Chapter 18
Values Education and Lifelong Learning: Policy Challenge

Values Education in Australia's Government and Non-government Schools

Susan Pascoe

1 Introduction

1.1 Australian Context

The continent of Australia in the south-eastern area of the Asia Pacific region has a population of 20.3 million spread over a huge, largely arid, land mass. The bulk of the population live along the coastline where cosmopolitan cities, industrial towns, and holiday locations are to be found. Founded as a penal colony by the British in 1788, Australia is yet to formally sever ties with mother England. From its initial uneasy coexistence with the indigenous population, Australia has become multicultural, with 23% residents born in another country and second- and third-generation migrants often retaining an affiliation with their parents' or grandparents' birthplace. Some 52% of marriages are between spouses from different birthplace countries.

The birth of Australian democracy was arguably the most peaceful in the world. There were no revolutions and the Eureka Stockade was a rebellion generated as much by miners' rights as by the lofty ideals of the Ballarat Reform League. Citizens retain respect for the judicial system and for electoral processes, which are scrutinised to ensure they are fair and transparent. While our current period of sustained economic growth has not been equally shared by all, the standard of living for most Australians is rising and the country enjoys cohesive community relations.

2 Government and Non-Government Schools in Australia

School education in Australia is a mix of government and non-government schools, with government schools fully funded for their operational and capital costs and Catholic and Independent schools partially funded from the public purse. There are 9,615 schools with 6,938 (72.2%) government-owned and operated and 2,677 (27.8%) non-government. Just over two-thirds of the student population attend

D.N. Aspin and J.D. Chapman (eds.), *Values Education and Lifelong Learning.*

government schools (67.5%) and of the remainder, 20.1% are in Catholic schools and 12.4% are in independent schools. The independent schools are a loose affiliation of religious and philosophical groups, notably Anglican, other Christian schools, Jewish and Islamic faith-based schools and, philosophically based schools such as Montessori and Steiner.

Constitutionally Australia's education structure replicates its federal model of government. There are similarities in the operation of Australia's education systems with the federated structures in countries such as India and Germany. School education falls to the states due to its omission in the founding constitution (largely because it was jealously guarded by the six colonies when they became states in 1901). Government schools are overseen by state bureaucracies. Governance of the Catholic education system differs from the state systems, with dual accountabilities to church and state. Independent schools by their nature are operated and accountable at the individual school site.

All schools operate within the framework of the 1999 *Common and Agreed Goals for Australian Schools in the Twenty-first Century* (*The Adelaide Declaration*) (MCEETYA 1999) and all are expected to teach democratic values. All schools are accountable for the appropriate expenditure of government funding and for the effectiveness of their educational programmes. Common decisions can be made for all the nation's schools by the Ministerial Council for Employment, Education Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), a body comprising state, territory, and federal education Ministers. As state Ministers are deemed responsible for the oversight of all schools (government and non-government) in their state, they make decisions for all sectors in forums such as MCEETYA.

The *realpolitik* is that the eight state and territory Education Acts set the framework within which all schools operate and both federal and state governments are increasingly making funding contingent upon agreements to implement their policies and programmes. These agreements typically specify programme, performance, and accountability requirements in more detail than MCEETYA decisions. For example, a requirement of the federal government is that all schools in Australia, to be eligible for federal funding, must have a functioning flag pole and display the Australian Government's values education posters. And, in its White Paper on the reform of the Victorian Education Act, the state government has spelt out the principles and values to which all schools must subscribe.

All providers of education and training, both government and non-government owned, must ensure that their programmes and teaching are delivered in a manner that supports and promotes the principles and practice of Australian democracy, including a commitment to:

- Elected government
- The rule of law
- Equal rights for all before the law
- Freedom of religion
- Freedom of speech and association
- The values of openness and tolerance (State of Victoria 2005)

Discussions of the structures and functions of a nation's education system can appear parochial in a connected world. However, educators and policymakers spend more time than ever observing each other through comparative assessment programmes such as the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), Civic Education Study, through comparisons of each others' programmes, and educational outcomes in forums such as the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (ICSEI) and in UNESCO or World Bank Round Tables. Educators know their educational performance is compared globally and their students are living interdependently.

3 Global Context

Australians have shared the arresting events of the opening years of the 21st century with their electronically connected neighbours. From the attack on the Twin Towers in New York City on 11 September 2001 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003, to the devastation of the tsunami in Asia in December 2004, televisions have provided immediate and graphic accounts. On the same day as newspapers reported a direct al-Qaeda threat against Los Angeles and Melbourne (12 September 2005) they also revealed research that the issue which most worries Australians is terrorism (*The Age* 2005). Australia is a member of George Bush's "coalition of the willing" and links are made between terrorist attacks in Madrid and London and, closer to home, in Bali and Jakarta as retaliation for this involvement.

Millennial commitments by major industrialised nations to poverty reduction in less developed countries put the globe on a small first step to a fairer share of its bounty in 2000. Later commitments by G8 nations, which ironically coincided with the London bombings in July 2005, have consolidated these earlier moves. On another level, the humanitarian response of regular citizens to the plight of others is often drawn by natural disasters The destruction of the 2004 Boxing Day tsunami which claimed some 300,000 lives and wrought devastation in parts of South-East Asia drew an unprecedented response of compassionate concern and financial commitment from the Australian community. There was a similar reaction to Hurricane Katrina in September 2005 in the USA, with both allies and unsympathetic neighbours such as Cuba and Venezuela offering support.

In a different domain the technology of the global village allowed us to sit in our lounge rooms in April 2005 and observed the different deaths of Terri Schiavo in a hospital in Florida and Pope John Paul II in his apartment in Vatican City. The ethical debates on rights to life and death were aired universally.

This chapter has begun with a broad brush to illustrate the values questions we now face and the need for communities, families, and schools to continually reassess our ethical responses. If technology allows Terri Schiavo to remain alive, should she? If our neighbours suffer a devastating natural disaster, what should be our response? If poverty and disease afflict other parts of the world, are we as

individuals responsible for their alleviation? And if a silent foe uses terrorist tactics against us, how should we respond?

As Director of Australia's fourth largest school system (comprising some 500 schools and 180,000 students) and as a contributor to national initiatives to revive values and civics education in Australia, the author has grappled with these issues and their implications for schools. This chapter will provide some insights into these initiatives and discuss the challenges facing the policymakers and implementers.

4 Civics and Citizenship Education

4.1 Political Context

In the year 2001, Australians celebrated the Centenary of Federation, 100 years since six colonies had united into one nation with a common purpose and direction and a common Constitution. The planning for the celebration of this historical event was extensive, with committees established in the mid-1990s to prepare the nation to remember and salute the past. The capacity of young Australians to understand the significance of this event was questioned by the Centre-left government (the Labor Party) in 1994. At the same time the question of whether Australia should become a republic was on the political agenda, championed by the then Prime Minister, Paul Keating. He established a Civics Expert Group to provide advice to the government on the state of civics and citizenship education in Australia. The fear of the Centre-right parties at that time was that this inquiry was "a Trojan horse" to introduce the republican argument by stealth, rather than an educational review.

The author was a member of the three-person Civics Expert Group – the others being eminent Australian historians, Professor Stuart Macintyre and the Director-General of the New South Wales Department of Education, Dr. Ken Boston. The Group found an almost 30-year gap in the systematic teaching of civics and citizenship education in Australia and argued that a coordinated national response was called for to provide relevant materials for students and professional development for teachers.

> Education for Citizenship ranks with English and Mathematics as a priority for school education. . . it is an essential component of a liberal education. (Civics Expert Group 1994, p. 57)

The Group did not find evidence of politically motivated teacher opposition to civics, rather a gradual abandonment of a programme which was regarded as dry and uninteresting in an increasingly crowded curriculum. The report triggered an immediate response from the government and AU$25 million was budgeted in 1995 to rectify the low levels of knowledge and understanding of civics and citizenship education in Australia.

The election of a Centre-right Coalition government in 1996 saw a pause in the programme as its agenda was scrutinised and the new government deliberated on whether to continue with it. The Coalition government, whose members were

largely ambivalent or opposed to Australia becoming a republic, now had firm grasp of the political dynamic and continued the debate – which was decided in the negative in the 1998 referendum. At the same time the government was strongly committed to clarifying and reinforcing "Australian" values. It took the decision to retain and modify the programme and the original Civics Expert Group was expanded to a seven-member Civics Education Committee with a new Chair. This Committee had oversight of the development of a comprehensive national programme of teacher professional development and materials development. The original three members remained in the expanded committee with the former Chair wryly observing that to be labelled "expert" in Australia was to invite derision. One interesting aspect of the work of the expanded committee was the close interest of the new Education Minister, Dr. David Kemp, a former politics academic. Dr. Kemp met with the newly appointed Committee and informed them that they had the imprimatur over materials for publication. While he retained an ongoing interest in the work he maintained this stance of dispassionate oversight.

4.2 Discovering Democracy

The expanded Civics Education Committee threw off the mantle of expertise and set to work on the *Discovering Democracy* programme. The programme comprises a comprehensive set of materials for schools, including teacher and student materials, CD-Roms and a dedicated website www.curriculum.edu.au/democracy. Funding was provided from 1997 to 2004 for the professional development of teachers and for training courses to be designed and delivered through distance education.

It was agreed to concentrate curriculum development in the middle years of schooling, Years 4–10 (age 9–15). The early years (Preparatory – Year 3) are preoccupied with foundation learning in literacy and numeracy and in elementary introductions to other key learning areas, while the later years are focused on post-school destinations. Given the sensitivities of a national Committee making recommendations in an area of state responsibility, the Committee drew its mandate from the *Common and Agreed Goals for Schooling in Australia* (*The Hobart Declaration*) (MCEETYA 1989) and consulted broadly with state curriculum agencies. The Committee was mindful of the strong message from the 1994 consultation that the curriculum was overcrowded already. It determined to nest the key learnings in the discipline of history which is core in this phase of schooling. The key themes are:

- Who Rules?
- Laws and Rights
- The Australian Nation
- Citizens and Public Life

Collections of readings and other resource materials for students in the senior years elongated the student programme into the post-compulsory phase of schooling despite the emphasis in this phase on post-school preparation and identifying career

pathways. These materials were designed to be useful in a range of courses from English to History to Politics.

While the student courses focus on providing the knowledge, understanding, and values underpinning democracy in Australia, there are also opportunities for students to gain an understanding of other cultures and political systems, for example, in the origins and principles of democracy, in the section on human rights, and in some of the international comparisons.

Discovering Democracy is explicit about the values and attitudes underpinning the materials:

- Democratic decision-making and popular sovereignty
- Government accountability
- Civility, truth-telling, and respect for the law
- The value of individual and collective initiative and effort
- Concern for the welfare, rights, and dignity of all people

The programme supports values such as tolerance, acceptance of cultural diversity, respect for others, and freedom of speech, religion and association (Australian Government 1997, p. 8).

Arguably the values underpinning *Discovering Democracy* were developed in an innocent era prior to a widespread concern about global terrorism. Calls in some countries since the London bombings for a reconsideration of social policies such as multiculturalism and racial and religious vilification laws suggest that conceptions of citizenship and civic behaviour could sharpen in the future from knowledge and understanding of democratic values to commitment to them. This is reflected in the intentions of the revised Education Act in Victoria to specify foundation democratic principles and values.

State curricula have adopted civics and citizenship education and most have located it in the Key Learning Area of the Studies of Society and the Environment, or in the subject of History. Attention had been given to the need for appropriate pedagogies and learning contexts. For instance, in the 2005 revision of the Victorian curriculum, *The Victorian Essential Learning Standards* (VCAA 2005), an integrated approach is taken to achieving the three interwoven purposes of learning, namely that students:

- Manage themselves and their relations with others
- Understand the world
- Act effectively in that world

These capabilities are built through learning in three core interrelated strands which are threaded across the traditional learning areas:

- The processes of physical, personal, and social development
- The branches of learning reflected in the traditional disciplines
- The interdisciplinary capacities needed for effective functioning within and beyond school (VCAA 2005).

Civics and citizenship education, while explicitly located in the first of these strands, is also taught via the others. Formal reports to parents specify civics and citizenship education as an area for feedback.

The nationally coordinated effort to resuscitate civics and citizenship education in Australian schools was in place for the decade 1994–2004. Despite school education being the constitutional responsibility of the states, the Australian Government took the lead on this matter, arguing that, in the national interest, citizenship and Australian identity were areas to which it could legitimately lay claim. Further, its Civics Education Committee took due heed of these political sensitivities in its work. A similar approach was taken in the development of a national values education framework and once again a Prime Minister was instrumental in propelling the issue to national prominence.

5 Values Education

5.1 Political Context

January in Australia is dedicated to holidays, with schools closed for the summer break, parliaments and many industries in recess, and newspapers with less activity to report. This represents fertile ground for the media savvy to introduce new issues. In January 2004 the Prime Minister, John Howard, ignited a heated debate on the teaching of values in Australia's government schools. He mused during an interview that one of the reasons for the drift of students from government to non-government schools was that most parents wanted explicit values education and this was more evident in non-government schools. In the furore which followed advocates asserted that values were explicit in government schools and analysts interpreted his comments as evidence of an agenda to "privatise" education and give policy primacy to parental choice in government or non-government schooling. As made by an adroit and experienced political leader, this comment was generally perceived to be strategic in intent.

The debate appeared against the backdrop of harmonious development of a national values education initiative. Like his predecessor, Dr. Kemp, the new Education Minister, Dr. Brendan Nelson, had a personal interest in the issue of values education. He attained the portfolio in 2001 in the government's third term and in a period of political stability. Like his predecessor he faced a group comprised wholly or largely of Centre-left state and territory Education Ministers. Achieving consensus for school-based initiatives required negotiation and compromise when the government did not have control of the Senate. (It will be argued below that a much more assertive and interventionist approach has been adopted since the Coalition government attained a fourth term and control of both houses in October 2004.) In 2002 the meeting of the eight state and territory ministers with their federal counterpart (MCEETYA) agreed to a national values education study. This study identified common conceptions of values in Australian schools and provided the foundation for the development of a national values framework.

The Australian Government's *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (Australian Government 2005) builds on the *National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century* (MCEETYA 1999) and complements earlier initiatives such as the *Discovering Democracy* Project (Australian Government 1997). The values are:

- Care and Compassion: Care for self and others
- Doing Your Best: Seek to accomplish something worthy and admirable, try hard, pursue excellence
- Fair Go: Pursue and protect the common good where all people are treated fairly for a just society
- Freedom: Enjoy all the rights and privileges of Australian citizenship free from unnecessary interference or control, and stand up for the rights of others
- Honesty and Trustworthiness: Be honest, sincere, and seek the truth
- Integrity: Act in accordance with principles of moral and ethical conduct, ensure consistency between words and deeds
- Respect: Treat others with consideration and regard, respect another person's point of view
- Responsibility: Be accountable for one's own actions, resolve differences in constructive, non-violent, and peaceful ways, contribute to society and to civic life, take care of the environment
- Understanding, Tolerance and Inclusion: Be aware of others and their cultures, accept diversity within a democratic society, being included and including others (Australian Government 2005)

Perhaps due to their development in schools, the values are a mix of attributes, dispositions, and ethical stances, with didactic overtones. They are written in a vernacular, folksy style – presumably to appeal across age groups. Unlike the *Discovering Democracy* programme, this initiative is conducted from the Australian Government's own education bureaucracy, the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). It has a budget of AU$29.7 million over four years to support implementation.

With the October 2004 election the Centre-right Australian Government was elected for an historic fourth term and attained control of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. In a range of portfolio areas it is asserting its policy agenda using a mix of mandated and opt-in measures. For example, to be eligible to receive funding from the Australian Government, schools must prominently display the poster of the nine *Values for Australian Schooling*. In addition, schools can choose to seek funding from DEST to conduct local forums to consider the place of values in school policies and practices. They can also apply for generous funding (up to AU$50,000) in clusters of schools in the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project to demonstrate how values education is core to education provision in their school/s.

The values education initiative has been distracted by a number of factors – the debate on the adequacy of values teaching in government schools, the mandatory nature of implementation, and more recently, national debates on Australian values.

Following the London bombings there have been debates in the Australian media about the boundaries of multiculturalism, freedom of speech, and freedom of religious practice. Headlines such as "Stick to our Curriculum, PM warns Islamic schools" (*The Australian* 2005) or "Accept the nation's values or get out, Nelson declares" (*The Age* 2005) have become commonplace. These debates degenerated to cries for a banning of the wearing of headscarves but were dampened when the Prime Minister made it clear he would not support such a move.

This is a difficult context for the teaching of values education as the social and political spectrum is unsettled. Terrorism instils suspicion of neighbours at the very time we are trying to teach inclusion, tolerance, and a "fair go". Reactions to terrorist incidents exhort some commentators to delineate between us and them and to assert the dominant values set. And teachers are under ongoing scrutiny and critique with the Treasurer alleging in the same period that some taught anti-American sentiment in their classrooms.

6 Values Teaching in a Global Context

One of the ways to respond to the teaching of values in the contemporary local and global context is to look beyond our shores so as to imbue in students an understanding of universal values and intercultural and interfaith understanding. In some school contexts this exercise could begin in their sacred texts, but a common starting point for all is the United Nation's *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (United Nations 1948).

Wrought from the wreckage of World War II, this declaration sought to affirm fundamental and common human rights and freedoms and to lay the groundwork for a more peaceful world. Even a cursory look at Articles 1, 3, and 7 will illustrate the degree to which the values in the Australian framework are derived from these universal values.

Article 1 All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2 Everyone has the right to life, liberty, and security of person.

Article 7 All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law.

While the values in the *National Framework* are written in accessible and vernacular language, the congruence with the values in the *Universal Declaration* is clear. For example, the values of a fair go and freedom can be related to all three of these Articles cited above.

For Australian educators, another means of ensuring that local values achieve the dual goals of social cohesion and global connectedness is to consider them in light of the report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for

the Twenty-first Century, *Learning: The Treasure Within* (Delors 1996). There is a timeless quality to this report which famously argues that learning should be organised around four pillars:

- Learning to know
- Learning to do
- Learning to be
- Learning to live together

All the values in the Australian framework can be related to these four pillars. The present author has argued elsewhere it is important that Australians stretch ourselves beyond our shoreline to international education initiatives such as the Delors Report as they provide a common and comprehensive basis for dialogue and understanding (Pascoe 2005a). Common ground is important in considering the role that education can play in promoting intercultural and interfaith understanding and thereby contributing to initiatives to combat the threat of terrorism. The author is also the Deputy Chair of the Australian National Commission for UNESCO, which has taken the initiative to promote dialogue on values education in the Asia Pacific region.

At the December 2004 conference of the Australian National Commission for UNESCO, *Education for Shared Values and for Intercultural and Interfaith Understanding*, delegates from 51 countries agreed to the position that education has a role to play in the immediate and long-term process of building peace and intercultural and interfaith understanding. In doing so the conference recognised the roles of families, other cultural and religious institutions, governments, the business community, non-government organisations, and the media. Educators do not work in isolation, but we do have privileged access to the next generation and the capacity to work toward more harmonious futures.

The report of this UNESCO conference (UNESCO 2005) called on education systems to incorporate common and agreed values into curricula and to prepare education content capable of promoting intercultural and interfaith understanding. It made reference to the necessity of preparing and supporting teachers for values teaching and the need for quality teaching resources. These recommendations provide a set of benchmarks against which countries and education systems can measure themselves.

7 Values Teaching: School Capacity

Attempts to reinvigorate civics, citizenship, and values education in Australia have been led by senior politicians – they have not been grass roots movements (see Chaney 2002). At its July 2002 meeting, when it endorsed a national values education study, MCEETYA noted that education is as much about building character as it is about equipping students with specific skills, and that parents expect schools to help students understand and develop personal and social responsibilities.

Similar understandings were contained in the 1994 report of the Civics Expert Group, *Whereas the People. . .*(Civics Expert Group 1994). This report argued that civics and citizenship education was as essential a foundation in Australian schooling as literacy and numeracy and that effective teaching in the area would depend as much on good curriculum and teaching materials as on the structures and practices in the school and the dispositions and actions of teachers. The dilemma for the Civics Expert Group was that it exposed a period of some 30 years when the systematic teaching of civics and citizenship education had slipped from school curricula and from teacher preparation. The diminished teacher capacity was recognised in the funding for professional development to begin the process of reskilling teachers in this area.

While state curricula may have neglected civics and citizenship education for a sustained period, there is a significant history of values education in government and non-government in Australia. One noteworthy contemporary project is the *Harmony through Understanding Project* conducted across Jewish, Islamic, Catholic, government and other non-government schools in Melbourne. The project brings students face to face to get to know one another and to discuss their cultural and religious differences. It has been conducted successfully for a number of years and is lauded by all those involved as increasing intercultural and interfaith understanding and providing an opportunity for students to move from their comfort zone to get to know "the other".

A good account of values education approaches in a range of different schools is contained in the Australian College of Educators' 2002 Yearbook *Values in Education* (Pascoe 2002). Amongst the descriptions, Principal Christine Cawsey describes principles of learning at Rooty Hill High School in New South Wales which, interestingly, predate and predict the *Australian Values Framework*; educator Paul Forgasz surveys the literature on teaching values in Jewish schools; and Salah Salman, Principal of King Khalid College in Melbourne provides an Islamic perspective. These schools are explicit about their values which are congruent with the *Australian Values Framework*. Arguably teachers in these schools are "values literate", and are already better positioned to teach values than their colleagues in schools where little attention has been paid to such teaching.

8 Values Teaching in Catholic Schools

The teaching of values is not an option in Catholic schools. The "gospel values" of faith, hope, and love are articulated as part of a broader set which incorporates Catholic biblical, theological, and social teaching. Dispositions such as compassion and community-connectedness are modelled and taught alongside commitments such as the search for truth, the promotion of social justice and care for the disadvantaged. These values and ethical dispositions are congruent with the Abrahamic base of Australian society and the *National Goals for Schooling in Australia in the Twenty-first Century* (MCEETYA 1999). It is noteworthy that the 1999 version of

the national goals expanded the original 1989 goals with reference to ethics and values. For example, Goal 1.3 argues students should

> have the capacity to exercise judgement and responsibility in matters of morality, ethics and social justice, and the capacity to make sense of their world, to think about how things got to be the way they are, to make rational and informed decisions about their own lives and to accept responsibility for their own actions. (MCEETYA 1999)

This adds significantly to an original 1989 goal (1.4) on civics:

> [b]e active and informed citizens with an understanding and appreciation of Australia's system of government and civic life. (Goal 1.4, MCEETYA 1989)

Prior to 11 September 2001 many social democracies were evaluating the impact of smaller governments on the "triple bottom line" (economy, community, and environment). Since then a number of state governments in Australia have created departments or branches with responsibility for identifying elements of social capital and the roots of social division (Pascoe 2005b). Against this backdrop the Catholic Education Commission of Victoria commissioned research on the contribution (if any) that Catholic schools made to local communities and to the economy. In their findings, the researchers argued:

> The emphasis in the Victorian Education Act of 1872 on education as "free, compulsory and secular" was driven by the belief that education, and equal access to that education, was vital for the life of the colony, and that public education needed to be secular to preserve its quality, objectivity and accessibility. In the knowledge-based economy of today the importance of education, and of equal access across social groups, is of enhanced importance. But religious schools have shown that they need not be socially divisive, that they can provide a rigorous, high quality education and that their graduates can contribute strongly to the community. The central public issues remain excellence in, and access to, education. (Centre for Strategic Economic Studies 2004, p. 1)

For Catholic schools, as with other faith-based schools, it is prudent in the current climate to have an evidential base on matters such as their contribution to social harmony and their commitment to democratic principles. For system authorities the challenge remains to continue the process of improving the knowledge and skills base of Australian teachers in areas such as civics, citizenship, and values education.

9 Values Teaching: Teacher Capacity

In their 1999 and 2003 evaluations of the *Discovering Democracy Programme*, the Erebus Consulting Group found an improvement in teacher practice from an initial base of low knowledge and skills to awareness-raising to grappling with implementation. Factors which impeded implementation were skewed pedagogical approaches (such as an unbalanced focus on content or behaviourist outcomes), a lack of leadership support at the school level and competing priorities in a crowded curriculum. Where implementation had been successful there was often opportunity for collegial sharing of teaching practice, a recognition of the quality of the

work, and opportunities to integrate the teaching with other educational initiatives (Erebus 1999, 2003). These findings are helpful for those systems and schools now implementing the highly congruent *Framework for Australian Values*.

Two ways that systems can encourage the teaching and attainment of values are to evaluate programmes in school reviews and to provide assessment in the area. School reviews can and should move beyond those areas which are directly measurable to ensure schools are attaining their missions. System-wide assessment has begun in civics and citizenship, including assessing citizenship dispositions and skills. MCEETYA's Performance Measurement and Reporting Taskforce is assessing civics and citizenship knowledge and understanding in a sample of Year 6 and 10 students in government and non-government schools.

Sufficient robust and innovative research has been done in Australia on assessment in the social domain for us to consider systemic and school applications. A very promising initiative into systemic assessment in the social domain is the pilot project conducted by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) for the Western Australian Department of Education to assess the social outcomes of schooling. The assessments are part of the ongoing Monitoring Standards in Education (MSE) and assess students in Years 3, 7, and 10 on interpersonal, moral, and ethical aspects of schooling (Government of Western Australia 2004).

Monitoring Standards in Education conducts two system-level testing programmes that Western Australia has in place to collect performance data. The WALNA/MSE9 is a population testing programme covering Years 3, 5, 7, and 9. The other is a random sample testing programme which operates across all eight Key Learning Areas. As well as collecting and reporting on system-level performance it provides schools with information and assessment materials that enable them to report on the performance of their students.

The MSE assessments of social competence include teacher observation, self-reporting and student responses to scenarios. Each dimension has developmental scales (e.g., respecting and valuing others) to identify where a student sits on a continuum, i.e., from seeing no dilemma in a scenario to showing compassion or taking principled action. A marking guide assists teachers in identifying the location of a student's response on the scale. The teacher completes a performance profile map calibrating the skills and understandings used by students in order of difficulty.

The importance of the MSE initiative is that it is piloting an evidence-based approach focusing on aspects of student development which are within the jurisdiction of schools and which are susceptible to school intervention. The descriptors are sufficiently fine-grained to enable teachers to make clear judgements. The data can be used to assist individuals or groups and for classroom lessons or whole-school programmes. The aim of this very promising pilot is to develop scales that are stable, valid, and reliable. We look forward to hearing from our Western Australian colleagues on the outcomes of this important initiative.

While state initiated assessment programmes such as the MSE can support teaching in schools, the evidence is that most Australian teachers will need to

begin with curriculum auditing and planning as a first step. Schools will need to review their vision and mission statements, audit their curriculum for opportunities for explicit values teaching where appropriate, and plan for extra-curricular opportunities for students to learn or demonstrate values dispositions and behaviours. This might sound daunting but all schools are teaching values already – there is no such thing as a value-free or value-neutral school. Neutrality is in itself a value. This exercise asks schools to check that the values they are imparting are the ones they value.

The nine *Values for Australian Schooling* are a mix of democratic virtues, ethical dispositions, personal attributes, and learning principles. As such some will lend themselves to explicit modelling in classrooms and others will require cross-curricular and whole-school approaches. The evaluations of the *Discovering Democracy Programme* (Erebus 1999, 2003) have illustrated that some teachers feel ill-equipped to respond and ongoing professional development is required. While initial learning can take place in formal settings, changes in behaviour usually require opportunities for students to spontaneously demonstrate the attainment of an attribute in a real or simulated situation. Such opportunities will need to be carefully planned and teachers will require some guidance. It would be helpful if the learnings from the "Good Practice" schools can feed into this process.

School structures and organisation, and teacher attitudes and behaviours will be as influential as learning opportunities. Unequal learning opportunities, inconsistent discipline, lack of follow-up on absenteeism or lack of pastoral care will all speak volumes to students about the real values in the school. Conversely, teachers knowing students' names and inquiring after their well-being, applying consistent consequences to misdemeanours, correcting work in a timely fashion and providing constructive feedback also implicitly demonstrate the values in the school. School leaders and teachers will need to ensure that they model the values they espouse.

10 Conclusion

This chapter has described politically initiated exercises since 1994 in Australia which are promoting a renewal in civics, citizenship, and values education in schools. The neglect of civics education over a 30-year period in the closing phase of the 20th century was more likely influenced by the growing pressures on the curriculum than any reluctance or opposition by teachers. The challenge for policy makers was to introduce a programme of civics and citizenship education which would be attractive to teachers and students.

The policy interventions by Prime Ministers of different political leanings in both the civics and citizenship and the values education programmes attests to their currency in political as well as educational domains. The keen interest of successive federal education ministers to lead Australian educational initiatives in these

areas has required adroit negotiation with their state and territory counterparts who retain constitutional responsibility for schools.

The challenges for full policy implementation in government and non-government schools has been discussed with particular reference to Australia's Catholic schools. Governments have used Education Acts, funding agreements, and well-resourced programmes to induce compliance or encourage voluntary implementation. The result is a slow renaissance in civics, citizenship, and values teaching in Australia's schools.

References

Australian Government (2005) *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science, and Training, AGPS.

Australian Government (1997) *Discovering Democracy School Materials Project*, Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation.

Chaney M. (2002) The importance of corporate planning in school governance. Paper delivered to AHISA Chair of Governing Bodies Conference.

Centre for Strategic Economic Studies (2004) *The Contribution of Catholic Schools to the Victorian Economy and Community*. Melbourne: Victoria University. Available at: www.cecv.melb.catholic.edu.au.

Civics Expert Group (1994) *Whereas the People. . .Civics and Citizenship Education*. Chair: Stuart Macintyre. Canberra: AGPS.

Delors J. (1996) *Learning: The Treasure Within,* Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. Paris: UNESCO.

Erebus Consulting Group (1999) *Evaluation of the Discovering Democracy Program*. Sydney: Mimeo.

Erebus Consulting Group (2003) *Evaluation of the Discovering Democracy Program 2000–2003*. Sydney: Mimeo.

Government of Western Australia (2004) *The Social Outcomes of Schooling: Respecting and Valuing Others, Teachers' Manual Years 3, 7 & 10*. Department of Education and Training. Perth: WA Government Publishers.

Ministerial Council for Employment, Education, Training, and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) (1989) *Common and Agreed Goals on Schooling in Australia: The Hobart Declaration*. Canberra: MCEETYA–AGPS.

Ministerial Council for Employment, Education, Training, and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) (1999) *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century*. Canberra: MCEETYA–AGPS.

Pascoe S. (2002) *Values in Education: College Yearbook 2002*. Australian College of Educators. Canberra: ACE.

Pascoe S. (2005a) *Values Education: Setting the Context*. Keynote Address to the Department of Education, Science, and Training (DEST) National Forum, May, Canberra.

Pascoe S. (2005b) *Assessing Social Competence: Can and Should We be Assessing in the Social Domain?* Brisbane: Curriculum Corporation Conference, June 2005. Available at: www.cecv.melb.catholic.edu.au.

State of Victoria (2005) *Victorian Government White Paper: Review of Education and Training Legislation*. Melbourne: Victorian Government Department of Education and Training.

The Age (2005) Accept the nation's values or get out, Nelson declares, 25 August 2005, pp. 1–2.

The Age (2005) Australians fear terror rise more than most, 12 September 2005, p. 4.

The Australian (2005) Stick to our curriculum, PM warns Islamic schools, 13–14 August 2005, p. 9.
United Nations (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Geneva: UNO.
UNESCO (2005) Report of Conference on Education for Shared Values and for Intercultural and Interfaith Understanding. Canberra: Australian National Commission for UNESCO.
Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA) (2005) *Victorian Essential Learning Standards*. Melbourne: VCAA. Available at: http://vels.vcaa.vic.edu.au.