

MUSIC EDUCATORS' SEMINAR

**SCV TOORAK
FEBRUARY 3-4, 1977**

The seminar was called to open up communication between music educators involved in teacher education. The meeting was concerned with some very specific as well as general areas. Dr. Lett was invited to give an overview of music as one of the arts and also the need, for a rationale for arts in education. Dr. Skilbeck was invited to give insight into the process of curriculum development and the work of the Curriculum Development Centre. He also gave the concluding address summing up the proceedings of the 2 days. The papers from Dr. Lett and Dr. Skilbeck were transcribed from a tape recording of the proceedings and therefore should not be read as formal papers.

Elizabeth Silsbury was overseas at the time of the seminar so prepared a paper to be read.

LET THEM EAT CROTCHETS*Elizabeth Silsbury - Sturt C.A.E.*

For the last five months, I have been interviewing tertiary music staff all over the country, gathering information about music and music education units in music degrees, arts degrees, music education diplomas and degrees, and teaching diplomas and degrees.

At the last count, there were 73 different tertiary institutions in Australia teaching accredited awards with music components ranging from nothing to lots, but with most of them showing at least 30 compulsory hours and a few going up to as much as 480 hours of elective music.

There is an awful lot of music going on, and I believe that before long we may all be called upon to defend it.

As I was invited to do some crystal-ball-gazing for this paper, I decided to begin by predicting two major battles which we could be called on to wage in the next 3-5 years. The broad view is this: at present in Australia there are nearly 60 tertiary institutions offering basic qualifications in teacher education. Apart from one college which takes only secondary trainees, all colleges are teaching music units of varying length, content and depth. Already the pressures are being felt of too many colleges competing for too few students. Practically every institution has been notified by State Education Departments that they can expect decreasing teacher education enrolments over the next three years, and in most cases we are being exhorted to explore every possible avenue for diversification. A number of colleges has already moved into such courses as business studies, nurse education, communications, speech therapy and even law and agriculture. Some others have already opened their music departments to the general public, and offer single instrumental studies and short courses in music history and literature.

This leads me to Battle No. 1.

Firstly, there could be pressure to reduce the number of institutions offering teacher education. This will be largely on grounds of economy, the official view being that small institutions of 300-500 students (there are about 12 of these) are not economically viable, and do not justify the expenditure of large sums of public money in the upkeep of buildings, staffing, equipment, administration and services to students. We should all be aware of this possibility and keep ourselves fully informed of the findings of the State and Australian inquiries into tertiary and post-secondary education, and assist our several staff associations in every way possible to ensure proper communication, free expression of opinion, and hopefully democratic decision-making. Where mergers are possible, we should look with open minds at various arrangements, and do all in our power to make our own decisions, rather than wait and risk having unpalatable ones imposed upon us. (Incidentally, it is distressing to hear of colleges where autocratic directors and principals, enthroned in exotic ivory towers and with extraordinary powers, make unilateral decisions which seriously infringe on the professional rights of staff and force them into unsuitable structures. In some cases such decisions obviously have a detrimental effect on the staff's ability to work properly - we may have an exaggerated concept of democracy in South Australia, but I do commend it as a sensible way of running a tertiary institution).

Which leads to Battle No. 2.

There could be pressures to concentrate various subjects in a lesser number of institutions, also on the grounds of economy, and especially in regard to the provision of Year 4 courses such as graduate diploma and B.Ed. These two points are in my mind very closely linked: wherever there is teacher education there must be music; and if there is music for three years it may as well be for four. In most cases it is actually cheaper, and better for the individual students, for a few to be attached to several colleges rather than have a whole lot at one, inevitably necessitating more staff and equipment. In all states except South Australia, colleges are competing for students for Year 4 music courses. For a number of reasons, the five teachers colleges in South Australia were all offering Year 4 courses, immediately following Year 3, to all secondary and about 15% of primary trainees, before the changeover to Federal funding took place. These were initially Advanced Diplomas of Teaching, but are now converted into B.Ed's as from 1977. In all cases, subject specialisation is available, to the extent where a complete fourth year in music and music education is common. This is very different from the other states, where Year 4 is usually only available after some years of teaching experience and the B.Ed. is usually regarded as an education specialisation.

I realise this is only one of the anomalies which keep cropping up in tertiary education in Australia - we should also be aware of these, especially where C.A.E's are being limited by restrictions and conditions that do not apply to universities. These then are the two battles we should be girding our loins for: one, to make our own decisions about the future of our institutions, and two to preserve and establish music to Year 4 level as an essential element in the training of primary teachers. Having decided that we must provide musical sustenance for these undernourished infants, the next step is a crucial one.

WHAT SHALL WE FEED THEM ON?

There is an enormous amount of music being taught at our tertiary institutions, but there is also an enormous amount of dissatisfaction among the lecturers - very few feel they are doing a really satisfactory job in preparing students to teach music, and such remarks as "we know they don't do anything but turn on the music broadcasts once they get out into the schools" - "most of them have no background in music" - "the new diploma structure has cut in half the amount of time we used to have" - "the students aren't really interested in good music" were so common that they almost could be taken as a general response.

For the sake of a single argument, let us consider the basic Diploma of Teaching (Primary) which forms the bulk of all primary teacher training in Australia. Out of the 52 colleges concerned, 18 have less than 50 hours of compulsory music/music education, 24 have 50-100 and 10 have more than 100. This fact in itself would be interesting, rather than significant, were it not for the content of most of these courses and the numbers of students involved. With only about 4 exceptions, the core units consist of formal theory training, aimed at teaching the students to read music (in a practical sense of course, by way of voice, recorder, piano laboratory, melodica, tuned and untuned percussion, autoharp and guitar) and also equipping them to teach formal music in the classroom. It is a common concept among humanitarian law-makers that the law must be sympathetic, and it must

be enforceable. As a principle, I find this most pertinent for our own philosophies, in this sense "The Aims of Music education courses must be sympathetic, and they must be achievable." I believe that we are feeding our musical infants with exotic fare which is akin to Camembert and Oven's Valley Shiraz when we should be giving them egg and lettuce sandwiches, or rusks with vegemite.

Most of us have been able to read music for so long that we can't remember what it was like not to. Also we have forgotten the process by which we learnt - for most of us it was half an hour or more a week, individually with a teacher, working through carefully graded material and over a period of several years, gradually acquiring this mysterious skill - the lucky ones of us had also a weekly theory lesson, alone or with a few others at the same level, and our practical work was reinforced with written exercises.

Now, we are expecting 18-19 year olds, in anything upwards of 20 hours, to gain enough fluency in reading to be able to perform on an instrument (remembering that their muscles are not as accommodating as ours were at 4 or 7 or 9 or whenever we began having lessons) and also to understand the mystical, symbolical language sufficiently to be able to teach it. And what is more, this is the system that has been operating in our training colleges for the last fifty years, and has had no noticeable effect on the school population as a whole, nor on the proportion (presumably among the brightest) who come on to tertiary education.

There are at least three possible alternatives to the formal, performance-oriented approach to classroom music which forms the basis of 90% of our primary music teacher education programmes. As a basic principle, any programme should be designed so that most students will learn enough to be able to pass on most of the content to most children.

Here is alternative No. 1 - The Australian Singing School

The most successful method at present is undoubtedly Deanne Hoermann's adaptation of Kodaly. Many experienced teachers, especially in the eastern states, are responding with great enthusiasm to something they can understand and enjoy, and although there is as yet only a small amount of Kodaly (as a single system) in the colleges, it is likely to grow. The attractions are easily identified: the system is very carefully graded with fine attention to detail, and the materials are carefully selected to provide confidence for those as yet wary of their own abilities. Above all, the system has dedicated and skilful teachers to demonstrate its success, and looks set for a very good run.

Alternative No. 2 - The Package Deal

Some colleges are taking what might look like an easy way out, but actually fulfils my criteria - using a good series of texts such as Silver Burdett, or Holt, Rinehart and Winston, and showing students how to use the books and records, without attempting to develop mastery of the background skills. This is an approach based on expediency, or the "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em" principle.

Alternative No. 3 - The Mudpie Approach

Some people call it creativity, but what I have in mind is no more creative than a milk bottle, and if a milk bottle is creative what do you call Rodin's Thinker? Others call it composition, but that's wrong too, because then you are left with no word for the process that produced the B.Minor Mass.

It does have a lot to do with puddling around with sound in the same way that we encourage children to puddle around with paint, paper, words, movement and dressing up clothes. At this point I must emphasise that I am talking about all children - and for that matter, all students - not the talented 10-15% who will benefit from learning to play an instrument, and incidentally learn to read a score along the way. Frequently music is combined with other art forms in this approach, and it is surely significant that 32 colleges include some combined arts projects in their music education units. This line leads very directly to an obvious conclusion. To garble up my food metaphor, instead of spreading our jam very thinly over the whole slice of bread, we pile it all up in one corner and put vegemite on the rest. In other words, I firmly believe that the only proper solution to our music education problems is to keep our formal music programmes for the elective students who will gain most and therefore contribute most, and to provide the rest with what they can comfortably and profitably handle.

My conclusions after completing this national study are that music education in Australia is generally not well. The time has passed when such ills were treated with money - the money is not available now, and anyway I do not believe it is the appropriate remedy for this particular sickness. I do believe that it is vital and crucial that we subject our aims to the most merciless and searching scrutiny, and that we formulate sympathetic and realistic objectives that we can honestly and whole-heartedly defend against whatever general and specific bureaucratic apathy, scepticism and outright antagonism we are called upon to combat.

THE ARTS IN EDUCATION

Dr. Warren Lett - La Trobe University

This talk was presented in an informal context and therefore should not be cited as a reference.

The paper is a script of the talk and has not been re-written as a formal paper.

During the last year, when I had been working on the Arts Education study, one of the things which confronted us and to which my attention was drawn very gravely by the Industrial Assistance Commission report, was the question of "Do we have a rationale for arts in contemporary society? and if so, What is it?" In listening to Liz's paper about music, it seems to me that in almost everything which was said we could have substituted the word 'arts' for the word 'music' and therefore that is my justification for talking about the arts more broadly first. Because you know more about the music situation than I do, I'll talk broadly about the arts rationale. I want to say about 9 things which I think we can feel comfortable with, in thinking about the arts curriculum per se. Let me just have a little preamble about that and say that I believe that the arts in education, if not already under challenge, become more and more under challenge and that people in schools and society will be looking for an increasing justification for giving even the amount of time which is given to the arts, let alone meeting the demands for more time for the arts in the curriculum. We do have pressure to increase dance movement, for example, (something that I am particularly interested in) and to increase the time for various other components in the arts. I want to start from the beginning of Liz's talk to say that what she called the Camembert model, I call the Daimler model, and I think that's the same thing. I think we are suffering from an over-indulgence in Daimler models in the arts, which is one of the reasons why we are in the difficulties we are in at present, and I will talk more about that later. I do believe, though, that we've got to find other ways of dealing with the problems of economy, because she, I think, has correctly indicated that we are faced with decisions relating to economy of time, manpower, money in the arts, in society and in education and the reason I want to speak about the rationale first is to lead into some suggestions and critical comments upon how those economies might be made. I don't want to use the word economy, but I want to foreshadow that I am going to use the word reconstitute, and that's why I am speaking about music in relationship to the other arts, because I don't think the answers will lie in any discipline - I think they will lie in something greater than a particular discipline. So let me begin to talk about what I think are at least 9 reasons which we can fall back upon in our contemporary society to justify the arts.

My first one is one which you will be very familiar with. It's the inherent or naturalistic. It's that the arts are always there. If you would like to go back to primitive society, it wasn't very long before man's work was expressed in an artistic form on a cave wall. It wasn't very long before, in looking at the environment, man's activities were ritualised and he developed a system of ritualised or expressive statements to try to give meaning to his universe. Now, it seems to me absolutely undoubted that in our universe today we must continue and we will continue to make that attempt - to make an artistic statement which arises from our inherent struggle with the universe, which will be made by the arts. So I'm saying you cannot avoid it, you can't prevent it. It is simply there. It is part of our nature to engage in expressive activity or we might call it creative activity and I would like to distinguish between those two. It is one of my hobbyhorses; someone has mentioned the word creativity already and I have written, at least edited, two books on creativity and I teach creativity. Creativity seems to be

*Dr. Lett refers on several occasions to the paper by Elizabeth Silsbury.

one of the most bastardized words of the last 10-15 years. It's as if we have discovered something which hadn't existed before. We wrapped it up with a whole lot of terminology which came out of experimental psychology, largely in the United States and we pretended that we had discovered something. Well, we haven't at all and in a way we've done ourselves a disfavoured. It seems to me that a great deal of work in the arts is simply expressive. It doesn't have to be creative. I want to distinguish expressive behaviour from creativity. It goes without saying that it is inherently there from the moment of birth as the thing which we are always working with and which I believe is largely blunted by the school system. I want to say finally on that point that I will call that activity a compositional activity using the elements of the arts in their most basic form, so that it might be play with clay or play with sound and it might simply be play with movement or vocalisation, but it is basically a form of very simple play. That's the elemental basis of this inherent activity.

I think a second justificational rationale is a therapeutic one and I am very nervous in mentioning this because there are so many people who want to argue that the basic reason for the arts in society is a therapeutic one. I think the best reason for the arts in society is the first one which I mentioned which is it is in the man's nature; therefore, it is a straightforward, health giving activity. The therapeutic seems to me to be a derivative of that which is as a repair activity. So that when the first one goes wrong you call upon the arts because it may have a function to repair. It's derivative in that sense. It's not a leading reason for the arts in society, it's because we have made a mess of things, it has become a justification. So in what sense is a therapeutic activity useful? I suppose it's because of disorder within the individual and disorder in social group. I think we seem to discharge frustrations. We seek to increase self awareness or body awareness when that is heavily deteriorated. Dramatic activities, sound activities often put one in touch with one's bodily self or one's concept of one's self which deteriorates. Bodily tone is related to art's expressive activity. So you get back a sense of order or structural shape. It can also be a recreative work in the sense of bringing together distance or alienated parts of the self and building a new whole. Some people call that the drainage theory, you know, let all the bad air out and put some good in; and you put the stopper back in. I don't particularly subscribe to that theory. That's a very Freudian notion and it's all right if you happen to agree that there is a fixed amount of energy and when you get bad energy, then it takes over. That's a structure I find a bit constraining. But let's say generally that the therapeutic is a repair activity and probably becoming increasingly important and therefore being mistaken for the real thing, because of the confusion and the disorder in individuals in society.

My third rationale would be that the arts provide for a form of knowing. I can speak somewhat feelingly about this since it seems to me that if we look at the tertiary institutions in society, and I have spent most of my life in the universities, we can see I think, a very dangerous thing happening. In the universities there is a tendency to say what we are on about is the intellect. We are to do with critical appraisal and evaluation. What I privately think that frequently means is that in the arts we turn out fifteenth rate critics who really cannot do anything beyond reproduce what other critics have said about other creative peoples' work. I would regard that as an extremely inadequate concept of university education in the arts. On the other hand if you look at

some other tertiary institutions there is a tendency to say these institutions are institutions which have to deal with the craft aspects of the arts and these people should be practitioners and therefore what these people need is not theory, or conceptual knowledge. What they need is basically "skills training." Of course many of those people become teachers, many of them become performing artists, practising artists, exhibiting artists and so on. I, by and large, don't believe that either of those is an appropriate model for tertiary education in the arts. I want to develop that later on but I do want to say that I regard skills element of a craft as an essential element of the arts. I upbraid universities considerably for removing that element from arts training, and yet I am equally concerned that other tertiary institutions may build a model which is heavily skills oriented and which isn't conceptual or theoretical and therefore turns out people who have either an excessive orientation in one direction or an insufficient orientation in the other. It seems to me that if we have a model of the nature of man, both of those things, or all of those things should be attended to in any one learning situation where the arts are being taught. So I want to suggest that the arts provide a form of knowing for the intellect, for the senses, for the intuition, for outlet for feeling and I don't go along with the viewpoint that the arts are only to do with affect. I think that is frankly nonsense. Art is as much an intellectual activity as a particular individual wants to make it. It is as much an effective activity as another individual wants to make it. The potential is therefore both those activities as is the potential for other kinds of activities, such as social comment. It may have that sort of function also. It seems to me that unless you take an extremely purist viewpoint, that arts in society have very variegated roles. So therefore when I speak about arts having to do with being a form of knowing, I am talking particularly at this moment about sensibility, awareness, intuition, feeling as being the thing which is so often stressed and not being available, I think, in many other studies and yet at the same time wanting to say that that isn't all the arts should be.

My fourth point is that I think the arts perform a fundamental means of communication between individuals, between societies and international groups, and that is an essential role in contemporary society. Arts communications can be graphic, they can be aural, they can be non-verbal, but the arts are to do with making statements - in particular kinds of language, language which is peculiar to a particular art form or peculiar to the arts more broadly speaking. My particular interest is that the arts deal mainly with the language of the imagination. I want to say once again, it's not only that, it's more than that. One of the obvious forms of communication in the arts is performance. I don't again, want to suggest that performance is the only kind of statement which the arts are able to make. I believe that participation is an equally important form of communication via the arts and it does seem to me that education through the arts is as important a notion as education in the arts and when we talk about art as a communication, we must also embrace the notion that education is through the arts i.e. it seems to me that in teacher education in particular - let me take drama as the example here - we are as much concerned with the use of drama as a set of processes and skills by which learning in a broad sense can be carried on as we are simply teaching textual criticism or the production of a particular play. Drama is, I think, the work of exploration as much as anything else. It's the exploration of man's world and the spiritual world. There is a language of communication through drama which has to do with that which is, I think, different from a language of communication in drama which is the performance language. So drama makes very different kinds of statements as I believe does music and other art forms. So that one needs to think broadly about the language of communication in the arts.

My fifth point is that it is an intellectual activity and I think that that is an absolutely legitimate thing and something which we must not lose sight of and I suppose in universities, it has its strongest development in history and theory subjects, in aesthetics, in criticism and so on. I think that is very good but I think by and large it is part of the Daimler model. I heard a speaker recently who said that the future of art education lay in the renaissance of the higher arts. Now I want to take the position that I fundamentally disagree with that, that I do believe that the high arts are extremely important to preserve. I, after all, am the product of that learning experience and so are you. Some of my most mystical and wonderful experiences have been within the high arts and I as a performer, present work from the high arts, but I do not believe that the future of the arts in this society lies exclusively, or even mainly, in the reformation or renaissance within the high culture. The intellectual component of the arts I believe must continue, but it must not have such a monopoly over arts activity as it hitherto has had and which has been registered through university controllers, schools curriculum and so on.

The sixth point, and for me the most exciting aspect of the arts, is that it is the means by which imagination, fantasy, inventiveness, a fundamentally vital part of man's nature is expressed and I tend to think this is the soul of man, and that this is where the creative process really lies. It cannot happen without skills obviously, but I believe that one of the things which we mirror in our education system is that it is appropriate for children to play, it is appropriate in the pre-school and primary school for the arts to be used as a major teaching and learning process and if you think about the past experiences which children had in pre-school and in first three years of primary school, the processes draw very heavily from the arts and I think that is absolutely appropriate. What I don't think is appropriate is that when we get down to the serious stuff the processes which are available to the arts are suddenly seen as meant for kids, for babies, I think that something very fundamental happens there in our imagery about the arts. We have somehow shown that the arts is an activity of play for childlike minds. It is not a play in the arts, it is not a serious adult activity. Somehow, we replace that series of images later on in secondary school where we start to get serious about the arts and we go into the Daimler model and that, if anything, would be my diagnosis of what seems to go wrong at a systemic level and regrettably it seems to me that the imagination is pushed out. That thing which leads into composition, that essential element which is inventiveness and imagination drawing of course upon skills, which must continue, that ingredient becomes lost.

Let me try to suggest what I think happens if you have imagination without skill. In many workshops which I have done, I have seen people who were highly imaginative who became immediately extremely frustrated because they did not have a technical vocabulary with which to convey the images which were coming to them. I also believe that you can get a great fluency of imaginative images if you have more skills, i.e. if you have been trained so that the imagination develops together with the skills. In my experience in the dance world over the last six years or so when I worked with a lot of choreographers and dancers, I observed the extreme difficulty which the dancer has when he is put into a compositional setting and I have observed the same thing with musicians. I have observed the same thing with all performing artists. It stands to reason if you are trained as a recreative artist, exclusively, you will find composition very difficult. You don't necessarily have everybody doing the same thing, naturally, but I do want to suggest that the imaginative, compositional side has been seriously neglected with a very strong emphasis on the critical appraisal side (theory and history) and the performance oriented

side. We can't afford that as a general basis for the arts curriculum. If you have imaginative people without either skills or knowledge, you only produce frustrations and clearly that won't do on its own. If you have knowledge and skills minus imagination, I think you get boredom or boring performance. The recreative artist who isn't also imaginative is terribly boring I find. So I think that imagination is really an ingredient of recreative performance. I think that knowledge and skills and imagination minus motivation equals waste and I think that you can't really get any activity unless you have motivation as well. So, my four essential ingredients of any art activity are - knowledge, skills, imagination and motivation. Without any one of those, I do not believe you can really get progress, motivation being equally important. There are those gifted people whom you really can't get to do anything and we get into our heavy moralistic thing about wastage of talent and I feel as much as you do that if motivation isn't there, we do tend to get on to our high culture warhorse about wastage. Motivation has to be there. Knowledge, together with motivation, minus skills and imagination seems to me to produce critics. Often, but not always. But I think that just knowledge and motivation is an inadequate model for the arts in education. It's sort of a by-product of the Daimler model - a spare tyre. I do believe that at tertiary level, there is a need for us to admit compositional activity, even in its most elemental form, broadly in the arts, rather than simply performance orientation or critical appraisal. So many people who begin with that "burning hot thingamy" (whoever it was said that - Noel Coward) - that burning hot thingamy towards performance, end up as teachers. And in so many teachers that need for performance was not satisfied. I know that College for the Arts is grappling with that problem at present and I think it is quite right that those who have the "thingamy" for performance should get it out of their systems first and we really do have to provide later on for re-entry into the teaching area; I don't think you can do both those things together at that time - because they are just not interested in that, but I do want to say that ultimately most performers become teachers and I think that they will be better teachers if two things happen. If they have experience broadly across the arts and if they have experience of what it is like to do compositional work across the arts, I think that their whole stimulus into training as performers or re-creative agents will be much enriched. The future of any particular pure discipline in the arts does not depend on only increasing skills, imagination and performance abilities within that discipline, but it also depends on going across into other art forms so that there is interaction between them and a wider understanding of how the imagination develops, how richness of imaginative thinking develops and how that leads into compositional activity.

My point number 7 is that art is involved in cultural transmission, whether we try to avoid that or not. Art does carry the images and the values and the attitudes of society at a particular time and it makes a statement about that society. In the work that we give children we are, whether we are aware of it or not, conveying to them the images which we feel are appropriate for them as people in our society. If what we give them is a diet of Dickens, Mozart, Gainsborough and so on, we create certain minds of unconscious images about how men behave in society, about what expressive activity is, about what aesthetic structures and forms are, and we have to be very seriously aware that in the diet of the arts which we give to children at any age level, and particularly let's say pre-8, we are conditioning the imagination to certain kinds of images with which they will work for a long time in the future unless we

diversify those images. So, I think it is most important that we take this point seriously, that we are involved in cultural transmission and that we are involved in the unconscious formulation of images in all the art forms which we present to children, particularly in the early stages and we must think about that extremely carefully.

Just a side issue of this cultural transmission notion. Art versus politics is of course, an extremely important issue and I've heard a number of people return from China glorifying what the Chinese have done and I think what the Chinese have done in the broad cultural sense is staggering but I do want to say a couple of things to you about this. In both Russia and China, art is a highly elitist activity as well as being a generalist activity, and in both the Soviet Union and China there are special schools for the gifted in the arts which are highly selective. The arts in both of those societies have been locked into the question of national identity, so that the arts are being used politically as the national identity and image-making process and for this reason therefore, they are often given over to political propaganda. We cannot avoid the arts making political statements, and I think it is very important that the arts should make a social critique. I suppose the visual arts are more prone to this than the performing arts, but the performing arts do have a role there I think also. I don't believe that the arts should be only the vehicle of social comment, but I do believe that is one of the ways in which grass roots expressive activity does begin to occur when it meets with what the average person is experiencing in his day to day struggle. I think that when opera as a form concerns itself with those issues and when it perhaps finds a different form from the rather stereotyped traditional structure, that it has the possibility of becoming a community performing art rather than a Daimler performing art. So whilst I am not wishing to say that the arts should be necessarily politically oriented, I believe there is a role for that activity and it may be an important one in education in the arts. Could I, if you haven't read the IAC report, draw your attention to it? I am in disagreement with their suggestion that all funds should be removed from the high culture. I don't believe that we can yet afford to do that, but may I make a comment that one author has made? All colonial societies do adopt the art forms of their antecedents, and reproduce them for some generations that is because those are the things which have been presented to us, because a sense of national inferiority leads us to be copyists and imitators and I believe we have done that very considerably throughout our history and that perhaps since the First World War we began not to do that quite so much, but I do believe that the arts' future lies very much in our not being colonial imitators, but in our being creative artists within our own national parameters. So although I don't want to advocate that arts in Australia should become a means of national identity seeking, on the other hand, I believe we must find another form of promoting the arts through community rather than through funding by the Australia Council.

My 8th point is that the arts in society, traditionally, have to do with quality of life. There is a very peculiar kind of argument there. It suggests that the artists in society may be more mentally healthy, better people, less mad. I don't think that's the right argument. What I have observed in such a creative person is that those people are high risk takers, high diversity seekers, experience a much wider range of pathology within themselves and cope with it. I think that is the important point as far as I am concerned from my studies in that area. I am not talking about mental health there. I am talking about diversity of experience, assisting what I talked about in my first point, the inherent and naturalistic experience of the arts, and preventing education from over-formalising, over-orienting towards what I call the Daimler model, producing inhibition, turning the arts into a

materialistic or a copyist type of activity so that the arts really are not accessible to more than a small elitist group as a means of improving quality of life. And so it is quality of life in relationship to increasing leisure which I think is another issue which we must take quite seriously within arts in education and arts in community. Participation seems to be the essential keyword if quality of life is to become a critical issue for the arts. So a question I pose is how can we conduct art in education in such a way as to increase involvement and participation at the practitioner level (and I would say I do regard listening, as a form of participation, but it has to be a particular kind of listening, it has to be an intelligent listening). We must find ways of increasing participation if quality of life through education in the arts is to be achieved.

My 9th point is the one which I mentioned earlier, that the arts are built on skills as well as the other things I mentioned; I do believe that the craft activity, the skill basis of every discipline in the arts must be retained if that art form is to survive and be modified. It won't be modified if we abandon skills for knowledge, knowledge of structure and aesthetics. But what I would argue for is to broaden that into those other things which I have mentioned. In the School Curriculum it does seem to me that there has to be room for the separate art forms in some form or other and there has to be a very serious thinking about the arts per se, whether the arts have a core activity or not, into which the various forms could relate as well as continuing separately. I don't necessarily want to advocate the fashionable thing of related arts. I don't even know what that means - and it is not a term that I care for - what I do care for is the notion that Liz doesn't like, of compositional activity. I believe however, that you can't write it in as a compulsory aspect of the curricula, but that it is a thing which does have to happen because people work together, and because people in the arts are practising the art of communication through the arts. I think that related work across the arts will only occur in the curriculum because people in the arts are relating to each other in an open and non-threatening way. It would be easy to say that I believe that if that doesn't happen, that the possible demise of the arts or reduction of the arts in the school curriculum will be because of the isolation, the competition between people in the different arts' disciplines and their refusal really to talk to each other or acknowledge that they are on very much the same wavelength and that they are dealing very much with the same things, that there is role for arts in society and that there is a role for arts in education and that there are some common components. In very few schools that one goes to is there a notion of the arts as a group of people working in that school. You find a group of music people if you are lucky, you may find one dramatist in one district. The drama people are sent out to one school and of course they don't have a curriculum of drama and after one year those kids are practically dead and they have to get a transfer out of that school because they've made so many errors and cannot cope. It would be far better if we concentrated our resources and served a district rather than putting individual evangelicals in one art form around to suffer the agonies that we've all experienced. The arts should talk to each other. You have obviously got social science curriculum, you've obviously got a natural science curriculum, you've obviously got an expressive curriculum, and unless we share that space, we may disappear. I suppose if that's all you remembered, I would be happy. That perhaps to me is the burning issue. So let me just round this section off by saying that out of these 9 points, I'm dealing with a concept of the nature of man which sees him as a thinking, feeling and sensing, a doing and a valuing person. So that the arts in education must serve the intellectual part of man, it must serve the imaginative and the affective part of man, it must serve the development of skills in man so that he can make statements, and it must serve the valuing and the moral aspects of man so that he can make statements and evaluate society through the arts. So I am

presenting you with a concept of the nature of man in four parts and I believe that ought to be the basis by which we think about the arts in education.

These are the impressions and you can treat them as you wish. I am trying to get at what I think is a fairly important question, what do the consumers in schools think about the Arts Curriculum? I have just a few little pieces of information to throw in about that. We surveyed 1500 primary school children in schools in Melbourne and I just want to report three things on that. First is on the question of choice of subjects and in asking them, if they were quite free, which subjects they would select. We gave them a long list of possible subjects. It was interesting to note that within the first five or six you have things like art, craft, film and television, back down in the 20's you have dance, or 19 was creative writing, 22 was dance movement and 18 was music and in the primary school there were 26 things listed. Instrumental music however seems to be increasingly popular with primary and with secondary school children, and when we asked the kids what they did in their spare time, we gave them a long list of possible things. It is very interesting to notice that 23% of them said that they play musical instruments. That's roughly a quarter of the sample which I thought was a pretty healthy sign, when you compare with things like 91% watch TV and 74% played sport and read. 17% said they made or acted in a play, that seemed to me to be an encouraging sign. When we asked those who had experienced arts subjects, which ones they liked a lot or liked, the picture is as follows. The most popular of the arts subjects and very high amongst any subjects at all were art, painting and craft. 88% said craft, 82% said painting. Then we go down to reading 76%, making or acting in a play 74%, creative writing 62% music 56%, movement or dance 52%. So that this is an impression and with all the difficulties of that kind of data reporting, since we found it consistently, it does seem that within the arts, general music at least is fairly low down on the priorities among the five or six arts which we were asking about. With the secondary children, the picture is really rather similar. We had 500 odd subjects (secondary and technical) and once again out of a long list of subjects which they would like to do, the most popular were craft, art, film, TV and cooking (for boys and girls). So it does seem that the emphasis is very much on doing things. There are a lot of other reasons I am sure, but those are all very practically oriented, expressive subjects. When we asked about the importance of the arts subjects to them, it seemed that most of the students again preferred art, painting, craft and drama. However, in most of the arts subjects, including music, they thought that they should be mainly elective, rather than compulsory. I couldn't say that it was absolute, but there was a move right across the table in the direction of liking and elective in all of the arts, except music was closer to not liking very much and elective I'm afraid to say.

In the secondary group 83% liked craft very much, film 89%, art 80%, drama 75%, creative writing and music 56%. In the leisure activities, there were about a quarter who said that they were involved in listening to music and practising instruments and I think quite a large number said they were involved in going to concerts. What I want to convey briefly then is that in both the primary and secondary schools the practical, expressive art subjects were the most popular and that within the arts group, music seemed to be coming along with dance movement, which I think is a special case because kids have very little experience of that. However there is a positive response to the increase in instrumental teach-

ing of music in the schools. I am aware and you are much more aware, that in this state there have in recent years been some major changes in music education, particularly since I was teaching music in schools around the late 50's and early 60's and during that time you have seen the Orff, Kodaly, Suzuki and Yamaha systems having their entry and impact along with some of the Paynter & Aston type work of more recent years. There are certainly, within the area of methodology, considerable changes and they are probably all representative of the Victorian system. One other major innovation in music in Victoria is the designation of music schools and I would include in that the five departmental secondary schools

That seems to me to be a very interesting development, but unfortunately there is often a failure to relate the music programme to the rest of the programme of the school. The relationship between the arts programme as a whole (of which music is a part) and the rest of the school curriculum is a critical issue. I believe also that there is a very strong need if we are to continue that system of designated schools, not only for people to be especially appointed because I believe that is the case, but for those people to have opportunity to confront the question of what is the purpose of those schools and what kind of curriculum should those schools be developing. Are they serving performance oriented students and if so, within those schools, how do they manage the heavy concentration of music studies which will be necessary for that with the general school music programme? It may be a defensible argument to have designated schools, but we may be in danger of feeling - at least the public might and the Government might be in danger of feeling - that having done that, they have provided all that is necessary for music education as a special activity for dealing with the musically talented in Victoria. That would seem to me to be an argument on the Daimler model. Whilst I think that there is a place for this, there is the much wider and perhaps more significant question of general music in the school curriculum and its relationship to the broader arts curriculum. That is the more critical issue for the survival of music.

The third major innovation so far as I can see in music area is the development of peripatetic instrumental teachers. Our study seems to indicate that there has been a valued activity at least from the children's point of view. However one must still ask questions "What is the function of this special group of instrumental teachers? Where does the critical and aesthetic development happen? Where does the arts compositional aspect happen in the experience of those people?"

All of those major areas of innovation have value. I do want to pose the question of whether they fit a broad model of arts education, or whether they fit a restrictive model of the Daimler music performance activity, and I don't want to pose it necessarily as an either/or but I do want to raise the question of continuity or discontinuity between the specialised innovations and the general programme. Let me finish now with what I think are some of the major questions remaining for the arts and for music in school and community. I've already suggested most of these, so let me summarise them.

The obvious one which you have all been struggling with and to which you have all found different answers is the question of compulsion vs. election. If you develop a system in which the arts are based on election, how can you possibly provide the opportunity for other people to experience the arts and choose to opt in to arts experience rather than not to choose and to be excluded from them. That seems to be a really critical issue and if we opt for the elective and perhaps possibly elitist (because I think elitism might be the eventual outcome of that) we fail to provide the kind of experience which will allow us even to choose. It does seem to me that that choice is still possible

at first year tertiary level. It is entirely possible for people to begin a new thing. They are probably not going to become leading performers. By and large, skill development has to occur earlier but what I am talking about is not the performance model but the participation, the experiential model, and it is still possible to do that at age 17 or 18. I think if all we have at tertiary level is a small, elitist, elective system, we are locking ourselves into the high culture Daimler model. My plea is for us to rethink that.

The second question is, What is the relationship between the performing arts and the teaching arts? I think that one of the most vexed experiences for any teacher of the arts in a secondary or primary school is having visiting performers. No matter how good the performance is, it is extremely difficult to get them in at the right time, to get them in a venue where they can be seen or heard, to get them in at the moment in the curriculum where it relates to something that is happening rather than something out of the blue which has no continuity whatever. One of the things which we have unearthed in our arts education study, is the development of the Victorian Arts Centre. We had long discussions with the ministry, the arts council and the committee which is developing that centre as to its use, because as I pointed out to them, the main consumers will be young people. I have asked them whether they are giving consideration to a youths' arts experience programme within that centre. You can have one kind of experience in that centre, the way its built, and it's a wonderful example of the way in which architecture can seriously control artistic activity on the Daimler model. That's all right if, at the same time, we rethink the performing arts in regional activities, which must not be on the same model. It must be on a very different model. My notion would be to have a decentralised group of performing artists' teams who would function in regions and who would work within a district and who would have repeated work with a small group of schools. They would be fitted in to the arts programme, so that the performing wing of the arts was seen as an integral part of the arts programme in schools, rather than a nuisance or occasional brilliant demonstration. I do believe that we must build bridges between community performing arts and school arts. I want to use the term community performing arts rather than just performing arts because it can add something different. There must be a greater integral relationship and greater sharing. Of course there is a professional problem there of non-certification for teaching of performing artists and I believe that that's an industrial issue which we must attend to if we are to make this bridge. The notion of courses for performing artists on a part-time basis is one answer. The notion of developing the concept of a resident artist is another, so that we legitimise the performing arts in the school community. That of course has connotations for architecture, it has connotations for buildings of the future and it certainly implies that there must be shared facilities between school and community, as well as shared people between school and community. In a number of country towns, it came to my knowledge through the ministry of the arts, that there is funding for arts education officers, for regional arts activities and they are all within the visual arts. There is funding for the conversion of buildings in country towns. Three or four have already had this funding from the ministry for the arts for the conversion of buildings for performance oriented community arts. There is no connection whatever with the arts in the schools. There is often a beautiful piece of architecture which is for art exhibitions and occasional classes. We simply cannot afford to go to every country town and build a small Sydney Opera House as a base for exhibitions and visiting concerts. We must have an articulation at the architectural level and personnel level between arts education, performing arts and exhibiting

arts. This is essential from an economic point of view, from a personnel point of view, from a straight meaning point of view for the impact of arts experience upon people. So, my question is, "How do we develop that kind of relationship between performing arts, education arts, community arts? I've talked about the model for music education and I've mentioned what I believe to be a critical issue, a relationship between music and the rest of the curriculum, the emergence of the arts curriculum per se and the survival of music and the other art forms.

Finally, there are certain curriculum decisions which should be the basis of our thinking and which revolve around 5 particular questions which I believe you will be considering for the rest of the time, so I'll just mention them and I think they will make a bridge into what you will be doing. In thinking about the arts curriculum and the music curriculum, there are 5 guidelines.

The first question is the question of content. What is it? What are we doing in that particular curriculum? What is the basis for the content? Is it a cultural anthropology which lies at the core of the arts curriculum? Is it composition? Can we find it? Can we develop it? What do we need to retain as separate activities and what could be combined in the core activity? That's a content question.

A person question. Who should teach the arts? Should they all be graduates in a particular discipline area? Are they the best people to teach it? I've already raised the question of performing artists as teachers. What about community art people? What about all those people who are responsible for the craft revolution which is going on in every small country town and district around Victoria and Australia? Have not they got some contribution to make? What about the thousands of private music teachers all around the state, or private dance teachers, or private speech teachers? Aren't they the people at the moment who are making one of the major impacts on the development of art in the community? Perhaps even more so than arts in the schools. Who should do it? Should it be done by individuals or by groups? We maintain the fiction that we as individuals should teach with them. But I tend to suspect that that core thing in the arts is a team activity and that the development of that the future depends on personal communication. So, by whom?

Next, a question of process. How should it be taught? I brave that question in many ways. Do we teach them all separately? Do we teach them in a formal or a participatory way? In what combination of those ways do we do it? Do we do it as an hour by hour activity? Do we make a demand on the school for blocks of time because these things really do require space and certainly inter-acting activity requires space. I believe that the most anti-creative control in the whole of the school experience is the 40 minute or hour by hour timetable. I believe that represents a philosophy of education all tied up in those little packages. I question that and I question our acceptance of that as controlling the processes in the arts.

My fourth sort of curriculum question is consumers. To whom? I've been working in a disadvantaged school for the last year doing a school appraisal, and there is no arts curriculum at all in that school. There is no arts teacher of any kind. In one of my country towns I found six district consultants to 60 primary schools, two of whom were in the arts, and only one of those schools had a permanent art teacher let alone anything else. My question then is, Are we sure that these processes relate to the characteristics or to the needs of the people we are teaching? If I go out into that school in Sunshine I'm perfectly sure that I will have to rethink completely an arts curriculum for that school. I think we simply have to find what the prior

experience of our type of group is and the answer does not lie in the application of a pure discipline. If we think that as musicians or dramatists or dance teachers, we have a programme which relates to that discipline which we can take into any school and push into them, we are absolutely and fundamentally in error. I do not believe that we can find the answers to the problems of music education or arts in education by being introverted and looking into the discipline per se. We will have to look outside the discipline. We will have to look into the other arts, and we will have to look in to our consumers to see where they are and what they are able to receive if we are to make bridges between our experience and theirs. That's my fourth concept for curriculum decision making and my fifth one is context which I have already referred to. It's a question of where in terms of socio-economic district, it's a question of where in terms of should it all happen in the school, should it all happen in the music room, should it happen out in a particular type of environment, should we take kids away for a week's environmental arts experience? Should we do composition making? Should we do a lot of our work in an actual theatre, should we go out and work with a performing arts group in their location? The where seems to me to be capable of much better diversity than we perhaps have imagined also. So we must answer the question of what, by whom, how, to whom and where. Those are the dimensions by which we have to make our decisions.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

DR. MALCOLM SKILBECK - Director, Curriculum Development Centre Canberra

(Transcript of an unscripted discussion)

We at the Curriculum Development Centre (C.D.C.) in Canberra have attempted to make people aware of its existence but obviously we have not succeeded very well because for example there is still a very large number of schools around Australia which claim never to have seen a copy of our newsletter, even though we have an address list which indicates that we put newsletters in every school in the country. That point of course, just illustrates something about communication and that is, that communication through bits of paper can appear to be very efficient but can be extremely wasteful because it doesn't work.

Most of our work in the National Curriculum Centre and most of our communicating work to date has been through written documents and clearly that is not satisfactory. The work of the Centre which is a statutory authority and as you will know statutory authorities are under scrutiny at the present time by the Federal Government, partly I suppose because it is felt that statutory authorities might not sufficiently toe the party line whatever the party line happens to be. That is perfectly true, they don't toe the party line. The CDC is a statutory authority and I want to emphasise some characteristics of a statutory authority. This may seem a rather bureaucratic technical matter but I think it is a matter of very great importance in terms of relationships between educational communities throughout Australia and a national body. One of the points is that the Curriculum Development Centre is not part of a Federal Government Department, even though my responsibility in that direction is to the Minister of Education. The Department is a separate administrative entity and Department policy making does not determine CDC policy making. I don't mean to emphasise a gap or to suggest that we are pursuing opposite paths, but I do want to emphasise that a National Curriculum Development Centre does not take its directions and ideas for action from the bureaucratic machinery of government departments. I also need to say, because there is a lot of confusion about this too, that the CDC is not part of the Schools Commission, though again I don't want to emphasise that we are pursuing different paths. Although in fact our paths are a little bit different, there are very close relations but I simply want to indicate that the structure which governs the operations of the Schools Commission is not the structure that governs the operations of the CDC. The CDC is a body which has working relationships with educational systems and groups throughout Australia which are at least as close as any relationships it has with any Federal or Commonwealth body. There is more professional interaction between the CDC and say some State Departments of Education than there is between the CDC and say the Schools Commission. I want to emphasise those points because they really all suggest a certain pattern of development. Namely, that the policy, the work role, the functions, the tasks that a national curriculum centre might take up or will take up, are all capable of being shifted, or modified or influenced as a result of the participation of groups or educators throughout the country. I am having more difficulty in getting that particular point across; maybe it is because people are a little bit sceptical, they perhaps think at the back of their mind that it's all right to say that but in practice, all the decisions are taken by that

bunch there anyway. I am very much of the view that a National Curriculum Centre has to represent and embody the educational aspirations of the whole community. In saying that, I know how difficult it is to achieve some kind of agreement or consensus regarding those aspirations, but unless we do achieve that kind of work style then a National Curriculum Development Centre will indeed be just some kind of minor adornment to the system. On the contrary, it should be a means whereby action thought to be appropriate in different parts of the country is determined, agreed upon and undertaken. I also think that statutory bodies like ourselves are a very important part of the political process, but I won't pursue that line at the moment.

Now I want to say a word about the range of our interests in Curriculum development. If you ever have a look at the Act of Parliament which determines the functions of the Curriculum Development Centre, you will notice that a number of functions are defined. The functions are defined in terms of the undertaking and the promotion of Curriculum development work of various kinds. There is specific reference to the production of materials and there is a distinction there between Curriculum Development and Materials Development. That is a difficult distinction in some senses, but I would like you to just contemplate it for one moment. Many people assume that curriculum development means the production of quantities of visible materials, but you can have a curriculum development programme without producing any materials at all. The question of materials is always a secondary one to whether the materials are necessary or desirable to achieve certain ends. So the Act itself, in a rather clumsy sort of way, recognises this by using the words "Curriculum and Materials." Many teachers and many schools, for example, still assume that when the term Curriculum Development is used, what you mean is that they should go to work in printing quantities of teaching materials. Whether schools have been printing quantities of teaching materials or not is a question for discussion and debate. It should not be assumed, for example, that school-based curriculum development means school level production of all text materials as some people imagine it means. The functions of the CDC also refer to research, the undertaking of research and the promotion of research, and a curriculum as used in the Act, is defined as "School Curriculum." "School" has a rather interesting definition being any institution like a school. I do not know how far that definition would take one in legal terms. I suppose the intention is clear enough but the translation of the intention into actual programmes leaves plenty of room for different kinds of interpretations. I want to draw attention to that point because both the research aspect of the CDC and the fairly loose way in which school is defined, provide us with a means of relating to tertiary institutions directly. There is another way in which we can relate to tertiary institutions, and that is if one attempts to answer the question, "Where does the curriculum development process take place?" Even if curriculum development as defined for us, is in terms of schools and even if we take a fairly conventional view of schools, it is nevertheless an open question as to where curriculum development is best undertaken. I take the view, personally, that schools must be intimately involved but that the curriculum development cannot be confined to schools. Taking that kind of approach it is not very difficult for you to appreciate that tertiary institutions do have access to the CDC to its resources and we have some kind of responsibility towards tertiary institutions. This is very true in relation to one very important function tertiary institutions perform, namely teacher education. In fact I would say that there are three closely related processes and if these three processes are not considered together, then we are in trouble. The three processes in question are curriculum development, teacher development and organisational development. Now, if one is contemplating a change it is extremely unwise to

contemplate a change in any one of those without due consideration to each of the others. You might say for example that you are going to concentrate on a new syllabus and you are going to focus very much on syllabus content questions or teaching method questions, but if you do not focus equally on the characteristics, the attributes of the teacher and what is needed to develop that individual teacher, then there will be a very significant and rather dangerous gap between what you propose in the way of changes in content and what actually happens in terms of the learning of the student. Many people are prepared to accept that of course and many people act upon that acceptance, but then there is the third element which many educationists are far too neglectful of, and that is the whole question of organisational change or development. There are very many well disposed educationists who profess to have no interest in questions of organisation, management, bureaucracy, or the way the institution runs. Now some of those people are lucky enough to carry their ideas through to fruition - accidentally as it were - but if you want to have a planned programme of change you have to be ready to enter into the whole question of how institutions and organisations work and how they may be changed too. So these three processes I think are three fundamental ingredients in any change programme. As a curriculum centre we are equally interested in questions of organisation, institutional organisation, school organisation, organisational change and development, and teacher development. We are equally interested in those, although neither of them is specifically mentioned in our Act. There is no reference to teacher development and there is no reference to organisational development, the whole reference to curriculum development. But the argument that I would pursue, or the argument I put before you in terms of the kinds of changes that you have in mind, is that it is a necessary condition of the success of curriculum development programmes that you should have policies and programmes in relation to those other two areas that I indicated there.

Now before coming on to some of the specific questions that I picked up at yesterday's discussion. I would like to say just one more word about the direction in which the National Curriculum Development Centre is going at the present time. We are funded directly from the Federal Treasury but the resources that we have at our disposal come at least as much from the States as they do from the Federal Treasury because although we receive no direct grants from the States, and have not sought any direct grant from the States, we are very interested in the more effective utilisation of the resources which exist in very considerable quantity in the States. In fact, the resources of the State Curriculum Research branch in Victoria, human and material resources, vastly exceed those of the National Curriculum Development Centre. And if you add the resources that exist on an equally lavish scale in N.S.W. and then those in the other States you have a truly massive set of resources for curriculum change in Australia. We do not intend to try and replicate that kind of pattern of provision. We occasionally look rather enviously at what is available, but what we do intend to do is to tap those resources and to use them. If there are resources for curriculum development locked up in the State Department in Victoria, as indeed there are, then we intend to provide a key to open that door and to get in there and utilise some of those resources. That is an approach in which of course the State Departments are very interested. At least they are very interested in terms of top management; when it comes to the actual programme it is not quite so simple. But I mention that because it underlines the point that we are a very small organisation in terms of staff. We have a defined budget; but if you look just at the staff size of the National Centre and if you look just at the budget that comes from the Federal Government, you get a completely false impression of the actual nature and scope of operations. For

every dollar that comes in from the Federal Government, there are at least two dollars of State resources that we are at present getting our hands on to and next year it might be three dollars. Now the uses to which we put those resources are quite various and I will not give a long descriptive breakdown; you can get plenty of examples of that if you read some of our literature - newsletters for example - but basically the money has been spent so far on curriculum projects of various kinds (mostly, but by no means all) projects with a heavy materials component. The largest project that the Centre is currently funding or is just bringing to a conclusion, is the Social Education Materials Project on which more than \$1 million of Federal money has been expended and according to the formula I gave you a couple of minutes ago, at least \$2 million of State resources have gone in. So something like \$3 million of development money has been spent already over a three-year period on the production of kits of materials in social education. Please do not regard that as a model for the future. We are not going to have \$3 million to spend on Music Education for example. But that has basically been the way in which we have spent money so far. The Centre has produced a triennial programme plan which will be published and available within a few weeks.

If you see that triennial programme plan you will notice that there is one area designated Expressive Arts and I listened rather closely to what Warren Lett had to say on the distinction between expressive and creative. Now we have avoided - perhaps wisely in view of what he said - the word "creative". We are resting content with a lower level if you like. However, in the area we designate Expressive Arts we have allocated some resources for project development. We have used the expression "Multi Arts Curricula." We have regarded the arts area of the curriculum as sufficiently significant to warrant specific mention and designation in our triennial programme. It is ranked with a very small number of substantive curriculum areas such as Science, Communications and so on. We have not earmarked money for development projects in all substantive areas of the school curriculum. One of the first things that I did when I came into the Centre was to ensure that we established a small study group in the expressive arts. We have had a report from that group and that report too will be published and the reason I did this was that from my experience elsewhere I knew perfectly well that art educators are not very good at coming forward with proposals for development projects and programmes. In my experience they have not been very good at focussing on the organisational and bureaucratic structure and seizing an opportunity. Art educators by comparison say with science educators or social science educators, are not queuing up at the door saying we have to have resources for the kinds of things we are interested in - development resources. But if you look at any national curriculum centres, or if you look at regional centres for example in the United States, you will find that there is usually quite a struggle to get a successful curriculum development project going in the arts. The Schools Council in Britain is probably a very good case in point. There have been one or two projects. They have not been amongst the most successful of the Schools Council projects. So I took the view that, in our centre at any rate, we were going to take special steps to ensure that practical proposals for development programmes should be made. And we do have some proposals. But we now have to come back to the arts education community which I recognise is very numerous and very diverse, and to get into discussion regarding the specific nature of the development activities that are required. That is going to be quite difficult because again, at least in my experience, it has proved quite a task to persuade art educators to focus on the practical problems of developmental type activities. This is surely

where teacher educators or people concerned with any aspect of teacher education have a special role and responsibility. One of the things that struck me about what you were doing, is that there has in fact been a great deal of development-type thinking in teacher education institutions in Victoria or institutions concerned with the arts generally. It is really very important to communicate that kind of thinking to the whole arts education community; especially in the schools.

One of the questions which I wanted to put to you in fact was what relationships exist between college members, staff members such as yourselves and teachers in schools when it comes to undertaking some kind of planning or development exercise. For example, how much involvement was there of teachers in schools in the planning operations that lie behind the presentation of new syllabuses, new courses, new outlines and so on. You have to negotiate of course with various bureaucratic bodies, the accrediting agencies, college authorities, college boards, with your colleagues on the college staff. You do not have to negotiate with art educators in the school. It is still possible to live that kind of isolated life. But one question I want to raise is how much of that kind of planning work was done with direct association with school teachers? I raise that question and it may well be that there was a very close relationship. If there is not a very close relationship, there is a lost opportunity. Not only because the school teachers have a very important influence in terms of their experience, their situation, but also because there is a learning task facing the school teacher. You see the point I made a moment ago about the relative incapacity of many art educators, or many educators working in the field of the arts, to focus on these organisational managerial type issues, which must be focussed on in a development programme. Now, that incapacity which I believe still exists to a considerable extent, has to be overcome and can be overcome partly through the leadership provided by people working in tertiary institutions. That may be a slightly old fashioned and elitist view, but I put it forward all the same. Of course, another issue which I want to raise which is related to that, is the extent to which students participate in the development exercises in curriculum planning. How far have we recognised the necessities of student involvement in curriculum decision-making? Again, not just because the students have some kind of rights, but because there is a very important learning experience for them to go through in the development exercise. Now I do not intend to talk any more generally about the question I was on a moment ago regarding the general contribution of the arts to education. I think I have probably indicated sufficiently that as far as the CDC is concerned, we have made a very positive statement. We have made an affirmation if you like that there will be a significant development work in School Arts Curriculum insofar as we have resources of various kinds to contribute to them. And please bear in mind the point I made a few minutes ago, that any sum of money that we set aside can be multiplied several times by our capacity to mobilise resources in the systems throughout the country. So any figure that is quoted is not necessarily the most meaningful figure. What is important is the structure that is set up to coordinate and to make effective use of resources which are otherwise scattered around and are not necessarily united in some kind of common programme. For example, throughout Australia at present in State Curriculum Research branches in the directorates of primary and secondary education where they still exist, in the consultancy services that are provided by the State Departments, in the services divisions or the audio-visual sections, or whatever they are called, there are very considerable resources available for development activity in the arts. If you take any one part of the system by itself, those resources look extremely thin and

impoverished. But if you make a total analysis of those resources, then it is a very impressive collection that exists. But we are certainly not getting the full effect, or the full potential of those resources, because there are practically no programmes, which represent a definite attempt to utilise those resources on a co-operative or co-ordinated basis throughout the country. The CDC does have the capacity to do just that. That capacity is something which is only just beginning to be exploited and I put it to you that our commitment to development work in the arts is a commitment that goes way beyond any particular sum of money that might be quoted. It is a commitment to the very important structure of co-ordination and systematic development across the country as a whole. Just how we work that, how that comes out in real terms over the next two or three years is something that will depend very much on the involvement of people such as yourselves. The last point I want to make about the CDC before going on to this set of issues, is that I said a moment ago that we had produced a triennial programme. We are on triennial funding like tertiary institutions. We have nominated the lower secondary level of schooling as our top priority for the next three years. That does not mean to say that we will not be doing work in other aspects of schooling. That does not mean to say that we are not doing work in primary education. It means that our focus is going to be lower secondary, but the focus includes the interface between lower secondary and primary on the one hand and on the other hand between lower secondary and workforce or upper secondary. If we take that first interface for a moment which would be of particular interest to many people here, there is no doubt that the gap that continues to exist between primary and secondary schools is a very serious and significant one in terms of the child's educational development. It may not be very important to teachers because they do not experience the gap because they are working in one institution or another, and quite frankly it does not make a great deal of difference to their individual lifestyle or work style if they never meet each other. But certainly from the point of view of their educational mission, that gap is a very significant one. I find it quite interesting for example that in some State Departments the gap has been eliminated by the merging of the primary and secondary divisions into something like a division of studies, a division of services or whatever, but there has not been a corresponding merging in the schools. So here is an example of a structural re-organisation taking place in the administration that is well ahead of developments in schools. So the question is what are educators in particular, doing about that transition problem. Now that is an area which does not get a great deal of debate or discussion upon which we want to focus.

Let us leave the CDC and some of its preoccupations and concerns and look at the problem of the development of teacher education programmes and courses in the arts from the standpoint of the kinds of issues that you raised yourselves. Perhaps if I simply identify some of these issues and throw them open for discussion and debate, inviting those people who raised them, to say a few words about the particular questions they have in mind. I should say, of course, that some of these issues are things that I thought I detected and you may not recognise them as they come out. I have already identified one of them, when I referred to this question of who are the participants and Warren Lett in fact identified this quite explicitly. It came to my mind when I saw that succession of diagrams which referred to new courses, new programmes and so on and I could not help asking myself who has been the architect of all of this, who is behind all this movement to create and structure new courses? Is this another rather inward looking highly professionalised group trying to establish a niche for itself, ensuring that it has a proper place in the sun in

the future. That is putting it very crudely but that is how these things can often be seen by people who are not members of such groups, because what you regard as a justification of a quite fundamental, theoretical significance will be regarded by people outside as a post hoc rationalisation, an attempt to provide reasons for doing the things you are already doing, to ensure that people do not come in and take those opportunities that you have already established for yourselves, away from you. It is very important, I think, to see how these things look from outside the circle which is engaged in development. Now you do not have to go right outside the circle, you do not have to go to the sceptical employers or the business groups, with their condemnations and attacks on any kind of significant change in education. You do not necessarily have to involve them in the development of planning but you at least have to go out from your own immediate circle. I was asking how far the students were involved in this planning development exercise, how far does it represent what they want, what they believe in, how far does it meet their aspirations, what part do they play in determining their needs, because all professional groups will claim a right to determine the needs of others whom they regard as their clients. A doctor for example, will claim the right to determine the needs of his patient, the patient being his client. But from a health point of view as distinct from the point of view of certain forms of medical treatment, the patient has as much say in the determination of his needs as the doctor does. From an educational point of view as distinct from a narrowing teacher dominated point of view, the learner has as much right in determining what he needs as his teacher does. I simply put that out as a point for argument and debate. But I raise that as one question. Who was involved? What has been the engagement of the client's system, what has been the engagement of the colleague system in these course planning exercises?

The second question that I have concerns the whole responsibility of tertiary institutions for in-service education. Now I have had a fairly substantial experience in teacher-education in one kind of institution or another and in different countries. I have reached the conclusion which is now becoming quite popular that our most effective work in teacher education comes at the in-service stage. That we have a very serious imbalance in fact in teacher education between the resources of all kinds that are available for initial teacher education and the resources that are available for in-service. Last year, Glen Evans from the University of Queensland and Jim Harvey who is a colleague at the CDC, carried out a study of in-service education in Australia which will be published quite soon. I was very struck by two things. One is that there has been a very substantial increase since the Schools Commission development programme came into effect a couple of years ago, but the other thing is that the provision is enormously unequal throughout the country and in different areas of education. You can find particular parts of the country, or you can find particular parts of education which are very well provided for even now in the more straitened circumstances - relatively speaking that is - that we are living in. You can find some areas very well provided for and others of very little activity. The question I put to you is how much of your planning and development efforts in terms of the education of teachers as musicians or music teachers is going into their post-experience needs which are rather different from their pre-service needs, and which I would put to you are needs which in many ways can be more easily and more effectively met than the pre-service needs can be. As teacher educators, as most of you are in one capacity or another, I am sure you would agree with me that there is very widespread dissatisfaction amongst our clients - among your clients - with what is going on. Regardless of subject area or specialism, trainee teachers

enter schools with a very substantial chip on their shoulder regarding the training programme they have been through. This is a common experience in many countries. The research that is being carried out in Australia and the anecdotal experience that I have come across confirms this feeling of very grave dissatisfaction. I believe that this dissatisfaction has some very healthy characteristics. It is not going to change basically anyway. It goes back to a point that somebody raised yesterday that you cannot achieve everything through a pre-service course. Of course you can't, so the next question is what are you doing on the in-service side to ensure that you are achieving some things there that you were not achieving on the pre-service side. How effective, how substantial are the in-service programmes? Reference was made by many people yesterday to things that are going on, but I think probably the theme of the conference may have been the initial courses because many of those reference were put aside. Perhaps on some future occasion it would be good to focus on those other things and see what you are doing and see how satisfactory the provision is on the in-service side. Now that just happens to be a particular pre-occupation of mine but I often feel that we could quite usefully reduce the pre-service course in length, for example, provided we introduce some kind of sandwich principle or some kind of extended in-service development programme. Certainly we have to do something about the unequal provision of resources for in-service and we have to get some better balance than we have at the present time - I am talking nationally here. Now a third question that occurred to me as I listened to what was said about course outlines, was what is the specific nature and quality of resources available to ensure that these courses in fact work? There is a great temptation in course design. As we all know, it is a paper exercise, it is a committee exercise, it is an exercise that is designed often to impress the accrediting body, so you have to put your best foot forward and prove that you have all the resources and so on. But in going through that exercise many teacher educators put them forward in such a way that they convince the accrediting agencies and they usually over-reach themselves in doing that. They usually claim to be doing more or to be able to do more than they are in fact able to do. So that the design capacity is rather greater than the delivery capacity. I would simply say that it is a very general experience wherever institutions or individuals have to go through this accrediting process.

So the next question is going to be "What is the operational or the effective music education programme in our tertiary institutions as distinct from the intended curriculum or programme". You see, we had a lot of statement regarding intention. These are maps or plans or these are structures that we have set up. That takes me on to another question. We do not know what the operational curriculum in Australia is - in schools or tertiary institutions or anywhere else. We have a lot of bits and pieces of study and odd bits and pieces of personal experience, but what role have the tertiary institutions in their relationship to schools? What role have they got in determining the operational curriculum in music education in the schools? There was relatively little mention of research yesterday. We had the rather traditional dichotomy - the universities of course proclaim their research role, but the colleges hardly mentioned research. Now that is in line with the determination delivered by Mr. Justice Campbell which I believe many colleges were rather unhappy about, but if you do not define an educational research role, then the next determination by Mr. Justice Campbell will increase that disparity between universities and the colleges because you will have accepted his definition of the situation, namely that the colleges have got a role in communicating or transmitting established knowledge,

whereas the universities have a role, not only in transmitting established knowledge, but in developing new knowledge. Now it seems to me that a body of people such as yourselves (whether you work in colleges or universities is almost immaterial!) ought to have a professional commitment by virtue of being teacher educators or educators or trainers of teachers. You ought to have some kind of specific professional commitment to the development of knowledge in relation to that area. That is not something that a college, for example, could hand over to a university and say you people please get on with the business of generating new knowledge about what is required in music education and we will go ahead and apply it. I will not go into detail on that. I am quite happy to discuss it at length if you want to, but I happen to think that is a completely false model and it is a rather dangerous model. It is a very convenient administrative or bureaucratic model because it enables us to say we are separate things. There are colleges on the one hand, there are universities, there is an Advanced Education Commission, there is a Universities Commission. There are resource allocations to be made. You can allocate resources according to these functions here and those functions over there. But I happen to believe that the situations that you are in are situations which it is necessary to be in, in order to develop that knowledge at all. It is not a kind of laboratory situation where you can set up a special kind of laboratory in which you can develop and test ideas. You happen to be in the appropriate laboratory from which new ideas and new knowledge about developments in music education can itself develop. That has to be made an explicit part of the college programme, I believe. It has to be given as much emphasis and attention as outlines of courses. In fact you cannot continue to outline courses in any kind of constructive or creative way, unless you have some kind of ongoing knowledge base - I use knowledge in a very broad sense here to cover a whole range of processes that you are engaged in and familiar with. Perhaps I should use the word understanding, a base of understanding which itself must be growing and changing and you cannot pull in that base of understanding by drawing upon the work that is going on in other institutions which are regarded as the creative institutions. So I was very interested in that question of the scope, the nature of research and scholarship in relation to the development planning exercises that is going on. Where is the leadership in ideas in relation to music education, to come from? What is the relationship of courses, of course construction granting all the points that have been raised about the need to satisfy various external bodies, what is the relationship of course construction to contemporary movements, in the culture from which you draw your own inspiration and ideas? To what extent is a substantive contribution of that culture being made by the people who are designing and developing courses. Those are simply questions which are relevant not just to music education but in fact to the whole college system, the whole concept of colleges as distinct from universities. And I was thinking about that when I was listening to some of the things being said.

Now going on to another question which somebody raised specifically I think. There is a lot of concern I know about the problem of communicating to wider audiences, the nature and the values of music in education. Warren Lett's paper was very much related to that particular question. I made the point earlier that there are certain risks involved in rather tightly defined professional groups defining their own roles and determining their own work programmes, in terms of the breadth of thought and understanding to be brought to bear on curriculum decisions. There is an equally great problem, I think, in relation to the wider audience which provides the context for decision-making - the public if you like - the public and its educational

problems. How effective is the communication mechanism to wider audiences, the public, the leaders of public opinion, the politicians, the employers, the trade unions and so on. It is interesting for me outside the country to read about the involvement of the trade unions in environmental issues. I am sure if you made an analysis it would show green bans are not just environmental things, they are also industrial and union things. That is a somewhat cynical point. But the question is - are the people who have a very decisive influence on various aspects of national policy, local policy, at all aware of the enormous amount of thinking that goes into your determinations of what you are trying to do? Isn't there in the area of music education, as in so many other esoteric fields (and I hope you forgive me for saying that music education is an esoteric field, even if music isn't), this enormous problem of the massive assumption that is made about what everybody else knows? Take for example, compulsory music studies. My question is why is it compulsory at all? Now I am not bringing that question forward with an implied answer. I do not want you to understand that my answer is that it should not be compulsory. What I want to know is what reasons would you give for making it compulsory? Let us put it slightly differently. You can certainly show that music or any of the arts for that matter, have values. But you could also say that those same values can be derived from a very large number of other activities. The question therefore is what is so distinctive about music? What is the essential component? What is it that enables you to say "Is it just a utilitarian argument in relation to primary school teachers for example that all primary school teachers ipso facto are teaching, or are required to teach, or might be required to teach music of some kind." That's just a utilitarian argument. You are simply saying that if you are accepting that they might be called upon to do it, we have to do something to prepare them for it. The great weakness of that argument is that they might cease to be called upon to do it especially with the move towards local autonomy and curriculum development. There will be no body in the State or nationally which will say to schools, you will or you ought to teach music. That decision-making is rapidly being, I was going to say delegated, to the Schools in the regions, but maybe relegated would be a better word. So there has to be some kind of attempt in this communication to wider audiences. It would not be enough, for example, to say through music you can achieve this and this and this. Because the answer of a sceptic is, yes, I appreciate that from a logical point of view. I am going to maintain however that you can also obtain those things through other activities and therefore, why music? That's a question which the students are bound to put and if the answer is you are doing compulsory music because there is some kind of requirement of the system that you should do it, that is a very unconvincing argument because the more astute students will say well of course we can change the system. The system is changing. So there must be some better argument than that. And there must be some argument which is not of the kind that you could reproduce. The same kind of argument applies in relation not only by the way to other arts, but also to non-arts subjects because many of the values that are ascribed to music can be attached to any kind of subject. Without too much difficulty for example you can take many of the values that I have seen identified as values of music, and attribute them all to science. In other words there is something missing in the concept of what it is that music has to offer. And this is especially true when the argument takes a fairly abstract form, because the more abstract the quality the easier it is to attach it to a whole range of activities. On the other hand, the more specific the quality is in terms of some skill, the more difficult it is to justify it as something universal. So I hope you can see the nature of the dilemma. I do not want to suggest that there is any easy solution to

that, but I do want to say that a communication to wider audiences has to be based upon a resolution of that particular dilemma, or an attempt to resolve it. Now I have raised another point which you identified so I shall say no more about that concerning the relationship of the course content and the procedures that are proposed for teaching the courses to the actual world of schooling. I simply ask that in my own mind - how is this relationship defined? What was the role of the schools themselves in determining or influencing what goes into those programmes that you spent a lot of time in defining.

Another issue which came up, is that I was not all that clear in my own mind, but I am sure you are, about the distinction between the requirements of specialist music educators and those who are generalists. Now this again is one of those problems or issues which you can find parallels to in any field. If, for example, you have things called general science which are for non-scientists, what is general science? What is its standing in the intellectual community? What value does it have to students? What specific organisational relationships are there between the general element and so-called specialists? I think those are simply questions that came to my mind when reference was made to the requirements of people who were going to be professional or specialist musicians or music educators as distinct from those who were not. Now, how well has that kind of distinction been analysed and has a fresh body or fresh stream of thought been brought to bear upon this or is it that a lot of assumptions are being made here about different needs - or overlapping needs - and requirements? I simply put that forward as an issue or question which occurred to me.

The last one which came up, and this is very specifically a curriculum question in the narrowest sense of the word was this: is it possible for music educators or, more broadly, for art educators or educators in the arts to agree on a common core, and is it possible for them to agree on minimal standards? Is there such a thing as a core of music education which everybody about whom it claims is going to be made must have experience? If there is such a thing or if people could reach an agreement about that, how would that be defined in terms of performance standards? I do not mean performance in your sense of the word. I mean performance more generally educationally. What would count as adequate completion or adequate performance in the context of that core of knowledge and understanding? Now that question which is a very specific educational or pedagogical question also happens to be one of the most burning public questions in Australia today regarding the whole of school, the whole of education. Is there such a thing as a core of knowledge that will enable us to say that all educational institutions, regardless of the autonomy they exercise in relation to specific parts, or specific interpretations of their core, ought to aim to present to their students? Now I do not know the answer to that question, and I am putting it simply to you as a question that cannot be avoided in any kind of pedagogical decision-making. Presumably, behind the notion of compulsory courses, there is a belief in a core. That might be an implicit belief, it may not have been made very explicit, but I would take it that the requirement that there should be compulsory courses for all students, presupposes belief in some kind of common core. If there is not that belief then it seems rather difficult to justify those compulsory courses and if there is such a common core as I say, then there must be also some implicit views about what would count as an adequate performance in relation to that. Is, for example, attendance at the core sufficient? Presumably everybody would say no, attendance is not sufficient. You can be there physically but you have to be involved or engaged in some way. Is it passing some kind of examination to go to the other extreme? Now many people would say no,

passing an examination, that is irrelevant too. Somewhere between those two there must be some notion which is tucked away concerning acceptable standards, and I do not want to take the line that if we do not define those standards, somebody else will find them for us. First of all, because I am not sure that is true. And secondly, even if it were true, the educational reason for defining standards has nothing to do with the fact that somebody else might do that job for us. It has to do with the fact that defining performance criteria happens to be one of the necessary elements in an educational process. Well those are the kind of questions that occurred to me in listening to what was said yesterday. Please forgive me for having taken up points which may strike you in some cases perhaps in many cases, as being a little bit idiosyncratic, but that is the risk you taken when you invite somebody from outside your own professional group to comment on or to take a part in a professional discussion. If there is any value in that, at least it has something to do with your capacity to come back now and say well it wasn't quite like that, it is not quite that way, it is something rather different. Or if it is as you said, then there is a great deal more to be said on that subject.

WORKING PARTIES

1. Why teach Music - Formulating Objectives

Introduction - Jennifer Bryce - Lincoln Institute
Report - Jennifer Bryce

2. Curriculum Development

Report - Michael Wood S.C.V.-I.C.E. Mercy College.

3. Role of the Classroom teacher and music specialist.

Report - Peter Larsen, S.C.V. Coburg.

4. Instrumental Music

Report - Barry Purcell, Music Branch

5. Evaluation of Teacher Training and Music Education

Introduction - Dr. Brian Chalmers, Deakin University
Report - Peter Sargeant, Ballarat C.A.E.

WHY TEACH MUSIC? - FORMULATING OBJECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

I suspect that this topic was selected for discussion at the Music Education Seminar as a result of a group of Australian music educators getting together at the I.S.M.E. Conference 1976 in Montreux, Switzerland. Geographically removed from Australia we could consider Australian music education from a new perspective. We were motivated by the questions of music educators from other countries: what is typical of Australian culture? What is distinctly Australian? Sing us an Australian song. We found these questions perplexing and we became aware of the fact that most of us seemed to be doing the same kinds of things as European music educators. Yet surely the needs of Australian children are different to those of European children. We returned with the resolve that we must attempt to define what we should be doing.

There appear to be two outstanding reasons why music educators should define what they are about. Firstly, in the present economic climate with the emphasis on literacy and numeracy skills, we must be prepared to justify music education. Secondly, it is apparent that there is a lack of coherency between music in primary, secondary and tertiary education. We start in primary schools by assuming, probably correctly, that most students have had little or no music experience. But we then make the same assumption at the beginning of secondary education, and also when students enter tertiary music courses such as those offered by S.C.V's. We may have become expert at starting music courses, but in most cases the courses have not been extensively developed.

If these problems can be solved by the formulation of a series of objectives spanning primary through to tertiary education, one important consideration remains: who should formulate the objectives? Unless the objectives are written by an authoritative and respected body they will have little impact. With the present commendable trend towards decentralizing education there is no apparent way that such objectives could be enforced. Yet unless they are observed by all music educators their purpose will be lost.

Some problems relating to the writing of objectives will now be raised, but it must be remembered that unless a method of implementing objectives can be found it will be futile to spend time writing them.

The first problem to confront the writers of objectives would be that of writing a rationale for music education - sufficiently broad to cater for the needs and interests of all music educators of primary to tertiary levels yet also a purposeful justification. The following ideas written by Barbara Hamer (Music Officer, Special Services Division) and Parry Purcell (Music Officer, Special Services Division, Victorian Education Department) are helpful.

Why Music? Music is an important, vital force in people's lives. This century has accelerated the impact both in terms of exposure and involvement.

Music aids personality development by providing rich opportunities for emotional response.

Music challenges and enhances the intellect and imagination in a distinctive way.

Music promotes social relationships as well as self development.

Music enriches and supports other areas and disciplines.

Therefore music requires a significant role in educational experiences.

To be effective music needs space, materials, skilled teachers and recognition by an encouraging educational climate and the community.

Justifications for teaching music because it develops imaginative and creative powers are commendable, but it must be remembered that other art forms can also perform this function. To write a purposeful rationale we must ask what is unique to music.

In order to allow teachers freedom and flexibility, a series of objectives should refrain from prescribing course content or teaching methods. A series of objectives would be closely related to the written rationale for music education. An attempt has been made to write a series of content and method-free music teaching objectives for the Experimental Teaching Project¹. It is also well worth mentioning the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project² and Richard Colwell³. In a discussion at the I.S.M.E. Conference in Montreux, Professor Henry Cady (University of Delaware, U.S.A.) outlined two major problems related to the writing of music objectives. Firstly, objectives are usually set out in a hierarchy, but we do not have sufficient knowledge about musical processes to do this accurately. Secondly, the words we use to describe music are the same as those used to describe spatial, concrete arts - for example, is the word 'structure' appropriate for an art form that proceeds through time? We must clarify our verbal symbols to prevent ambiguity.

REPORT OF WORKING PARTY

The tasks of our discussion group at the S.C.V. Toorak Music Education Seminar were to consider whether it would be possible to write a rationale for music education and to consider how one might go about formulating a series of objectives. We started by considering what is Music? We thought about the nature of sound, illustrated by details of a group member's young daughter's reactions to discovering sound. We considered the various justifications for teaching art forms discussed by Dr. Warren Lett the previous evening and came to the conclusion that the unique contribution of music is that it introduces the listener and performer to an aural world; this is something that no other art form can do.

The lack of continuity between primary, secondary and tertiary music courses was illustrated by a number of examples such as students starting tertiary courses saying that they 'know nothing' about music, and we considered the consequences of primary school teachers having no confidence in their own musical ability. Music is often considered to be a 'precious' subject and students become apprehensive about musical skills.

One way to start to write a series of music teaching objectives might be to ask what Musical Skills would we expect a student to have acquired and what Musical Experiences would we want him to have had at the end of secondary schooling. After outlining these skills and experiences it would be necessary to decide at what primary and secondary levels they should be introduced. There has been a lot of discussion about

the need for specialist music teachers. It was not the role of this particular discussion group to consider this question in depth, but it was suggested that the allocation of specialist music teachers could help to overcome the lack of coherency between primary, secondary, and tertiary music. For example specialist music teachers could be allocated to three areas within primary and secondary education: grades 1 to 4, grades 5 to 8, and grades 9 to 12. This would immediately overcome the tendency to start again in grade 7, or the first year of secondary education. Obviously there would be a number of organizational problems with this scheme, but it may well be able to work on a regional basis.

In conclusion this discussion group asked that the Curriculum Development Centre (represented at the seminar by Dr. Malcolm Skilbeck) be approached to convene a group to formulate a series of rationales and teaching objectives for music and the other arts.

References

1. The objectives appear in the Experimental Teaching Project Handbook: Enjoyment of Music Through Group Activity available from the faculty of Music, University of Melbourne.
2. Ronald B. Thomas: Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report, Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase NY, August 1970.
3. Richard Colwell: The Evaluation of Music Teaching and Learning, Contemporary Perspectives in Education Series, Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Dr. Skilbeck noted the concluding remark and invited this group or any other group to put forward a proposal to CDC. CDC staff would be prepared to discuss the objectives based approach to curriculum making. If this group would like further advice or assistance in preparation of the submission, CDC will help with that also.

REPORT - CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Geoff Jones delivered a brief paper at the start of the first session on the need for a curriculum development. Below are listed some of the points discussed:

1. Curriculum development is of vital concern to us if music is to survive as a discipline.
2. Who should develop it?
 - Is it the role of the colleges? Perhaps this is unwise as this could neglect needs of individuals, cultural and local backgrounds.
 - Is it the role of each school or region of schools? Perhaps too restrictive, specialist teachers would need to be available.
3. Curriculum guides should be as flexible as possible.

4. Few of us trained in expertise needed to devise a curriculum - well structured curriculum should involve experienced members of music staff, classroom teachers, representatives from colleges, C.D.C., C. & R. and in-service teachers.
5. It should be possible for a child to discover his affinity and interest in music and to pursue this interest of his choice and to attain within the curriculum his maximum level of attainment - this requires a comprehensive curriculum, an immense task.
6. Should we explore a system which exploits a specific skill to give an in-depth experience in music? Often the field we aim to cover is so wide that the child ends up with only a superficial interest in music.
7. A curriculum should demonstrate cognitive growth - how can this be achieved; should we set levels; is it necessary to try and justify a curriculum by setting academic standards?
8. A high powered curriculum tends to exclude generalist teachers with the result that they leave music alone altogether.
9. Two curricula could be structured, one for specialists and one for generalists.
10. There is a need to set up special music schools - if too idealistic at present then at least special music rooms.
11. There has been no curriculum to follow since 1956.
12. Music Branch has just put out a guide - really more a collection of ideas - not much help to the young teacher.
13. At present there is no cohesion, everybody is doing his own thing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This particular group acknowledges the necessity of a curriculum for music education.

We suggest that a group be authorized by the seminar to investigate current attempts at devising the music curriculum. The purpose of this investigation is to determine the level of expertise, the progress being made and the areas of development being studied.

If there is not such a group we recommend that one be formed comprising experienced members of music staff, classroom teachers, representatives from the colleges, C.D.C., C. & R., and in-service teaching. We consider this recommendation to be of the utmost urgency.

To assist the evaluation of the music program, to implement an advanced curriculum and to ensure maximum benefit of a specialist teacher this group recommends that as many music specialists as are available be placed in selected schools throughout Victoria to initiate a music program. We envisage that these people would be only attached to that school and would be full-time members of staff. We see the minimum requirement for a specialist teacher as being a graduate with a major study in music or that which is deemed equivalent by a representative of the employing body.

(Michael J. Wood)

NOTE: Barbara Hamer expressed interest in this idea and suggested that this group could be set up through A.S.M.E.

ROLE OF THE CLASSROOM TEACHER AND MUSIC SPECIALIST

Trevor Jones presented a paper and he posed seven rhetorical questions which were the basis of the subsequent discussion.

1. Is a specialist music teacher desirable, essential to the successful implementation of a classroom music education programme?
2. If so, should such a person be solely responsible for the implementation of the programme?
3. Should such a person be attached to the school or the division?
4. What relationship should such a person have to the classroom teacher?
5. What is the attitude of education authorities towards the employment of specialist music teachers?
6. At the present time is the employment of specialist music teachers politically and financially viable.
7. How can a plan for school-based music teachers be implemented?

The conclusion that we reached were that:-

1. Specialist teachers (whether resident or resource) are essential for the planning and implementation of music programmes in any school.
2. There should be shared responsibility between specialists and the classroom teacher with regard to the planning and implementation of the music programme. We were very keen that if the class teacher is able to make a good contribution, he should be given the opportunity to do this and the music specialist retire in the background.
3. In each of the larger schools a permanent specialist ought to be appointed and should be responsible essentially to that school. He should be on an equal footing with any other member of staff of that school.
4. The specialist and classroom teacher should constitute a music teaching team.

RESOLUTIONS

1. That wherever possible, music specialists should be involved in the teaching practice of students even on teaching rounds. They should have access to and a contact with music specialists.
2. That each student taking music at Teachers College should be required to teach music to a significant extent on each of the teaching rounds.
3. That the present student/pupil ratio of the primary education department is seen as a limiting factor in regard to the provision of music specialists. It is recommended that some appropriate

RESOLUTIONS (contd)

adjustment be made by the department to allow for a greater number of music specialists.

4. That specialist resource staff and facilities should be available locally to all teachers.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

Don Coxon's paper "The High School Instrumental Program" was read. Discussion then focused on the order of priority in aims and objectives. It was agreed that all children should have the opportunity to express themselves on a musical instrument, value this as a means of self-expression and desire to make this a part of continuing musical experiences in life. As such Instrumental Music must be an essential part of any comprehensive and balanced Music Program. It was pointed out that non-musical goals such as promoting self discipline, social responsibility or sound physical health are not central to this process of genuine music education.

The group was concerned that there should not be a division of classroom/instrumental music but rather an integrated and co-operative approach. To this end it was felt desirable that all music teachers in their training gain knowledge and some experience of instruments and instrumental programs. This would give insight and help overcome problems that have plagued some schools.

The instrumental program itself needs to be relevant and capable of being incorporated in the life style of the students. On this point it was emphasized that a successful model does not necessarily have to be a symphony orchestra or concert band and skill achievement alone. The program should include creation and recreation and should not be elitist either with music or children. Provision for the talented is part of this total program.

It was felt essential that there be a viable pressure group to focus and press for improvement in the Education Department structure on instrumental music. The present Divisional organisation does not allow for the best educational and effective development. It was suggested that Area Teachers (perhaps based on the Regional Model) who service primary and post-primary schools would allow for beginning tuition at an early age and allow continuity in the program.

There was felt to be a great need to consider teaching facilities, subsidies and bulk purchase of instruments, instrumental repairs and the best use of professional musicians. To this point it was suggested that:

- (a) the master-musician in-service program be expanded both for teachers and talented children.
- (b) in country areas, the "artist in residence" be promoted who could stimulate music both in schools and the community.

EVALUATION OF TEACHER TRAINING AND MUSIC EDUCATION

Dr. B.A. Chalmers, School of Education, Deakin University, Geelong.

I have been asked to say something stimulating and provocative on the subject of evaluation in Music Education at this seminar.

The very notion of evaluation in Music Education is itself quite provocative. "Evaluation has traditionally been an area of weakness in the music education program and in the preparation of music teachers."

and most of us are aware that scepticism on the part of musicians (let's include ourselves here) regarding the use of measurement procedures in music education has a long history.

"It is sometimes unfortunate," says Herbert King, "that the attitude of the musician to his art is like that of the mother to her child. Both are inclined to resent any attempt on the part of an investigator to apply anything savouring of mathematics or the foot rule to their protege."

For many, mathematical measurement and art are completely antithetical. However, Carl Seashore points out that investments in musical education hinge upon an adequate evaluation of talent. This notion of accountability, I believe, is motivating the current interest in evaluation now taking place in Australian Music Education. It is very difficult to prepare specific guidelines for a working party in a short space of time. So, against my better judgment, I am about to make a number of sweeping comments which I hope you will find pertinent to the subject of evaluation in teacher training and music education. This brings to mind one important aspect of the evaluation process - the necessity to be specific.

The need to be specific

What aspects of teacher training, what aspects of music education precisely do we wish to discuss? If it is not practical for the purposes of evaluation, if we intend to use psychometric measuring methods, to tackle the whole enormous area in toto. We must therefore select areas which we consider basic to

- (1) Teacher training and
- (2) Music education.

1. -What kind of student should we train?
 - Should we train only those who have a formal background in music?
 - Do those who have no formal learning in music before reaching a training program make better teachers of school music?
 - What positive evidence do we have one way or the other, on which to base a reply to these questions?
2. -What areas are fundamental for good music education courses?
 - Should we teach only basic skills and hope that desirable attitudes develop as a consequence?
 - Should we cultivate a "music for leisure approach" setting up "creative music" type situations and insert the basics informally?
 - Do we have evidence that one of these systems is better than the other, or that a combination of both is better than either one?

Those who criticized Wing 50 years ago for his attempts at being precise in his evaluation and measurement of musical intelligence and appreciation, did so on the grounds that music was too spiritual a thing to be measured statistically. Even a slight knowledge of evaluation processes shows that such attitudes are based upon a fundamental misunder-

standing of how statistical measures are made in the field of music psychology, which is the name of the discipline we are now in to.

Cyril Burt believes that doubts regarding the valid application of measuring principles in music, stem from the false assumption that all measurement is necessarily additive measurement. Most aesthetic material is not additive but is generally ordered according to ranks.

I will spare you an explanation of the statistics Burt is alluding to here and point those who are interested in the direction of the current Australian Journal of Music Education, p.13.

If as music educators we have to make effective evaluations of teacher training and music education, we need first to become familiar with the principles of measurement and evaluation, and to relate these to the instructional processes in music. In discussing evaluation, we should think not only in terms of tests but also in its broadest context, encompassing a host of devices as they pertain to music teaching at all levels from pre-school to tertiary.

Purposes of Evaluation

It may be fruitful to include a discussion on the role of behavioural objectives in evaluation of music education some time in the future.

Selecting and using assessment devices

The third National A.S.M.E. Conference panel on special talent and music assessment is going to reveal to us all in Canberra next May that much wider use of standardized tests is made in Australian music education than some of us had hitherto suspected. Bentley's Measurement of Musical Abilities, Wing's Standardized Tests of Musical Intelligence, Colwell's Music Achievement Tests, The Australian Test for Advanced Music Students are now sufficiently used to provide their authors with considerable data on which to calculate norms for Australian populations of mixed age groups. But in selecting an appropriate text for our purposes we need to consider a number of the tests' features:

1. Usability
2. Validity
3. Reliability

Interpreting the Results

In music education training programs thought might be given to teaching an understanding of basic terms such as measures of central tendency, frequency distribution, correlation, standard score, standard error, chance scores and item analysis. I feel we will do future music educators a disservice if we do not help them understand and use these evaluation tests to their full advantage on their own teaching methods. There are many very good standardized measures available for the evaluation of musical talent at all ages. Early editions of the Wing and the Seashore measures can be borrowed from A.C.E.R.

Evaluating Cognitive learning

There is no evidence that the amount of knowledge presently taught in schools excludes giving attention to the affective aspects and the skills aspects of music. In order to evaluate how successfully cognit-

ive learning is taking place in the classroom, teacher constructed tests are a necessity. Even if new standardized tests become available for this important area, these cannot completely replace teacher constructed tests directed at the specific program of the local situation. We therefore need to teach students of music education as much as possible about test construction in order to produce good tools for use in daily teaching.

Evaluating musical skills

Music performance falls well within the definition of a skill, being far more a psychomotor activity than a cognitive one.

To conclude on a personal bias. I would like to repeat my belief that evaluation in music education and teacher training at this stage in our history ought to be quite precise and specific. The kind of precision I prefer is that provided by quantified data. The kind of evaluation (favour is that which has a basis in experimental method. This permits the analysis of hundreds of observations (in the form of statistical data) which can be evaluated impartially (although interpretation of results may not always be impartial) using appropriate measurement devices. Currently there is increased recognition of the need for objective evaluation in Music Education Factual data, the product of scientific investigation when correctly used, will surely help evaluate and develop music education processes and practices.

Evaluation of Teacher Training and Music Education

Our discussion group centred around the evaluation of Teacher Training and Music Education. A very broad topic as you may well realise. It began with a paper given by Dr. Brian Chalmers from ex-Geelong State College, now Deakin University. Brian presented a very detailed and very lengthy paper on this topic although some of us felt that perhaps the topic of his paper would better be described as an evaluation of music teaching. He covered a number of areas under the headings of Need to be Specific, Purposes of Evaluation, Selecting and Using Assessment Devices, Interpreting Results of Evaluation, Evaluating Musical Talent, Evaluating Cognitive Learning, Evaluating Musical Skills, Evaluating Effective Domain. Out of that came quite a number of very interesting points. One of them was the various assessment devices that he's been using that are available in Australia. So if you are interested in those have a look at Brian's report. He mentioned a number of quite interesting devices. From that report and from a couple of other points which were discussed we came up with a number of points that we feel need examination; maybe by this group, maybe by A.S.M.E. At the moment it is hanging in the air who should examine these sorts of things. One of the group came up with a survey that approximately 80% of students leaving colleges don't teach music. This seems to be a fact. Now we immediately got on to this and suggested that if this is so, we do need some sort of positive research as to why this exists and what are the reasons for it. Now we feel this is one of the first things which should be done. We suggested that perhaps it could be a feeling of incompetence on the part of the student, maybe it is a historical reason. When you go to school your first year out someone can help you with the mathematics programme. But there is no one who can help you with the music programme. But perhaps there are not any real materials in music available in the schools, other than the old record player, the ancient sound system and so on. Maybe it is because of the unsatisfactory college programmes. That point does really need careful examination and positive research as to why this is so. How best to evaluate teacher training

noting that there are two areas, was another point. There are two areas of curriculum training and general elective studies. Some of us doubted whether this division needs to exist whether we need to have curriculum separate from general elective areas. Maybe there is a need to evaluate different approaches to curriculum studies. The Burwood approach is one that is mentioned, another one that comes to my mind is the Ballarat approach. Have a look at those. There is a need for the close examination of the content of college courses - what to teach and how best things are taught.

There was a series of points related to in-service work. Just at the moment the in-service music courses reflect a weakness in the college courses. Over the past three years, there was something like 2,000 students enrolled for in-service music courses so we wondered whether this reflects a weakness in college programmes we are offering. Does this demand reflect some need for a shift of emphasis in college music programmes from pre-service to in-service type courses? Do the type of practical oriented in-service music courses reflect a demand of a practical type course in colleges? Now our last point. Are esoteric general elective type studies offered in some college music programmes; best suited to post-graduate studies? We felt that these are some of the points which should be carefully examined by people like ourselves.

CONCLUDING ADDRESS - DR. MALCOLM SKILBECK

I have the advantage of being able to offer two or three comments at the conclusion of the sessions and I am just going to offer two or three observations and leave it at that. The first is that it is very refreshing from my point of view to see such a very wide coverage of the field. It is very interesting for a non-music specialist to see the extent to which problems and issues which have been canvassed in this seminar as I have heard them are so similar to problems and issues which are being canvassed right across the field of educational development. Now that is in many ways a very healthy sign because it indicates that the music specialists are in tune with or part of the mainstream of criticism and enquiry and reflection in education and are not behaving like members of an isolated, inward looking, rather insulated group as some music educators feel that they are. It is quite clear to me that the kinds of questions, issues and viewpoints that have been presented, indicate that there is not that isolation at all, at least amongst music educators in Victoria. That is perhaps encouraging to you also from another point of view because it means that many of the problems to which you are addressing yourselves, are problems which are being addressed by other people and there has been some progress towards resolving some of them. We were just discussing evaluation. There has been a great deal of work done in evaluation. No group working on the subject of evaluation at this stage has to start completely afresh. There has been a vast amount of very interesting and challenging work done on programme evaluation, on institutional and organisational evaluation, quite apart from the work that is going on in relation to pupil assessment. That work is available to any group such as yourselves and ought to be referred to and ought to be further developed.

The second observation I would like to make of a general kind, from what has been said at these sessions, is the very great importance in any kind of development programme, or development operation of a process as distinct from product issues. Now that relates specifically to the question of defining objectives or developing materials, or developing new curricula. One of the big mistakes that has been made in the curriculum development movement internationally over the past 20 or 30 years (the modern phase, because after all curriculum development is a very ancient craft) is to assume that the real job is to produce models

and materials of a rather good and interesting and significant kind. The real job in fact is to engage as many people as possible in the process of reconsideration and reflection and development and not to be greatly worried if the products that emerge from this are not of the higher standard of excellence. There is a very important difference between the perspective of the publisher and the perspective of the developer in this regard. The publisher does want to see products of good quality and will impose upon a curriculum development process criteria or standards which have to meet with the production of materials in the world of publishing. A developer by contrast might be very well satisfied if there are no materials or if the materials that are produced may appear to be rather sloppy or insignificant because he will be interested as much in the process by which these materials were produced as he will in the actual product itself. They can apply that specifically to the objectives in question. What is really significant is to promote the processes this seminar has promoted of stimulating objectives type thinking rather than to come up with lists of objectives. As I said earlier this afternoon, if this group or some group of which this is a part, wishes to come forward with a proposal to the CDC that we might get involved in the formulation of objectives, all I would say to you is that we would be likely to respond along the lines "Yes, we are very interested in process questions in the field of objectives." We are very interested in the notion of guidelines although it has to be admitted that teachers when they are presented with materials, put the guidelines in the teachers' notes on one side and they work very largely from the pupil's materials. So if we are going to produce statements of objectives and guidelines, it might be more sensible to produce them within the body of learning materials rather than to produce separate kits of teachers' materials. I say that even though the CDC is producing teacher materials, guidelines and so on. But I leave that particular thought with you. The next observation I make from what I have heard this afternoon is a general point and that is that all subjects have constantly to redefine themselves and their relationships to the world. And when somebody observed that it is impossible, you try to define music and everybody thought that is great because everybody has been trying to do that for a long time and nobody has succeeded. Everybody in the world of science has been trying to define science and has not succeeded and so on. The important thing from a development perspective again is that people should realise the openness of the area rather than regarding it as something closed and fixed, and they should be constantly trying to relate developments in their own field to the world at large and to ask the educational question, "so what as far as the learner is concerned?" It might be a very important particular question from the standpoint of a specialist within a field but what is the significance of that question from the standpoint of a learner?

My next point is one that I have raised already. I would just like to identify it, and that is the question as to who are the curriculum development experts? Well I think I have said enough on that subject to avoid going on with it. But I will just say that the curriculum development process in music as in any other field just like the business of reviewing the subject, is a continuous process. It is not a matter of undertaking a massive effort, and say well, we have done that, we will now turn to something else. Our task is to build the capacity for development and renewal into the existing systems rather than to imagine that we can build a separate system called the Development or the Chain System and superimpose that upon all the existing systems. We need to build the capacity for evaluation or development into teachers rather than to imagine we can solve the problem by defining a separate group called Developers and Evaluators. We do have to have such a group but it will only be very small and they will not carry out the whole job. Now another group in their presentation drew attention to a lot of very practical and reality

type questions concerning teachers' needs, teacher role, and the importance of relating aspirations in a field. It is easy to develop aspirations for the subject of music education, but those aspirations obviously have to be related to the teachers' aspirations and the aspirations of the music teacher are not only the aspirations of a musician, they are the aspirations of an ordinary human being living in our society with all its distractions and constraints, and what can be done is a matter which is at least as important as what ought to be done.

One point which occurred to me when the question of resources was being discussed, was a point that has been discussed individually or privately with one or two people in this conference namely that the resources for music, as for so many other activities in contemporary life, are really very considerable in our kind of society. If you have had any experience of so-called developing societies then you know what real resource hardship and scarcity is. But in our kind of society, Australia is an extremely affluent society and in all affluent societies there is a superfluity of resources, not a scarcity of resources. There is tremendous extravagance and waste, and there is the assumption that resources have to be multiplied in all institutions and bodies, so I asked the question, must the schools be the places where the resources are provided or isn't it the case that many of the resources which the schools seek, do in fact exist, but it is a matter of the schools or educational institutions generally striking up new kinds of relationships with those bodies or agencies which at the present time, have command of the resources? I know that we have some very impoverished communities, urban communities and rural communities, but none of our impoverished communities - none that I have ever seen anyway - compare in the least degree with impoverishment in poor countries of the world. So I think we have to be very careful of this question of what resources do we need. I accept the point of course that will be made, that somebody has to set a standard. Somebody has to indicate a level or an aspiration level, but it really is very interesting in our society, the extent to which large amounts of potential educational resource of all kinds are locked up in various bodies and institutions and groups. Not least of all the schools because supposing we do provide the schools with these resources, the question then is, what is the extent to which those resources will be effectively available during those periods when the schools are not actually using them? Now, if you work this out on an annual basis, the time the school actually uses the bulk of resources available to it, is a mere fraction of the year; it is not just a question of the length of the school day, the length of the school year, it is the time that the resources are actually used within the context of educational institution. So we have a terrific problem here of intensive use of resources and it is a bit like the point I made earlier about evaluation and development. It is a question of not adding, but releasing and making more available those resources which potentially are there already. At least I wanted to develop that point slightly. Forgive me for pushing it hard; it is a view I have in general about a lot of educational and social questions.

The last point I want to draw attention to, is that the seminar has quite rightly and properly focussed on a whole range of questions which lie within the area of music and which lie within the perspective of teacher educators. We are surrounded of course by learners who do not have the same perspective as professionals and teacher trainers. The learners' view of the world is one which is still not adequately represented in our decision-making processes. We don't really know what the learner wants or expects from any kind of programme or activity until we involve the learner in the decision-making processes regarding

that activity. Similarly we do not really know what the society or the culture wants or expects unless we relate it in that decision-making process too. There are really two elements that need to be brought together I think. They need to be brought much more directly into the decision or reflective process in education. The first one is the learner, and the second one is the society. You see we do claim to be meeting the needs of both learners and society. We claim to have that special power or expertise or capacity or interest or commitment which enables us to define and meet their needs. I made the point yesterday about the learner having a right to define his own needs. The society or the culture also has the right to define its own needs and I leave you with the thought that it is extremely admirable for a professional group to come together and work on its problems. It is no less admirable, at a suitable time, for the professional group to open its doors a bit wider and bring in the client systems whose needs the professional group is trying to satisfy.

I thank you very much for inviting me to take part in your seminar. I found it a very stimulating and interesting and intriguing experience. I have learnt a great deal more than I have contributed and it has been a very gratifying and satisfying experience and as I said a few minutes ago, all the references that have been made to the CDC I have taken good note of, but whether anything happens about those really does depend very much on yourselves. Thank you.

