This paper arises from research regarding New South Wales visual arts curriculum in the 1980s and 1990s and is in two parts. Firstly, we outline some aspects of our local curriculum decision-making scene. Originally intending to give an account of the role of the inspectorate, we have amended this objective. Rather we seek a new understanding of the forces driving the examination. This is followed by some preliminary Foucauldian speculation concerning texts, authors and readers. As the paper unfolds, copyright emerges as a key protagonist. With this in mind a brief account of C18th copyright debates and the present expectations in Australian law is noted. The second part of the paper reconstructs a curriculum genealogy as a case study of the 40 plates, using Bill Green's adaptation in *Post-curriculum history?* of Foucault's tripartite structure of discourses, programmes and effects.

I

The historical context in which the NSW inspectorate held sway has been lightly described and little analysed. Hunter's *Culture and Government. The Emergence of Literary Education* covers some analogous territory. Policy analysis in Stephen J. Ball's UK genealogies/ethnographies of reform and cultural restoration show Her Majesty's Inspectorate returning as Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). In this paper we intended to report some of the activities of the art inspectorate in NSW as an apparatus influencing curriculum and teacher subjectivities through the mechanics of the visual arts syllabus committee. This uncertain tradition, this unexamined category proves most
elusive. Rather than playing any central, initiating role, the inspectors on the senior syllabus committee were fairly quiet. Whether this is subterfuge, compliance, agnosticism or some other form of dissent, resistance or power is yet to be demonstrated. Our focus has subsequently shifted from the role taken up by the inspectorate to the role of the syllabus committee in the 1980s in the complex social field that is curriculum.

A 1971 report by Graham, an inspector in NSW, identified the tensions/contradictions inherent in a role combining advice, judgement or from a Foucauldian perspective, through governmentality. Interestingly, inspectorial influence, so potent from the 1950s to the 1980s, appears to have been eclipsed by new forms of governance linking funding and the mutation of professional development, teacher accountability, teacher accreditation and new forms of consultancy. The inspectorate endures in one guise or another until the present day as a peculiarly NSW entity currently with the imprimatur of the curriculum authority, Board of Studies.

Little reported on, inspectors are mentioned in a companion piece in Bill Green's point and counterpoint, by Phil Cormack. Cormack includes inspectors as follows: "often unexamined categories ... the inspector…. inspector's reports…. represent small (capillary) sites…. discursive practices through which subjects such as teachers, students and inspectors are constituted". Cormack continues, "Historical curriculum texts such as syllabus documents, curriculum commentaries and inspectors reports are, like all texts, formed out of the discourses of their time and out of other texts, whose words they use or to which they refer" (2005, p. 55 – 59).

Given this difficulty this paper is itself a little fugitive, as we here turn to the event that, it is argued, is profound and wide reaching in the conflicted discourses and relations of curriculum. The syllabus committee were compelled to harness all the 'spin' available, the goodwill of teachers [a currency too often relied upon] to recover from an unanticipated intervention disrupting the types of statements and practices encouraged and facilitated by the 1987 Visual Arts Syllabus Years 11-12 and its 2/3 unit examination.
The 1987 syllabus, some fifteen years in the making, was much anticipated. It was hoped and imagined that a new way of teaching and learning art, one designed with a late C20th adolescent as its subject, not a mini academic or artist, would result. Following that intention the examination, long the nub of many and varied problems, had to change. The very idea of what an examination should do and be was altered. This entire undertaking is undone when the syllabus and examination are determined by the Board to infringe copyright legislation. A curriculum reform is ruptured by the intervention of alleged legislative risk, ironically, as copyright was originally conceived with author's rights, education and equity in mind. The bizarre result is the collision of two very different discourses, a revolutionary framework for studying art reverts to an examination structure of the very type of content and questions originally intended to be over turned. An incompatible tension between equity, the self-expressive needs of child and the status of art returns.

In keeping with a genealogical and textual analysis we do not pretend to represent the 'felt' experience of being an inspector. Neither writer has held this position, nor have we attempted to interview or otherwise canvas their views. Rather we utilise the minutes of syllabus meetings as our data. The inspectors will be considered as one voice, amongst many, at the site that is the syllabus committee. We found the syllabus committee to be the enunciative authority most concerned with constituting the subject. Inspectors, as did others, enhanced their status as a member of the syllabus committee. We expected the relations to be reversed, a group of powerful experts, but counter to this the syllabus committee, at this time, afforded its members prestige and status. The work of the syllabus committee was similar to the traditional inspectorial role – advise, represent the subject and set policy. We found the inspectors as much agents of the subject through the committee as the reverse – the committee as agent of the inspectors. The syllabus committee appears to carry the identity of the subject: its status, authority, advocacy, initiatives. All arise from the history and force of this anonymous group of twenty individuals, acting in solidarity, despite the contested and fractious discussions portrayed [or inferred] in the minutes. The occupant of the syllabus chair holds considerable
influence, and in the example before us, was never an inspector. The syllabus committee and the field are mutually constituted as a set of contingent power relations.

A note regarding the documents/syllabus minutes. Although Foucault insists on the monument, the remanence of the archive and libraries, the documents utilised as data are limited, incomplete and often abbreviated and cryptic. From the British context Swift (2005) also observes this problem, "pursued through the documents of the centrally responsible bodies",

\[\textit{the lack of detailed archives in individual colleges and schools of art ... subseuqent reliance on printed material (inevitably produced by the government or its subsidiaries). Historians ... furthered the theory of a vice-like grip of central control in all matters (p. 81).}\]

Research such as this depends on the existence, archiving and availability of or potential access to records. Foucault has much to say on this matter of preservation, accumulation of the archive. In our investigation, we discovered that records just hadn't been kept, or later destroyed making this task harder. Little status had been attributed to the continued existence of the document. We too are constrained by the extant, traditional, orthodoxy of curriculum as conditioned by reform.

Further to the doubtful availability of the material record is the uncertain transgression of language and authorship. Speaking of literature and libraries, Foucault writes of "the site where books are all recaptured and consumed: a site that is nowhere since it gathers all the books of the past in this impossible 'volume' whose murmuring will be shelved among so many others" (1977, p. 67).

A syllabus is not literature nor does it subscribe to the use and critique of literary tropes. Most particularly, a syllabus is written by multiple author functions and used by multiple readers. Some texts, Foucault observes, do not have an author. A syllabus is one such
text. Foucault identifies copyright as a discursive condition producing the literary author, one of four author-functions. A "system of ownership and strict copyright rules were established that the transgressive properties always intrinsic to the act of writing became the forceful imperative of literature" (1977, p. 125). Some syllabus texts and policy are never read at all, whilst many users interpret and apply without ever reading the syllabus text for themselves (Ball, 1994, p. 17).

We now briefly digress to a summary account of copyright history and contemporary legislation. Copyright legislation recognising the rights of authors was first enacted as the Statute of Anne in 1709. Copyright has become a vast international legislative and regulatory industry. In the C21st copyright legislation, patent law and contention regarding intellectual property rights have burgeoned.

For our purposes we characterise the concept of copyright as within the public domain to promote education, access and enlightenment ideals. We rely on a paper by Mark Rose (2003). "Copyright and the public domain were born together" (p. 76), Rose observes. He continues, "One of the earliest writers to agitate against the bookseller's perpetual monopolies was John Locke" (p. 78). Locke's *Memorandum to Parliament* combined

*traditional anti-monopoly sentiment with the Enlightenment commitment to the circulation of knowledge, a view he shared with other members of the recently founded Royal Society. His Memorandum was influential in securing the lapse of licensing in 1695, but it remained unpublished until the early nineteenth century* (p. 78).

Copyright debates initially coalesced around property rights, perpetual copyright and knowledge. Prominent jurists involved in these debates, Rose reports, were "only indirectly [in] a struggle over knowledge and the public domain. It was essentially an argument over the theory of property" (p. 80). He goes on,
Whereas Mansfield had grounded his opinion in the fundamental principle of the individual's right to property, Kames grounded his in 'the first principles of society' ... Likewise, Camden asked rhetorically about the social nature of mankind. 'Why did we enter into society at all, but to enlighten one another's minds, and improve our faculties, for the common welfare of the species?' (p. 81).

Rose highlights the regulatory power of copyright. He says, "it is apparent that the C18th debates did not produce a legal discourse of public rights strong enough to balance the discourse of property rights" (p. 86).

Today, protection extends to every kind of derivative that may be produced from a work, and the right protected is not merely the right to print but to make copies of any kind including photocopies for one's own use. Copyright has therefore ceased to be primarily a matter of concern to booksellers; or even a matter of concern to booksellers and authors. It has become a subject of general concern (p. 86).

Copyright is now exercised through a number of regulatory authorities. The Copyright Agency Limited (2007) describes the contemporary, local position as follows:

Australian law recognises that individuals have the right to protect the moral and economic interests arising from their creative works. Copyright is a form of intellectual property that protects a variety of literary, artistic, musical and dramatic endeavours as well as other things such as sound recordings and films. It is not ideas but their expression that are protected by copyright law.

In Australia, copyright law is contained in the Copyright Act 1968 (the Act), and in court decisions that have interpreted the provisions of the Act. The Act is amended from time to time to keep the law up to date.
The law gives owners of copyright exclusive rights to do certain things with their material. Copyright is intended to protect creative works from being used without the agreement of the owner and to provide an incentive for creators to continue to create new material.

Copyright is a type of property that can be traded just like other types of property, such as real estate. However, it is different from tangible property in that it can be copied or otherwise used easily without the knowledge of the owner.

II

We now adopt the Foucauldian method advanced by Green as

a basic distinction is posited between three such general orders of events: that of certain forms of explicit, rational, reflected discourse; that of certain non-discursive social and institutional practices; and that of certain effects produced within the social field (2005, p. 53).

As Green observes, the urge or implication for tight exclusivity and unity in using such a classification is best resisted. Instead, messy, irregular, disparate and incongruous categorisation is anticipated. Specificity is respected. The unexamined and the omitted are given renewed privilege.

Discourse is taken to involve how a concept is used and in our application proceeds from a material description of the text to the words and things. In this discourse analysis, the minutes are interwoven with the syllabus text, memoranda, correspondence, examination papers and other policy texts. The focus areas, the 40 plates, and the recommended areas of study are considered in series. This follows Foucault's injunction in the introduction to The Archaeology of Knowledge; "to define the elements proper to each series, to fix its boundaries, to reveal its own specific type of relations, to formulate its laws, and, beyond this, to describe the relations between different series" (1972, p. 7).
Discourses

Art history content and its examination is a contentious issue in the art education community and syllabus committee, unabated over many years. The 1978 course limited visual arts content to a chronological method. In this syllabus a compulsory common core, History of the Visual Arts, provides “a broad general background in art history with emphasis on comparative analysis and the development of understanding of relationships between art forms, styles and cultural influences” (1978, p. 4). This is not unsurprising, and is consistent with then current university conceptions of art history. Art history was not a broadly based inclusive course of study. The content and articulation is a tripartite cross-cultural examination of European, Non-European and Modern.

Australian is placed within the broader category of Modern. Modern is a list including post-impressionism, cubism, expressionism, social realism and surrealism. A syllabus document is prone to taxonomies and produces the dividing practices that support the examination. Discursive force is attributed to statements that survive at the structural level of the examination and its prescribed rules. In the 1978 syllabus, Australian is buried amidst Modernism. In the old syllabus art content appears in lists, not unlike a series of book chapters, a discourse without a teacher or student, heavily dependent on progress through influences.

The 1987 syllabus organised content in a completely different form as four Focus Areas. They were called, in order of appearance, Art in Australia, Art and Culture, Art and Media and finally Art and Design. Focus areas are presented as comprising two parts: Making Artworks and Studying Images and Objects. Overlapping each focus area is the core of the local environment. For the syllabus committee, the focus areas were a solution to a number of problems including the perceived anomalies and other shortcomings of the previous syllabus, in particular the delimitation of Australia as a period in a modernist chronology, the vexed questions of craft, design and technology, the ascendancy of semiotic theory in the visual arts, and the examination.
A child centred discourse is spread across the 1987 syllabus. This second contested discourse made to fit is the K-12 policy. Finally realised in the 1987 syllabus, this 'new' discourse was built around a subjective and process based philosophy, oriented toward the present experience of students. This was expressed in continuity with the ‘K-12 Statement of Principles’.

It is the examination that is the dominant discourse, occupies many hours of the syllabus committee's time, is the source of many difficulties in practice and policy, and indeed has its own subsidiary committee, the examination committee who annually set the paper. The examination is the source of much angst, is a constant topic and has one persistent and specific difficulty; the lottery. This lottery refers to an apparently simple matter of content selection that harbours deeper concerns of content, range, equity, resources and relevance. The syllabus committee responded to the lottery with an audacious idea that simultaneously solved a couple of persistent problems. In an effort to reduce some of the unknown and unexpected contents in the written examination, specifically the artworks students would be required to discuss, the examination paper is devised to include forty artworks that would be known in advance - indeed - a year ahead of sitting the examination. The forty artworks, coined the 40 plates, had the added benefit of explaining, by example, the meaning of the focus areas. The artifice and contradictions of the focus areas, as written in the syllabus, had made them notoriously difficult to delineate. For example, the discursive unity of 'areas' in focus areas, a word whose rarity is as an object of geography, problematised the use of place as an exclusionary device.

Further, the 40 plates would be different each year, and rather than merely nominate them, each student received an A4 booklet of black and white images to study, making "the choice of answers less of a lottery”¹ observes the working notes of the syllabus committee.

Oddly however, this new thing, [the 40 Plates] devised to have such remarkable effect is given the slightest reference in the formal syllabus document. Almost an afterthought

Amanda Weate and Alicia Yorke
An Uncertain Tradition
Melbourne ACSA 2007
and strangely prescient - seven lines at the foot of page thirty-five of the 1987 syllabus document are dedicated to this new examination mechanism. It does however reveal the displacement and transformation of the discourses of art to the singularity of images and objects.

*Each year the Board will determine a series of Prescribed Images and Objects to be studied. Up to 40 images and photographs of objects will be published in the year preceding the examination. They will cover each of the focus areas in about equal proportions. This annual provision of Prescribed Images and Objects will focus on those artists, groups and types of images and objects which will need to be studied for Part A of the 2/3 Unit examination - Studying Images and Objects* (1987, p. 35).

The 40 plates were examined three times, 1989, 1990 and 1991. Their annual production variations are suggestive of the difference of opinion within the syllabus committee and reflective of the wider visual arts community. The examination committee, comprising six members, two of whom were not syllabus committee members, provided the opportunity for those not acclimatised to syllabus politic and debates to be heard. The multiple interests at play opened up the possibility for contrasting and conflicting discourses.

**Programmes**

In 1991 the third year examining the 40 plates the Board of Studies wrote to the syllabus committee warning they were potentially in breach of copyright legislation. Section 200 of the Copyright Act, amended in 1989, says, “The copyright in an artistic work is not infringed by reason only that the work is reproduced as part of the questions to be answered in an examination, or in an answer to such a question”. This amendment was the reason advanced, requiring, the minutes record, a “fresh interpretation”.iii
Copyright had attracted some occasional difficulty for the Board who had sought permission from artists and others for clearance to enable the sale of past examination papers. Otherwise copyright was unknown and unimportant territory to the syllabus committee. It appears the contention pivoted on the definition of an examination. Could an examination extend across 12 months, which would be the duration of the 40 plates booklet? How could the 40 plates be regulated if student's had possession outside controlled and invigilated examination sites? Are the plates akin to a prescribed text as used for many years in English syllabus? The following memorandum suggests these issues are anticipated.

The accompanying Visual Arts Plates booklets are supplied for distribution to Year 11 students studying Visual Arts for the HSC [Higher School Certificate] examination in 1990.

The number of copies is strictly limited by an agreement between the Department of Education and the Copyright Agency Limited and NO extra copies have been printed.

You should keep a record of students who have been issued with this book.

The copy issued to students must not be taken into the Higher School Certificate examination room. A copy will be issued to candidates in the examination room.

Rather than challenge the copyright warning the syllabus committee preferred to change the examination paper and remove the 40 plates. Within weeks of students commencing this part of the course, the chairman of the syllabus committee and the chairman of the examination committee, made this recommendation to the president of the Board of Studies.

The demise of the 40 plates was presented as problems of copyright however dissent and doubt had surrounded the 40 plates since their inception. One year after implementation there was a shared view expressed by the syllabus committee that short statements
accompanying the prescribed images and objects were required to “bring out the spirit of the syllabus”\textsuperscript{iv}.

This sentiment is redistributed as one of four declared justifications for the cessation of the annual issue of the 40 plates booklet, two years later in a letter dated 24\textsuperscript{th} June 1991 from Len Rieser, Chairman, Visual Arts Syllabus Committee to John Lambert, President, Board of Studies: “The original intention of the “40 Plates” appears to have been misinterpreted on occasion in the past. Therefore it has been decided that such prescriptions tend to inhibit and distort the study of Visual Arts and so deny the spirit of the syllabus”\textsuperscript{v}. The compliance to the copyright warning suggests some members of the syllabus committee welcomed the abrogation of the 40 plates. Already demonised as a problem this rupture led to the formation of new discursive practices.

A restructure of the examination was proposed to manage the different form of content. The discourse of examination as structure and arrangement would be revised to include a range of alternative questions that “reflect” and “amplify”\textsuperscript{vi} the four focus areas. The constant preoccupation with how to examine the focus areas led to the formation of a new discourse built around ‘Descriptors’. The regulative discourse of ‘Prescribed’ according to the Oxford Dictionary is “to lay down or impose authoritatively” (2004, p. 1020) was replaced by statements intended to depict, portray, illustrate, express and/or explain the focus areas.

The Board of Studies now provided two statements, to later be called Recommended Areas of Study, without images, for each of the four focus areas as Part A of the examination. Part B of the examination remained unchanged, comprising eight unseen coloured plates and three alternative questions. Unseen, a curious idea, does however continue the discourse of the single example. Students were now presented with artworks of which previous study or practice would be a complete ‘lottery’.
The 40 plates examination technique privileged the student’s personal self-expression. In a rejection of previous chronological models, dates were not provided for each of the forty artworks. The student’s experience was heightened by the inclusion of images from visual culture. Like the 40 plates, interpreting unseen artworks was an intuitively creative and subjective process. Democracy, equity and inclusiveness were promoted whereby all students were deemed capable of art. The syllabus committee was obliged to set up a working party to assist the Board in revising “all of the regulatory documents and publications affected”\(^{vii}\).

Uncertainty surrounding the implications of these changes to the syllabus and examination questions is apparent in the meeting minutes of the 26\(^{th}\) June 1991. The question is raised if “Examination questions should be based on the content of the syllabus or 4 Focus Areas”\(^{viii}\). It appears in this instance that the syllabus committee did not recognise the focus areas, without the 40 plates, as curriculum ‘content’.

Five months after the copyright warning, a memorandum to principals and teachers set out the decision, the reasons for the change and the new structure to the examination paper. The core and focus areas would be examined in lieu of the 40 plates. The syllabus committee received approval from the Board of Studies to convene a working party of examination committee representatives to decide on “Recommended Areas of Study to replace the 40 Plates”\(^{ix}\).

The Recommended Areas of Study erupt as the new discourse. The restatement of ‘areas’ suggests a coexistence and mutual functioning was anticipated between the recommended areas of study and focus areas. The focus areas appeared as an organizing device, invented as a solution to the perceived shortcomings of the previous syllabus including the exam and the place of Australian art. The recommended areas of study are subsequently developed as the focus areas provide the conditions or field of practice for visual arts curriculum however they are stealth in providing the tools necessary to make and study images. The two statements, or “detailed suggestions of content for the making
and studying of art**, supplied for each focus area were to provide clarity for teachers and fix the boundaries of the focus areas.

Five days after their inception into visual arts discourse principals and teachers learn of the recommended areas of study in a memorandum advising, “amendments have been made in the Visual Arts and the Examination Specifications as a result of which, for 1992, they will be replaced by the following Recommended Areas of Study for each Focus Area”**xi**.

The syllabus committee had worked in anticipation of the possibilities for a syllabus and examination restructure, “to devise a reasonable satisfactory solution and to prepare adequate support material in time”**xii**, following the Board of Studies’ decision not to issue the 40 plates for 1992. Following this flurry however, in a letter dated 4th April 1992 from Mr Len Rieser to Mr John Lambert titled ‘The Removal of the 40 Plates and their replacement by Recommended Areas of Study’ the syllabus committee expressed their disappointment that the support document did not reach schools until March 1992 despite its readiness in November 1991.

**Effects**

The implications of this delay “caused considerable anguish in schools”**xiii**. The Board of Studies is accorded the responsibility for this curriculum reform however the teacher is the agency of prescribed pedagogic practices. Teachers’ conduct was self-regulated to review, evaluate, consult, respond and potentially implement this new and better curriculum policy with minimal guidance or explanation from those sites possessing a formal and authoritative role in the production of this knowledge. In this instance the syllabus committee believed the actions of the Board of Studies “reflects badly upon the credibility of this committee and the Board”**xiv**.

The syllabus committee received letters from high schools and professional art organizations concerning the recommended areas of study. Discourses of concern were
expressed in statements such as: “not enough information to explain adequately what it is we are required to do in terms of areas to be studied”, “continual changes”, “a bit sudden”, and “continual need to expend financial resources”. This is strange as the recommended areas of study redistribute accumulated statements.

The field of memory embracing environment, local and immediate across all four focus areas in the 1987 syllabus disappears and other statements privileged the original discourse. The recommended areas of study adopt an alternative discursive configuration from the statements of perspectives on pages 34-35 of the syllabus. Many begin with “The function, meaning and purpose of …”; “The expression and communication of ideas, feelings and perceptions about/of …”; and/or “The characteristics and significance of …” (Board of Secondary Education, 1987, p. 35). The recommended areas of study were conceived as the agent in the construction of the examination paper however they too failed to provide greater interpretative content for the visual arts curriculum. A discourse of traditional art history chronology subsequently returns with the recommended areas of study.

The recommended areas of study were regulated by the syllabus committee to be optional, not compulsory and suggestion only. This sentiment is evidenced in letters from the syllabus committee to the high schools and professional art organizations who expressed their concern. The language used to illustrate this includes: “My personal feelings are that you are over-reacting as none of the recommended areas have to be addressed at all, or one would be amply sufficient”; and “It is important to remember that if you do not want to address the Recommended Areas of Study you don’t have to”. The ‘Recommended’ Areas of Study reject and contradict the previous ‘Prescribed’ Images and Objects.

Despite this “unstable nature” of the recommended areas of study, a Report to the Board of Studies dated September 1997, recognizes the “preparation of the Recommended Areas of Study for the 1998 HSC with attention being given to further
advice for teachers” as one of their achievements during 1996-1997. This ‘advice’ was in the process of development to “assist teachers in their understanding of the relationship between the Recommended Areas of Study and the Focus Areas in the Syllabus.” Five years on, the syllabus committee was still attempting to rationalise the reciprocal functioning between the focus areas and the recommended areas of study.

A persistent set of discourses occupies the syllabus committee. The principle, recurring discourses are matters of content principally Australian, K-12 policies and the examination - its size, status and regulation. "Foucault points to the work of historical accidents, abrupt interruptions, and the play of surfaces” (Bouchard, 1977, p. 17). In this paper, we have shown how the intervention of alleged legislative risk brings about a loss of control and a rupture to the direction of visual arts discourses. Without the practices, instruments and institutional formation to support the 40 plates and its scant regulatory reference, ironically, the examination is relied upon to carry the day. The examination was to provide explanation and clarity for visual arts curriculum content in the form of recommended areas of study. The coexistence of the recommended areas of study and the focus areas is a forced relationship. This collision in visual arts discourse permeates visual arts education discourse for nearly ten years.

An Uncertain Tradition? We began with the uncertainty of the inspectorate as a category and conclude with the uncertainty of a lottery and a thwarted attempt to circumvent it by altering the discursive grounds of the examination.
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