: REVIEW OF ARTS EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

Purpose of Project:
By means of a study conducted in New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria, involving State, Catholic and other private schools, the project will
• describe the philosophical bases of arts education programs.
• identify prevailing forms of arts education, their objectives and the means whereby they are provided,
• estimate the resources and proportion of school-time currently allocated at arts education in schools

The study will embrace music, drama, visual arts, dance movement and media. All levels of schooling - kindergarten, primary and secondary - will be covered.

Timetable for Project: including dates for progress and for final report
March-May: Collection and analysis of syllabi
May-June: Development of questionnaires for e.g. curriculum advisers; discussions with curriculum advisers and others
June-July: Development of questionnaires for principals, arts teachers and Parents and Citizens organisations; discussions with these groups
August-September: Classroom studies in selected schools
October: Preparation of report

Researchers: Mr M Hull
Organisation: Technisearch Ltd, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

Financial Calendar: Period Contract Funds
1985-86 $7000
1986-87 $8000