

Learning and Teaching for the Twenty-First Century

Learning and Teaching for the Twenty-First Century

Festschrift for Professor
Phillip Hughes

Edited by

Rupert Maclean,
UNESCO-UNEVOC
International Centre for Education,
Bonn, Germany



 Springer

The Springer logo, which consists of a stylized chess knight (horse) facing left, positioned to the left of the word "Springer" in a bold, serif font.

Rupert Maclean,
UNESCO-UNEVOC
International Centre for Education,
Bonn, Germany

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007936024

ISBN-13: 978-1-4020-5772-4

e-ISBN-13: 978-1-4020-5773-1

Printed on acid-free paper.

© 2007 Springer Science+Business Media, LLC

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the-written permission of the publisher (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC., 233 Spring Street, New York, NY-10013, USA), except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in this publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks, and similar terms, even if they are not-identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Contents

Foreword	xi
<i>Phillip Hughes: International Educator, Scholar, Teacher</i>	
Photographic Gallery	xvii
List of Contributors	xxiii
Section I: LEARNING AND TEACHING: THE PERSONAL DIMENSIONS	
1. From Centralized Imperialism to Dispersed Management: The Contribution of Phillip Hughes to the Development of Educational Administration in Australia	3
<i>Hedley Beare</i>	
2. The Power of Narrative to Enhance Quality in Teaching, Learning, and Research	17
<i>Jim Cumming</i>	
3. A Pedagogy for International Education	35
<i>Ian Hill</i>	
4. Learning to be Tolerant: Lessons from Research	57
<i>Kerry J. Kennedy</i>	
5. To be a Teacher	79
<i>Malcolm Skilbeck</i>	
6. The Outer and the Inner Forms of Teaching in the Twenty-First Century	101
<i>Colin Power</i>	
7. New Directions for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment	115
<i>Robert D. Strom and Paris S. Strom</i>	

Section II: LEARNING AND TEACHING: INTERACTIONS WITH EDUCATION REFORM

- 8. Achieving Large-Scale Reform** 137
Michael Fullan
- 9. Educational Development in the Twenty-First Century: Reflections on the Integration of Research, Policy, and Practice** 145
Brian J. Caldwell
- 10. The Impossible Choice: Access, Quality, and Equity - The Case of Secondary Education Expansion** 165
Françoise Caillods
- 11. Reform and Convergence in School Education: International Perspectives** 181
Joanna Le Metais
- 12. Care and Compassion: Values Commitment and Attitude Clarification in Education** 197
John Fien

Section III: LEARNING AND TEACHING: ASIA-PACIFIC PERSPECTIVES

- 13. Seeking a New Education Paradigm for Teaching and Learning: Achieving Education for Sustainable Development** 213
Victor Ordonez and Rupert Maclean
- 14. Teacher Professional Judgement in Teaching and Learning Decisions** 233
Michele Bruniges
- 15. Navigating Culture and Context: The Principalship in East and South-East Asia** 255
Allan Walker and Phillip Hallinger
- 16. Improving the Participation of Disadvantaged Students in Post-Compulsory Education and Training: A Continuing Challenge** 275
Joan Abbott-Chapman

17. Phillip Hughes: A Personal View..... 293
Ruth Radford

18. Semi-final Reflections: And Miles to Go Before I Sleep 299
Phillip Hughes

Author Index..... 311

Subject Index 315



In Reflective Mood: Congratulations Phillip Hughes on the occasion of your 81st birthday, 12 March, 2007

Foreword

Phillip Hughes: International Educator, Scholar, Teacher

This Festschrift is published in honour of Professor Phillip Hughes, an exceptional Australian educationalist and influential member of the international education community. Professor Hughes has made major important contributions to the advancement of education and schooling both in Australia and in various developing countries throughout the world, the latter being mainly through his work for UNESCO.

I first met Phillip Hughes in 1980 when he took up an appointment as Professor and Head of the Department of Teacher Education in the Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania, Hobart. I was a Faculty staff member, and even before I first met Phillip in person I felt that I already knew him very well from his numerous publications and keynote presentations at major conferences. Prior to returning to his native Tasmania, Phillip's reputation was already well established as a national and international leader in education; and as a highly respected and influential member of the Tasmanian community.

Phillip and I worked together for 10 years as colleagues in the Faculty of Education in Hobart, Tasmania, and became close friends. I have always found Phil (as he is widely referred to by family, friends and colleagues) to be a charismatic and incisive thinker, with a great ability to lead by example and to inspire others to give of their best. In my own case, Phil was the person who most encouraged me to join UNESCO. He has remained a powerful influence in my life over the years, in both professional and personal terms.

* * *

Professor Phillip Hughes is currently Adjunct Professor at the Australian National University, Canberra, and Emeritus Professor, University of Tasmania. He has held many important positions, as consultant to the Tasmanian Government on State Education Review (2001–2005), consultant to UNESCO Paris on the Reform of Secondary Education (1998–2001), Visiting Professor, Chinese University of Hong Kong and consultant to the UNESCO Paris Task Force on Education for the 21st Century (1998), Chief Executive Officer, Australian Principals Centre (1995–1996), curriculum consultant to OECD Paris (1993), Chairman, Medical Education, University of Tasmania (1992–1995), Chairman, Professorial Board, University of Tasmania (1988–1990), and Professor and Dean of Education, University of Tasmania (1980–1991).

The following quotes are from letters sent to the University of Tasmania on the retirement of Phillip Hughes in 1991.

Professor Hedley Beare, former Dean, University of Melbourne:

One can say without hyperbole that Phil has been one of the great Australian educators of our time. Few can match and none can outrank his contributions to education in recent years.

Professor Colin Power, former Assistant Director General, UNESCO:

Every Australian can attest to the contributions made by Phillip Hughes to the developments of secondary education and teacher education nationally. Phil has contributed a great deal in assisting developing countries throughout the world to improve their education systems. UNESCO would also like to acknowledge his contributions to education. Education For All has always been a central passion in his life.

Professor Herb Rudman, Dean, Michigan State University, USA:

I have yet to meet an Australian who doesn't know of the work of Phil Hughes. His contributions to state departments of education, to the foundation of the University of the South Pacific and the new school system in Canberra and to teacher education generally are outstanding.

Professor Jillian Maling, Vice Chancellor, University of Western Sydney:

For me personally, Phil Hughes personifies a breadth of vision, a commitment particularly to youth, a warmth of spirit and humanity which has stayed and outlasted the onslaughts of changing fads and trends in education and even a new economic rationalism.

Dr. Raja Roy Singh, Former Assistant Director General UNESCO and Chief of the Regional office for Asia and the Pacific:

I recall with deep gratitude the creative insights and stimulus he provided us Asian educators. Educators from twenty-nine countries of Asia and the Pacific thank him for his participation and unique contribution professionally and personally.

Professor Ken McKinnon, Vice Chancellor, University of Wollongong:

Phillip has made one of the more significant contributions to Australian education in a variety of capacities. He has always been regarded as the person to bring in if the situation required a knowledgeable person, a person with the highest moral and ethical principles and, yet, in the end, a realistic and practical person interested in solving real problems. His thoughtful and wise input has been greatly valued.

Professor Barry McGaw, Former Director of the Education Division of OECD:

Phillip Hughes has a special place in Australian education. From his early years in senior positions in Tasmania, through his creative developments in Canberra, to his more recent work he has built and maintained an impressive national and international reputation. His intellectual acuity and his breadth of experience have combined to produce a substantial theoretical and applied wisdom on which his colleagues frequently call. More important than all of this, in many ways, is Professor Hughes' humanity. He is a great listener, a sensitive and caring person and one who operates from a coherent and consistent value position with obvious integrity.

Dr. Fenton Sharpe, Director-General of School Education, New South Wales:

Phillip Hughes has made a unique and lasting contribution to education at all levels and across the whole nation as well as in other countries. I have always enjoyed his liberal

mindedness, his ability to explain and synthesise matters of importance and the transparent care and concern he has for the education of children and for their teachers and leaders. He has a great capacity for friendship and supportiveness.

Professor Brian Caldwell, Former Dean, University of Melbourne:

His contributions to education in Tasmania, Australia and overseas have been quite remarkable. His keynote presentations to conferences have been outstanding and his support and counsel have been appreciated over the years. He has inspired us through the examples of his own work to ensure the strongest linkages between educational administration, curriculum and teaching.

Professor Zhu Hejian, President, Fujian University, China:

Fujian University will always remember what he has done to establish friendship and cooperation between our universities.

* * *

Phillip Hughes was born in Tasmania, on 12 March 1926. He attended Devonport Primary. Winning a bursary enabled him to continue his studies at Devonport High School, where he proved himself to be an all-rounder who excelled both in academics and in sports. At the end of high school a scholarship took him to the University of Tasmania where he graduated in Science (B.Sc., 1946), and in 1947 a Rhodes Scholarship took him to Oxford University from which he earned an M.Sc. (1950).

On his return to Australia, three different work offers were available to Phil: to join the Department of Foreign Affairs to become a Diplomat; to work in a university physics department to further build upon his academic studies at Oxford; and to become a teacher.

Phil decided on teaching as his career. Between 1954 and 1960 he held a number of teaching appointments, at the Royal Australian Naval College at Flinders Naval Depot in Victoria, at Devonport High School, at Hobart Teachers College and at the University of Tasmania. He then moved into educational administration, being appointed Superintendent of Curriculum and Principal, Hobart Teachers College (1961–1965), rapidly rising to the position of Deputy Director-General of Education (1965–1969), Tasmania.

Phil left the state in 1970 to become Head, School of Education, Canberra College of Advanced Education (1970–1980), and Foundation Chairman (1973–1977), Australian Capital Territory School Authority, Canberra. In 1980 he returned to Tasmania as Professor and Dean of Education, University of Tasmania.

Professor Phillip Hughes has made an exceptional contribution to promoting education policy making, practice and research in Australia (and also internationally) over the length of his illustrious career. In this regard, the facts clearly speak for themselves; the aim here being to convey the essential flavour of Phil's numerous contributions to education, rather than provide an exhaustive list of all his considerable accomplishments.

In addition to his M.Sc. from Oxford University and B.Sc. from the University of Tasmania, Phil holds a doctorate from the University of New England (Ph.D., 1981), and Honorary Doctorates from the Universities of Tasmania (Hon. Doctor of Medicine, 1995) and Canberra (Hon. Doctor of University, 1996.).

The citation for the Honorary Degree of the University of Tasmania reads:

Emeritus Professor Hughes has made an outstanding contribution to the University, the State and the country in the areas of medical education and education generally.

Apart from being a Rhodes Scholar, Phil has been the recipient of many important honours, awarded in recognition of his substantial, multifaceted contributions to education. These include Fellow of each of the following: Australian College of Education (1965), Australian Council of Educational Administration (1981), UNESCO Asia-Pacific Centre of Educational Innovation for Development (1996) and Australian Principals Centre (1998).

He was awarded a Gold Medal by the Australian Council of Educational Administration (1991), and the Medal of the Australian College of Educators (2002).

In 1991, he was appointed as an Officer, Order of Australia, for services to education.

In Australia, Phil has chaired numerous important, ground-breaking education committees, such as the Tasmanian Committee on Early Childhood Education (1993), the Committee on the Role of School in Society (1968) and the Federal Government Committee on a New Education System for the Australian Capital Territory (1973). He was also Deputy Chair, Task Force on School Restructuring in the Australian Capital Territory, Department of Health and Education (1991), and a Member of the Bell Committee on Teacher Education (1971).

Phil has also been in high demand for major consultancies in Australia, such as the Tasmanian Government Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Education Department (1982); the University of Tasmania, Review of University Administration (1983); University of Wollongong and James Cook University, on amalgamations (1984); DEET, Improving Secondary Participation Rates (1987); Tasmanian Government, Performance of Rural Students (1988); DEET, Improving Access of Disadvantaged Students to Higher Education (1989); Commonwealth Government, Evaluation of the Family Medicine Programme, RACGP (1991); Queensland Government, Curriculum Management in Queensland (1991); RANZ College of Psychiatrists, Continuing Professional Education (1994); Tasmanian Government, Review of Health Education (1995); Victorian Government, Evaluation of Information Technology Use in Schools (1995); Victorian Government, Professional Development for Principals (1996); AusAID, Australian Government Aid Agency (1998; 1999); Tasmanian Education Department, Curriculum Review and Evaluation (2001–2005).

Phil has undertaken numerous overseas consultancies, such as Australian Member, Inter-Government Mission on Higher Education in the South Pacific (1965), which led to the foundation of the University of the South Pacific; ADAB Programmes for Teacher Education in Fiji (1973–1978) and for College Lecturers in Papua-New Guinea (1973–1980); Australian Representative, Ministerial Advisory Committee on Regional Cooperation in Asia and the Pacific (1985–1987); and consultant to the Curriculum and Assessment Board in the UK.

It is not by chance that most of the overseas consultancies undertaken by Phil have involved UNESCO. This reflects the fact that he is a great believer in the significance of UNESCO in promoting peace building and international understanding through education, and in assisting developing countries achieve economic and social development through strengthening and upgrading their education systems. In keeping with this belief, Phil has been a consultant to various UNESCO offices on numerous occasions, such as Australian Representative, Asian Regional meetings for UNESCO (1980–1989); Leader, Australian Delegation to UNESCO International Bureau of Education Conference, Geneva (1981); Leader, UNESCO Evaluation Team for Programs in China, Korea, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines (1986); consultant to UNESCO Paris (1994–1995; 1998; 1999; 2000), UNESCO Oman (2001), UNESCO in the Republic of Korea (2002), UNESCO Bangkok (1996; 1997), and to UNESCO-UNEVOC Bonn (2003; 2005).

His countries of work experience include Australia, China, Fiji, France, the UK, the USA, Western Samoa, Solomon Islands, Switzerland, Thailand, Arab Gulf States, Malaysia, Myanmar and Nepal.

With regard to research and publications, Phil has published more than 30 books and reports and over 150 articles in international refereed journals. These mainly deal with teachers and teaching, teacher professional development, school leadership, educational administration, curriculum development and reform, evaluation and assessment, education inequalities, monitoring student progress, reform of secondary education, and various aspects of education in the Asia-Pacific region.

* * *

A common thread running through all the teaching, research, publications and consultancies of Phillip Hughes is his keen interest in examining how education can be best organized to facilitate most effective learning, and in so doing meet the multifaceted needs of learners and their multiple intelligences. He also has demonstrated a special interest in examining the characteristics of good teachers, and how teachers influence their students.

It is for this reason that in deciding to prepare a Festschrift to honour and celebrate the work of Professor Phillip Hughes, it was decided that the most appropriate topic would be that of ‘learning and teaching for the Twenty-first Century’.

All of the invited contributors to this volume are well-known, eminent educators in their own right, many of whom are working internationally. They are former students and colleagues of Professor Hughes; they all share his passion for, and belief in, the importance of education as a positive force for development, and have been personally touched by his qualities, and by his work as teacher, researcher and author.

Bonn, Germany
January, 2007

Rupert Maclean

Photographic Gallery



PWH with Sheila Whittaker (left), Anne Siwicki (centre) at the UNESCO General Conference, 1998



Zhou Nanzhao, PWH, Kelli Hughes and Va Vathy at a conference in Korea, 2001



PWH presents the closing address at a UNESCO-APEID International Conference on Education, 2001



PWH, Oxford Athletics, 1948, the runner rapidly overtaking Phillip being Roger Bannister



Hughes Family. 1975, Back: David, Tim, Phillip John; Front: Louise, Jennie, PWH, Peggy Hughes and Margaret



PWH having a tutorial with Robert Horan in the garden, Oxford University, 1949



PWH and Professor Bill Walker, Director, University Council of Educational Administration, Hobart, 1987



Phillip and Kelli Hughes (centre), being welcomed to the University of Suzhou, China, 1998



PWH welcoming Professor Michael Fullan, Director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, who visited Canberra to deliver the 2005 Phillip Hughes Oration



The fun of the fair! Nancy Fauzt Sizer, PWH and Ted Sizer, former Dean of Education at Harvard University, 2004

List of Contributors

Dr. Joan Abbott-Chapman, Associate Professor, University Department of Rural Health, University of Tasmania, Australia

Professor Hedley Beare, Honorary Fellow, Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Dr. Michele Bruniges, Chief Executive, ACT Department of Education and Training, Tuggeranong, ACT, Australia

Dr. Francoise Caillods, Deputy-Director, UNESCO International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris, France

Professor Brian Caldwell, Managing Director, Educational Transformations, Melbourne, Australia

Jim Cumming, Centre for Educational Development and Academic Methods, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

Professor John Fien, Professor of Sustainability, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

Professor Michael Fullan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, Canada

Professor Phillip Hallinger, Executive Director, Graduate College of Management, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

Dr. Ian Hill, Deputy Director-General, International Baccalaureate Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

Professor Phillip Hughes, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

Professor Kerry J. Kennedy, Dean, Faculty of Professional and Early Childhood Education, Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR, China

Dr. Joanna Le Metais, Consultant, LE METAIS Consulting, Ascot, UK

Dr. Rupert Maclean, Director, UNESCO-UNEVOC International Centre for Education, Bonn, Germany

Dr. Victor Ordonez, Adjunct Fellow, East-West Centre, Honolulu, USA

Professor Colin Power, Chair of Board, Network of Educational, Social Science, and Policy Leaders (Eidos), Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

Ruth Radford, Assistant-Director, Leadership and Learning, School Education Division, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

Professor Malcolm Skilbeck, CONNELL-SKILBECK Educational Research and Consultancy, Drysdale, Victoria, Australia

Associate Professor Paris S. Strom, Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology, Auburn University, USA

Professor Robert D. Strom, Division of Psychology in Education, Arizona State University, USA

Professor Allan Walker, Chair, Department of Educational Administration and Policy, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

Section I
LEARNING AND TEACHING:
THE PERSONAL DIMENSIONS

Chapter 1

From Centralized Imperialism to Dispersed Management: The Contribution of Phillip Hughes to the Development of Educational Administration in Australia

Hedley Beare

1 Educational Administration Takes Root

The year 1966 was in retrospect a pivotal point in transforming the way schools were to be managed thereafter in Australia.

In the early 1960s there was growing interest in the role of the principal of schools. The early landmark Australian text by Bassett, Crane, and Walker, *Headmasters for Better Schools*, first appeared in 1963; but in the second edition of that work, the authors were able to say that “in the four years since this book was first published there has been a marked intensification of interest in the problems of school administration in Australia” (Bassett et al., 1967, Preface). Much of that intensity was generated in New England, the northern tablelands of New South Wales, where Bill Bassett, a former school inspector, was at the time Professor of Education at the University of New England (UNE). Bill Walker was an Associate Professor in the same faculty, and Alan Crane was principal of the regional Teachers College in the same city. They were colleagues, working closely together and making public the huge theoretical advances occurring in the modes of school and system organization. Educational Administration was, indeed, a new scholarly specialization with enormous consequences for practice.

Walker had been a Fulbright Scholar (and doctoral candidate) at the University of Illinois from 1956 to 1958 and a Carnegie Travelling Fellow in 1959. In the following year he returned as a lecturer to Crane’s College, transferred to a senior lectureship at UNE in 1962, and became Associate Professor in 1966. Walker was one of the persons destined to be dominant in the transformation of Australian education. Prior to 1966, as a Visiting Scholar at the University of Illinois, he had secured a substantial grant from the Kellogg Foundation, a philanthropic organization eager to feed the growing crop of school management studies. With the sponsorship of the newly founded University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) in the USA, Walker set up the first international convention of scholars and practitioners concerned with the running of schools and school systems. It had the unwieldy name of the International Intervisitation Program in Educational Administration (IIP), and the hope was that such a program would be convened every four years. Representatives came from the UK,

the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (Bassett et al., 1967, Preface, Farquhar and Housego, 1980).

Walker hand-picked a small group of influential Australian educators, mainly senior bureaucrats and leading scholars, for this mission to the USA, and the consequences of his choice could hardly have been more propitious. From the outset he ensured there was to be no artificial bifurcation between scholars and practitioners. Bassett and Crane were two of the team, but he made sure that all States were represented and preferably by someone who was not only a senior administrator but who had also contributed intellectually to the shape of education in Australia. These people were to be trailblazers and missionaries on their return, they had to be influential, and they must be made to feel that they had firm ownership of the field.

Phillip Hughes almost picked himself. He had been Tasmania's 1947 Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, returned as a teacher, served as a member of the Education Department's research facility; and subsequently became both Principal of the Hobart Teachers College (1964–1966) and the department's Superintendent of Curriculum; unique indeed in being an academic, Tasmania's premier teacher educator and a senior member of the State's Education Department simultaneously. In 1966, just prior to his going to the USA with the Walker team, he had been appointed Deputy Director of Tasmanian Education. At the early age of 40, he had been teacher, teacher educator, and senior administrator, the archetypical scholar/practitioner. It is significant to note here that Hughes had himself been a Visiting Professor at the University of Illinois in 1961–1962, Walker's alma mater. Working in the Bureau of Educational Research there, he met many of the scholars soon to make a mark on the newly flourishing field of Educational Administration.

Walker's group found what he wanted them to find, namely that the field of Educational Administration was in positive ferment in Canada (especially at Alberta) and the USA, with Chicago and Illinois in particular bursting with productivity, and with a powerful nexus developing with Ohio State University, where the national headquarters of the UCEA were located. Roald Campbell was running the Midwest Administration Centre in Chicago, giving visibility to the work of people like Getzels and Guba, Luvern Cunningham, Jack Culbertson, Ben Bloom, Andrew Halpin, Don Willower, and Laurence Iannaccone. The story has been well documented in the summative volume produced by Walker, Crane, and Thomas in 1973, by Meredydd Hughes (1975) in his report of the 1974 IIP, and in Cunningham, Hack and Nystrand's *Educational Administration: The Developing Decades* (1977) (Karmel, 1973).

The situation in those years was well put to me by one of the leading academics of the time, Lindley Stiles of the University of Wisconsin in Madison. The Graduate Programs in Educational Administration in the USA could be easily grouped into two categories, he maintained. There were those which were theory-based and inquiry-driven, and which were constantly interrogating the operational bases for current practice. The second group he called "theological colleges". Doctrinaire and experience-based, they were staffed by former school administrators who taught "how it was done" according to their own coded beliefs about the field. In short, they peddled received doctrine. The second group saw themselves as

providing *preparation* courses for administrators, a set of “how to” courses with a doctorate awarded to show their readiness for the role. The first set saw themselves as *scholars*, not least some of them as scholar-practitioners. They regarded their candidates as already competent and capable of administering, but who were agonizing about the field, questioning whether there were better ways and how to prove what “better” means, with the intellectual restlessness that goes with scholarly inquiry, defensible methodologies, and a burgeoning theory base. So Hughes found himself a member of the task force to observe this newly developing field of inquiry in which the “theory movement” was developing a head of steam. He brought much of that drive back to Australia.

The Second IIP was held in Australia in 1970, and Hughes was, of course, an active participant. At the crucial summative gathering in Armidale (called the “conference phase”) the visitors and their hosts met in residence after two weeks of visits to school establishments in the states and territories in Australia. That memorable meeting created the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration (CCEA) with delegates from at least 14 countries associated with the British Commonwealth agreeing to form an umbrella body to cohere internationally the work in educational administration. The CCEA headquarters were set up at the UNE, housed in the faculty of which Walker was a senior scholar. Not only did it feed the emerging activities in all Commonwealth countries, but it also developed strong linkages with the selective UCEA, the universities in Stiles’ first category, which were bent on raising not only the standard of administrator preparation in the USA, but also ensuring its practices and assumptions were being well and constantly researched.

As a consequence of his early involvement with the genesis of the CCEA, Hughes was a key actor in setting up three years later in 1973 the Australian Council for Educational Administration (ACEA). It became the Australian Council for Educational Leaders (ACEL) in 2002. Through the 1970s and 1980s, Hughes was involved with several of the international meetings – in particular IIP’74 in England and Scotland where the famous confrontation occurred between one of the field’s icons, Professor Dan Griffiths of New York University, and the emergent Canadian scholar Professor Tom Greenfield, on the topic of phenomenology (Are management and organization socially constructed realities, too ephemeral to be the object of empirical research?). Hughes also presented a paper four years later at IIP’78 in Canada discussing issues in the preparation of school administrators. The IIPs tended to dissipate after 1978, some commentators blaming the convening of the fourth in Nigeria in the midst of political upheavals on that continent, but the real reason lies much deeper. By 1982, studies in Educational Administration had become a strong presence in universities across the globe, and there was a huge amount of international interaction. Put simply, the collapse of the IIPs was the result of the very productivity, which had spawned them in the first place.

For our purposes here, however, it needs to be noted that Hughes has played a substantial, influential, formative, but (to a degree) unacknowledged part in developing Educational Administration as a field of intellectual inquiry. His involvement has been sustained and long term, spanning more than half a century.

In recognition of his unmatched contributions, the ACEL made him a Fellow in 1984 for outstanding services to the field, and in 1992 awarded him its Gold Medal, the highest honour it can confer on a member.

2 The 1970s: A Decade of Educational Reform

Educational Administration as a field of scholarship took fire in the decades from 1970 onwards, with several major university programmes established. There was a rich alchemy at work here, bonding those in senior positions with those teaching the field in universities and with a strong encouragement for school principals in particular to acquire a higher degree or diploma in this area.

The 1970s in Australia saw widespread and major upheavals in educational reform, so extensive that they altered permanently the shape of the professional terrain. The period saw parallel changes elsewhere in the Western world, particularly in North America, Europe, and Great Britain. Several major innovations stand out, epitomizing the nature of the reforms. By a stroke of fortune, Hughes found himself at the eye of the storm, on hand in two of the major exemplary changes in the nation.

By the late 1960s, funding had become a major issue in education. The Australian constitution, formulated in 1901 when already sovereign states agreed to federate, divided legislative powers in such a way that the Federal government dealt only with matters that were clearly national in nature (defence, migration, customs, foreign affairs) leaving with the states residual powers which were clearly local, in particular education, hospitals, health, and community affairs. The parlous condition of universities had forced federal intervention and funding in the 1950s. By 1967 the needs of school-level funding were so clamorous that the Commonwealth Office of Education was converted into a full-bodied Minister-led Department of Education and Science. The establishment of the Australian Schools Commission in 1972 marked the first major intervention by the federal government into school education in Australia.

Higher education was in crisis, most clearly articulated internationally by the inquiry in the UK headed by Lord Robbins, which produced its Report in 1963. Australia saw significant federal intervention at this time, particularly in terms of funding and imposed uniformities following the Report of the Committee on Australian Universities (known as the Murray Report, 1957). But there was mounting pressure from heavy enrolment demand, the escalating diversification being called for (not least because of a diversifying economy), and a long-standing dispute to separate teacher preparation from the control of the employing authorities (the State Education Departments in particular). Following a national review headed by the Chair of the Universities Commission (Sir Leslie Martin, after whom its 1965 report was named), the federal government made a dramatic change, introducing a binary system for the sector, namely a set of universities, all federally funded, and a set of vocationally oriented, polytechnic like Colleges of Advanced

Education (CAEs), which in many cases simply grew out of existing Teachers Colleges, now freed from control by the state Education Departments. The creation of the CAEs made teaching into a graduate profession by ensuring that pre-service teacher education led to a Bachelor of Education degree. The newly formed Education faculties in many cases formed the backbone of the CAEs.

As if to demonstrate what a CAE should look and function like, the Commonwealth opened in 1971 its own degree-granting CAE in Canberra, with a School of Teacher Education to model what the Canberra community through the Currie Report had earlier called for, and to be the archetype for a new era in teacher education. With remarkable acumen, the Canberra CAE chose Hughes to head the new School, clearly one of the best credentialled persons for the job in Australia. By the time he left Canberra in the early 1980s, his School rivalled any Education faculty – CAE or university – in Australia. Not surprisingly, it had developed a strong programme in Educational Administration.

3 Founding the Canberra School System

The developments in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) crystallized the trendlines in running schools and school systems. The Wyndham Report of 1957, although addressed to the New South Wales school system – its curriculum, the nature of secondary education, and the mode of external examinations – had a profound impact on the whole of Australia and set off a chain of remodeling and reorientation of schooling. Parents were agitating for a greater say over the education being offered to their own children, and so the setting up of local school boards on which they were represented and forms of governance became widespread issues, as they were in the UK (Sallis, 1988). There were moves across Australia to decentralize the administration and control of schooling (Ebert, 1964), and clamouring for principals to be given greater discrimination over decision-making for their own schools, especially in terms of financial expenditures and staffing. The same trends in the UK were documented in such books as Bush and Kogan's *Directors of Education* (1982).

Through the 1960s and early 1970s, teachers and, more importantly, the Canberra community had been agitating strongly for a breaking of the nexus of control of their schools from NSW (and the centralized headquarters in Sydney). They wanted not only local autonomy but devolution of powers down to individual schools. By 1966 the controversy had become so widespread that the Department of Adult Education at the Australian National University convened a meeting of the involved parties, from which was set up a Working Party, chaired by the distinguished academic Professor Sir George Currie, to report on the need for an independent education authority to run the Canberra schools. To provide the ACT with a supply of teachers, the Currie Report (1967, p. 59) also recommended the creation of a National Teachers College in Canberra, "closer to university stature, with considerable emphasis on research, free of any employing authority."

In July 1972, just before the Conservative government lost the national election of that year, the outgoing Minister for Education and Science, Malcolm Fraser, announced that a statutory authority would be set up to control ACT government schools from the beginning of 1974, that it would “encourage community participation in its work”, that it would disengage ACT schools from the NSW school system and become a free-standing system in its own right (Burnett, 1978, pp. 20–21). It was immediately apparent that a suitable model was needed, and that planning had to begin urgently. So the incoming Minister of Education in the newly elected Whitlam (Labor) government, Kym Beazley Snr, disbanded the slow-moving planning arrangement already in place and in its stead appointed an independent committee to come up with a working model. Because the Commonwealth needed a blueprint to guide the formation of and planning for the new ACT Schools Authority, it called for submissions and suggestions and asked the expert panel to sift the evidence submitted.

The timing of Hughes’ appointment as Head of the School of Teacher Education at the Canberra CAE could not have been more felicitous. Barely a year after he had arrived in the national capital, he was invited by the national minister to chair his panel of four, one of whom was Professor Walker. The panel worked with alacrity as well as efficiency and in May 1973 produced the book *A Design for the Governance and Organization of Education in the Australian Capital Territory*, now known as the Hughes Report. It appeared almost simultaneously with the first report of the interim Australian Schools Commission, one of the major innovations of the Whitlam government and whose activities over the next decade were to create an environment of unprecedented innovation and change in schools throughout the nation. In a sense, the ACT was the first cab off the rank (Burnett, 1978, pp. 20–22). The Interim Schools Authority was up and running by early 1974.

4 Foundation Chair of the Act Schools Authority

It was at this time that Hughes and I became associated in bringing Canberra schools out from under the jurisdiction of the NSW Education Department and in to the newly created ACT Schools Authority. I was appointed the territory’s first Chief Education Officer in 1975, having just returned from doctoral studies in Educational Administration at Harvard, and from setting up a similar, new, state-type school system for Commonwealth government’s other mainland territory, the Northern Territory (1972–1974). As if to close the circle begun was his imaginative action with the Hughes panel, Hughes was appointed the lay, part-time, foundation Chairman of the Interim Schools Authority, navigating it through its early teething problems, the complicated politics both national and local, and preparing it for the day when its own Ordinance would give it operational certainty. Those days demanded an intellectualizer, a visionary who could stand above the dailiness of the start up, a realist with experience in system administration, and a person with public aura and respect.

Hughes' input into this major Australian innovation in educational administration was both enormous, inspirational, and above all, wise. In a public consultation held in 1973, the year before the Authority materialized, Hughes skilfully characterized the administrative arrangements for schools in the USA, England, Canada, and New Zealand, made comment on the radical proposals being put forward by de-schoolers like Paulo Freire, Ivan Illich, Paul Goodman, and Everett Reimer, and proposed for Canberra (and elsewhere) a pattern of school connectedness that is relevant today and which foreshadows full-service schools; in short, he was way ahead of his time (Harman and Selby Smith, 1973, pp. 57–71). The Hughes administrative model was a neat amalgam of the best features of the UK Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and the School Boards of the USA.

The ACT system modelled new ways in which the management of schools and schooling could be conceived of and handled in Australia. It had to weather a great deal of suspicion and resistance from elsewhere in the country, and required some exquisite diplomacy. It needed intellectual rigor in its design. The ACT Schools Authority sponsored a school-based approach to management, including their own budgets, the existence of individual school boards, and school-based curriculum decision-making, all adumbrated in the Hughes Report of 1973. This period was one of the pivotal moments of change in Australian education, and it was both nationally significant and pioneering in terms of Educational Administration. (Hughes and Mulford, 1978).

The 1970s saw a virtual revolution in approaches to the curriculum and how learning outcomes are assessed. The decade saw a swing away from the content-based polarity of the curriculum conceived of as a list of “things to be learnt” and towards the child-centred polarity of the curriculum conceived of as personal formation, as personal as well as intellectual development. The move in emphasis meant that what was once accepted as a fixed “national curriculum”, a detailed, standardized, subject-by-subject set of syllabuses, was over time replaced with curriculum frameworks, where it was left to schools to provide differential offerings, which more aptly fitted the individual differences and levels of achievement of students, where a greater range of curricula had to be on offer, and where students could travel by several carefully reconciled tracks through their secondary schooling and into a range of post-school options.

In particular, bodies like the Schools Council in the UK were charged with translating these radical reforms into practice. Not only were curriculum outlines rewritten, but “school-based curriculum development” became a favoured mode, and the national examining bodies changed their assessment regimes away from externally prescribed, one-size-fits-all examinations to accommodate school-based assessment, varied styles of reporting, and the legitimization of these methods within the framework of a nationally accredited certification procedure.

In Australia, newly formed bodies like the Australian Schools Commission and the national Curriculum Development Centre pushed the reforms. Significantly for our case here, the headquarters of these bodies were in Canberra, alongside the active, intellectually tough but theoretically enlightened School of Teacher

Education of which Hughes was the Head. There were numerous formal and informal interactions across the city and various projects, which entailed work among the members of these bodies.

In the new ACT system, where Hughes was playing such a formative role, a new Year 12 Certificate was set up; the courses which contributed to it were written by each senior secondary school and then accredited by expert panels on which both teachers and academics from Canberra's two principal tertiary institutions served; an ACT Accrediting Agency was created to coordinate these developments, and (taking considerable time, expense, and expertise to do so) the Agency negotiated the acceptability of the new ACT certification processes with all major universities and employing authorities in the nation – including universities in other states and bodies like the Nurses Board and the several state and Commonwealth public services.

5 Engagement with South-East Asia

Late in my tenure as CEO of the ACT Schools Authority, which had now become an accepted member of the Directors-General of Education (DGE) Conference, I recall making a vigorous case for the Australian school systems to throw their weight behind and make a contribution to the newly established Asian Program for Educational Innovation and Development (APEID). It was a grass-roots endeavour among school systems in the South-East Asian area, aimed at pooling and sharing their expertise in curriculum innovation. I argued that Australia had not only much to give but also much to gain by collegial activity in this geographic area. UNESCO through its regional office in Bangkok had agreed to sponsor the project and it created a centre (ACEID) to facilitate its functioning. Support of APEID could have become a perfunctory item on the Australian agenda, but to their credit the idea won warm support from the Australian DGE. A little later when Australia was asked to nominate an expert to sit on the APEID Board, Hughes, now Professor of Education at the University of Tasmania, was chosen. It was a congenial coup, for he had a long association with UNESCO, and he brought to the role a deep and detailed knowledge about the resources in Australian education. He served on the APEID Board for a decade, and was the Board's Chairperson for six years.

6 The Changing Locus of Power in School Education

In the early 1990s, I moved from being Canberra's Education Chief to the position of Professor of Education at Melbourne University, the sort of move known in the UK but the first time it had occurred in Australia. Simultaneously, Hughes moved from his position at the Canberra CAE (soon to become the University of Canberra)

into the position of Professor of Education at the University of Tasmania. These moves symbolized how strong had become the scholarly backing of Educational Administration studies, the reputation which the school-based advocacy had acquired, and the intellectualism which was now becoming apparent in the teaching profession. During the 1980s, higher degree work was undertaken by hundreds of educators aspiring to leadership roles in schools and school systems. The amount of research done, and the range and depth of master's and doctoral studies undertaken by practising educators, the proportion of teachers with postgraduate qualifications (especially in comparison with other professions), the direct impact – not least, intellectual – on policymaking and on public education policy, and the leap of confidence within the teaching profession were tangible advances of this decade.

Even so, by the early 1990s, several profound changes had set in. Largely based on the Business Management models adopted across the public service, governments (both Conservative and Labor) began to promote into the positions heading up education bureaucracies people who were primarily managers and not educators. Master's degrees in Business Administration had proliferated across the world, copying the success of the Harvard and Stanford MBAs. "Adjectival Administration" was in a sense outpaced by "Administration qua Administration", the widespread (and largely untested) doctrine being that an expert administrator can manage anything, from a school to a sports stadium, from a zoo to an IT company, from a bank to an army.

A second powerful factor was at work, driven largely by the intellectual frameworks, which became the legacy of Margaret Thatcher's period as Prime Minister in the UK and Ronald Reagan's period as US President. Economic arguments began to be pervasive. Where once the justifications for and the impacts of public policies (including educational ones) had been softened by considerations of social justice, a fairness to individuals, of care for the least privileged, now there had emerged hard-edged questions about value for the dollar, about efficiencies, about measuring outcomes, about rewards for the deserving, and penalties for free-loaders. These issues began to dominate budgets, and not least education funding. Put in blunt terms, money went where issues about productivity ruled.

In most cases, it was apparently axiomatic that private suppliers were more efficient and delivered better quality than government-run enterprises. The market is the engine which delivers efficiency, value for money, and client-sensitive services, the creed went. Privatization of service delivery therefore became the favoured mode. To be particular, government-sponsored schools had to be made to run like private schools, in competition for their clients. Even more so, therefore, systems managers and school leaders had to be skilled in financial and personnel management, had to act like CEOs of a private enterprise, and above all else had to please their customers and clients. There followed a plurality of management changes, changing loci of power, leasing out of services, and a breaking down of the tightly monitored, centralist, control-driven management styles, which were earlier seen to characterize schools.