

ADULT EDUCATION IN AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND - A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF POLICY CHANGES, 1984-90.

Robert Tobias
University of Canterbury

Abstract

Since 1984, when the fourth Labour Government was elected to office, there have been major changes in the structures of society in Aotearoa/New Zealand. A wide range of reviews and reforms of economic and social policy have been undertaken, and not surprisingly the structures and policies of adult education have come under scrutiny and been subject to major changes. The purpose of this paper is to examine the politics of policy formation over a six-year period. Using official and unofficial reports and other documents, the paper seeks to identify some of the key changes in adult education policy that have taken place in recent years and to locate them within the context of the contradictory pressures operating upon and within government and the field of adult education.

Centre for Continuing Education,
University of Canterbury,
Christchurch.
July, 1990

ADULT EDUCATION IN AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND - A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF POLICY CHANGES, 1984-90

ROBERT TOBIAS

Background

Since 1984 there have been major changes in the structures of society in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In a previous paper (Tobias, 1988), an attempt was made to document some of these changes, with special reference to the most significant economic and social policies introduced by the Labour Government since its election in mid-1984. These changes have been driven by two sets of contradictory forces. On the one hand pressures arising from a stagnant economy have combined with the rise to international dominance of the ideologies of the New Right to induce the state to limit its role in social service provision, to de-regulate the economy, and to rely increasingly on market forces in all spheres including education. On the other hand, pressures have come from within the labour movement, the feminist movement, and from the forces of de-colonisation associated with the Maori renaissance, to redistribute resources including educational resources and to set in place policies which would create conditions of greater equality between working class and middle class New Zealanders, between women and men, and between Maori and Pakeha.

In view of the major changes taking place in every aspect of society, it is not surprising that the structures and policies of adult education have come under close scrutiny and have also been subject to major changes. Using official and unofficial reports, submissions and other documents, this paper seeks to examine some of the key changes in adult education that have taken place in recent years and to locate them within the context of the contradictory pressures outlined above. The attempt is also made to identify some of the key issues confronting those involved in the field to-day.

One of the difficulties in undertaking an assignment such as this is that of knowing where to draw the boundaries on what counts as adult education. For the purpose of this paper I shall focus primarily on "...the education ... of those whose main occupational role is no longer that of a student."(NZ National Commission for UNESCO, 1972: 5) However the attempt will also be made to locate this discussion within the context of developments in the wider field of post-compulsory education. Adult education encompasses a vast range of programmes and activities. They may however be conveniently grouped within three

different though overlapping clusters: 'labour market', 'institutional', and 'community' education(See Law, M,(Chair), 1987: 63-4).

Labour market education includes those forms of education which have traditionally been labelled 'vocational' and 'professional', as well as those forms of education and training which have grown in recent years in response to increasing unemployment. It is the primary form of education provided by tertiary institutions. It has been estimated that it constitutes about 80% of the provision by polytechnics (Probine, M. & Fargher, R. (Joint Chair), 1987: 4), as well as a significant proportion of the education provided by university continuing education departments. In addition it is provided by a large and increasing number of private training agencies as well as by an increasing number of staff training and development units in the private and public sectors.

Under regulations dating back to the 1890s schools were empowered to offer 'vocational' and 'non-vocational' classes, and until the 1960s most trade and technical education was provided by technical high schools during the day as well as through evening classes. From the early 1960s, however, with the establishment of the first Technical Institutes in the largest urban centres, the reorganisation of the Technical Correspondence School into the New Zealand Technical Correspondence Institute, and the establishment of the Central Technical College (in 1972 renamed the Central Institute of Technology) intended to offer specialist trade, technician and technological courses, the function of providing initial 'vocational' education was removed from the schools. By the early 1970s the Vocational Training Council, which had been established in 1968 as a tripartite (Government/Employers/Trade Unions) advisory and co-ordinating body, had begun to emphasise its belief in the importance of linking education and training closely with the demands of the workplace and in the importance of lifelong education and training. By the early 1980s it had established twenty-nine Industry Training Boards, and the technical institutions had taken on the wider function of responding to the increasing demands for technical education generated by the requirements of an expanding industrial and technologically-based economy.

Until the early 1960s much professional education at university-level for degree and diploma purposes was undertaken on a part-time basis. From that time onwards there was a considerable expansion in the range of professional courses offered by universities, while the number of adults undertaking professional courses on a part-time basis, mainly by distance education through Massey University, also increased considerably. In addition, from the 1960s there was a considerable growth in the provision of non-credentialled continuing professional education by university continuing education centres and departments.

In addition to the state-funded educational institutions, there have for many years been a limited number of private commercial organisations providing 'vocational' and 'professional' courses. In the 1970s and early 1980s, however, there was an increase in the number of these private training agencies as well as in the number of staff training and development units in the private and public sectors.

Institutional education includes institution-based 'second-chance' education - basic and general education - provided mainly by schools for certificate and diploma purposes, the 'general or liberal education' provided for certificate, diploma and degree purposes offered by universities, and the more traditional forms of non-credentialled adult and community education offered by schools, polytechnics and universities. It includes liberal adult education, education for personal development, and education for leisure and recreation.

In 1974 legislation was passed which provided for adults to re-enter normal day-school classes and there was a rapid growth in the number of adults taking advantage of this. In addition schools maintained the long-established tradition of providing other forms of credentialled and non-credentialled adult education and received state funding for this. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s this provision continued to grow, and its growth was particularly marked in the 1970s in Auckland following the establishment of a pilot scheme under which four schools were given very much greater autonomy in planning their programmes. A consequence of the expansion of school-based education was that by the latter part of the 1970s a ceiling was imposed on the total number of programmes in each region that would be funded by the state.

In the early 1970s the third labour government established the first community colleges and extended the functions of the polytechnics to include the provision of 'non-vocational' adult and community education. In addition, in 1979, the first four Rural Education Activities Programmes (REAPs) were established under a national government to serve the community education requirements of rural areas with populations too small to justify the establishment of community colleges, and in the three succeeding years REAPs were established in a further nine rural districts. Considerable growth in the provision of institutional adult and community education took place as a consequence of these initiatives, although there is some evidence that some of this took place at the expense of the work that had previously been done by voluntary organisations and community groups (See for example Social Advisory Council, May 1986, p 62).

There is a long tradition of part-time university studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand and of relatively open entry for adults to general arts and science degree programmes. However, from the early 1960s there was a considerable growth in full-time enrolments in general arts

and science degree programmes in universities, as well as in the number of adults enrolling part-time and full-time in general degree courses at the regional universities and through Massey University. In addition, from the mid-1970s the universities established a number of special programmes such as the Certificate in Liberal Studies at the University of Canterbury and New Start courses at each of the universities to encourage and assist adults who wished to undertake university studies.

Until the 1960s university adult education or extension departments were the main providers of all forms of non-credentialled institutional adult education. They also administered the funds available to voluntary organisations, such as the WEA and Country Women's Institute, for community education. From the 1960s, when they began to shift their resources to continuing professional education, they gradually withdrew from their roles as general providers (See Williams, Barry M, 1978), and it seems that the provision of non-credentialled adult education by university continuing education centres has not increased significantly since then. Despite this the University Grants Committee retained the right under 1963 legislation to nominate two out of five members of the National Council of Adult Education. They thus retained a potentially powerful position in the field.

Community education includes some forms of 'community-oriented' education offered by institutions but for the most part it consists of those forms of education which are undertaken by community groups and voluntary organisations such as the WEA, adult reading and learning assistance groups, Te Ataarangi, community houses, the YWCA, Marae committees, etc..

These forms of education have a long and important history in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Frequently they have been based within social movements of resistance or protest, or have provided the impetus for innovation and change in society. Many of these forms of education have taken place without state funding. However from as early as 1919 the WEA has received state funding, and since the 1930s other voluntary organisations such as the Country Women's' Co-ordinating Committee have also received funding directly or indirectly from the state through the education vote.

From the late-1960s, and on into the 1970s and 1980s a number of new social movements emerged and some older ones re-emerged to engage in important forms of community and non-formal education. These included the peace movement, the anti-apartheid movement, the environmental movement, the women's movement, some sections of the labour movement, the renewal of the struggles of the Maori people for the recognition of their rights, charismatic religious movements, parent and pre-school education movements, cultural groups and beneficiaries rights groups. Many of these movements sought state

funding and support for their education programmes. On occasions they made links with or were sponsored or supported by educational institutions or were funded for educational projects by state departments other than education, such as the Internal Affairs and Health Departments as well as by local authorities. However, by the early 1980s, with the growth in labour market and institutional education and with many educational institutions withdrawing or limiting their support in this area, many voluntary organisations and community groups were starved of resources, and the legitimacy of their long-established roles appeared to be under question.

There are a number of further features of the field of adult education in Aotearoa/New Zealand which should be referred to by way of background: Firstly, with regard to funding, the labour market segment attracts by far the largest level of funding from both the state and the private sector. It is very difficult to obtain precise figures. However I have calculated that in 1987-88 as much as \$481 million or 39% of the total budget for post-school education was devoted to labour market adult education. This of course includes the amount of \$369 million allocated to ACCESS in that year. By way of contrast the total state funding of institutional and community adult education is very small indeed. In 1987-88 it has been estimated (Working Group, May 1989: 70) that about \$19.3 million or 2% of post school education funding was allocated to institutional adult education (of which \$7.6 million went to schools, \$5.9 million to polytechnics and \$4 million to universities), while the entire field of non-institutional community education received only about \$2 million or 0.2% of the post school education budget.

Secondly, not surprisingly, of those employed full-time in adult education the vast majority are engaged in labour market education. However they still constitute a small minority of those employed in post school education. The number of people employed full-time in institutional and community or non-formal education is very small indeed and is scattered across a wide range of institutions and agencies. The vast bulk of the leadership and work done in community and non-formal education is done by volunteers or unpaid workers. Thirdly, many of those engaged in adult education do not see themselves as adult or community educators, and their primary personal and political commitments tend to be to the institutions or organisations in which they work or to the fields of study in which they teach or to the movements or issues which drew them into the field.

A consequence of this is that the field as a whole is politically weak and tends to be fragmented. This is reflected in the existence of two main membership bodies, the NZ Association for community and Continuing Education Association (NZACCE) and the NZ Association for Training and Development (NZATD) which seek to represent the interests of the different sectors, in addition, of course, to the various professional associations and trade

unions. In addition, the fragmentation has been reflected at the national level in the existence of two statutory bodies, the National Council of Adult Education (NCAE) (established initially in 1938) and the Vocational Training Council (VTC) (established in 1968) together with the Department of Education and a number of other bodies, each of which has had responsibility for advising the Minister of Education on some aspects of policy and for executing this policy.

Fourthly, not only has there been fragmentation; there has also been considerable potential for conflict, especially in those areas in which there was an apparent overlap of responsibilities. Thus, in the case of institutional and community education, when the present NCAE was established in 1963, adult education was considered as something clearly distinct and separate from vocational and technical education, and the responsibility for providing adult education was seen to rest primarily with the universities and voluntary organisations. In the 1970s however, definitions and understandings changed, the polytechnics began to engage in more institutional and community adult education, the role of the schools in this field was expanded, and a division of continuing education was established in the Department of Education with primary responsibility for the polytechnic system and some responsibility for the schools' programmes. From the mid-1970s the NCAE sought to change its constitution to reflect these changes and to expand its role and membership to include representation from polytechnics, schools, and other organisations. However under a conservative government and Minister of Education, between 1978 and 1984 these attempts to promote the necessary legislative changes were thwarted, and neither institutional nor community adult education received much further support from the state. Despite this, in the late-70s and early 1980s the National Council of Adult Education(NCAE) did some very effective pioneering work in such fields as educational broadcasting, Maori community education, adult literacy, and the training of adult educators, as well as working to review and rewrite the 1963 Adult Education Act in order to broaden its base and extend its functions. (See Dakin, J. C., 1988)

Then in 1982 the Government called for an overall reduction of 3% in state expenditure. Community education, underfunded as it already was, was particularly severely affected by the resulting cuts. The WEA lost its entire grant and the NCAE suffered massive cuts in its grant. Adult educators reacted by launching a 'Save Adult Education' campaign. In the case of the WEA the political nature of the government decision was recognised and highlighted and the campaign to reverse the decision and to save the WEA generated such a high degree of political solidarity that despite its loss of grant, in some districts, programmes were not only maintained but even extended.

By way of contrast, in the case of the NCAE the Minister of Education succeeded in diverting the political decision by government into a management and industrial relations problem for the NCAE by means of the tactic of threatening privately to withdraw all state funding and then acceding to the request from the Council that a minimal grant be maintained. In order to live within its reduced budget, the NCAE was left with the task of laying off all members of its staff and then re-advertising a limited number of positions at lower salary levels. The staff reacted negatively to the secrecy of the negotiations between the Minister and the Council. They argued that the decisions should have been made openly and if necessary taken into the political arena, whatever the consequences, and that the government should have been forced to live with the consequences of its own decisions. Accordingly none of the staff applied for the posts when they were re-advertised and they advocated a nation-wide boycott of the posts. This boycott received widespread support from adult and community educators and was endorsed by the NZACCE. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the various decisions, it is clear that the only winner was the minister of education. The NCAE itself was left seriously weakened not only by the major cut-backs in staffing and funding but also by the deep divisions which resulted and which affected the entire field for several years to come. (See Dakin, J. C., 1988)

The Formation of Economic Policies and the rise of the New Right

In mid-1984, following a snap election, the fourth Labour Government was elected to power. The first few months of the labour government were ones of frenetic activity. On the economic side it was widely believed that there was a major crisis. In a previous paper (Tobias, 1988), I documented some of the most significant economic policies introduced by the Labour Government since its election in mid-1984. I argued there that the most powerful pressures for change have arisen out of a perceived crisis of capital accumulation, in combination with the rise to international dominance of the ideology of the New Right, articulated in Aotearoa/New Zealand most powerfully by the neoclassical Friedmanite economists in the Treasury, together with representatives of the Business Round Table, both sponsored and supported politically by Roger Douglas, the minister of finance from 1984 to 1988(See The Treasury, 1984 & 1988, Jesson, Bruce, et al., 1988 and Jesson, Bruce, 1989).

The New Right ideology is based on a deep-seated belief that the institution that is best suited to securing the interests of individuals in the fairest and most efficient fashion is the marketplace. The obverse of this is an equally deep-seated distrust of the state and its capacity to do much more than secure the conditions under which the market may operate with equity and efficiency and protect individual liberties and property rights. The New Right, then, is ultimately distrustful of collective political action and of democracy since it may bring about 'distortions' of the market. It emphasises individual choice, and views the welfare state as

"...a negative force that intrudes too much in the lives of its citizens, stifling initiative, inhibiting choice, and fostering drab uniformity ... Within this perspective, education is viewed primarily in economic terms: as a means of providing trained human resources to 'meet the needs of the economy', and as a commodity to be chosen and consumed by individuals."(Middleton, Sue, et al (Eds), 1990: ix) The educational language of the new right is drawn from economics and assumes that problems of educational policy are primarily technical and managerial rather than political ones, and hence should be solved by technical means or else left to market forces.

Economic measures taken by the government in accordance with this ideology have included the floating of the New Zealand dollar, the lifting of foreign exchange controls, the abolition of restrictions on foreign ownership of financial institutions, the progressive removal of export subsidies and import tariffs, duties and restrictions, the broadening of the tax base with the introduction of GST (initially 10% but raised in 1989 to 12.5%), the lowering of company taxes and of marginal rates of income tax paid by those on high incomes, the reduction in the scope of the provision of a number of state services and of state expenditure on the provision of these goods and services, the promotion of 'user pays' policies, and the corporatisation and later privatisation of an increasing number of agencies of the state. All these measures and others have been designed to expose New Zealand institutions, both private and public, more fully to the competitive forces of capitalism.

The Formation of educational policies, 1984 -87

By way of contrast the government's early actions in the field of education were based on traditional labour philosophies as stated in its election manifesto. This stated that "... Labour's policies will be designed to overcome inequalities arising from gender, race, income or environment"(NZ Labour Party, 1984: 1), and contained a number of commitments in the field of adult education. In the light of this it is not surprising that there was a sense of euphoria among many adult educators; and the government was no less active in its attempts to implement its educational and social policies than it was in the field of economic policy.

Shortly after its election, government established a Cabinet Social Equity Committee to co-ordinate its equity policies across all government portfolios, including education. In addition, a number of groups were established to investigate ways of implementing its policies. There were groups set up to investigate transition education (Scott, Noel, et al, 1984), the school curriculum (Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools, 1987), the organisation and administration of polytechnics and community colleges with a view to establishing a Technical Institutes Grants Committee, trade union education, and paid educational leave. In addition, the Minister of Education, Russell Marshall, asked the NCAE

to review and rewrite the 1963 Adult Education Act, and, following a well-attended South Pacific Lifelong Learning Conference convened by the NCAE in September 1984 at which he gave the opening address, he gave his support to the establishment by the NCAE of a Lifelong Learning Task Force. The Task Force was asked to: "...review the current allocation of resources to lifelong learning, make recommendations on how resources might be re-allocated, particularly to individuals and groups involved in non-formal learning, support the Government's policy on social equity (and) assist the NCAE to identify adult learning needs, develop policies to meet adult learning needs, and consult with people in the field"(Lifelong Learning Task Force, April,1985: 6).

It had probably been the hope of the NCAE that the success of the conference and the setting up of the Task Force would consolidate its position and reduce the tensions in the field. However, during the latter part of 1984 and the first few months of 1985, it would appear that the Minister had been receiving conflicting advice and had become increasingly aware of the divisions that existed in the field. Accordingly, in March 1985, he asked the Department of Education to convene a meeting of individuals and representatives of a number of organisations, to recommend mechanisms for consultation, co-ordination and improved communication between the various adult education organisations and groups, and between these organisations and the Minister, and to examine such issues as the restructuring of the NCAE, adult education legislation, the role of the Department of Education in non-formal learning, the provision of resources, the place of research, and ways of improving access and information flows and of strengthening networks. The group, consisting of 30 or 40 people, met on three occasions between May and August and in September 1985 presented its report containing suggestions for developments in the immediate and medium term (Report to the Hon C.R. Marshall, Minister of Education, 1985).

The report identified itself closely with the equity issues which were the declared focus of the government's social and educational reform initiatives. It endorsed the view that adult education had the potential to be an agent of change. It argued that priority should be given to recognising and supporting the educational interests of those who are economically and socially vulnerable, both as learners and contributors to learning. It then went on to emphasise the importance of providing recognition and support for non-formal learning in which the control of resources and the initiation, management and evaluation of learning are in the hands of economically and socially vulnerable groups, and to recommend a range of more or less specific mechanisms and policies that should be set in place nationally by government, the department of education, the NCAE and the NZACCE, as well as by educational institutions to ensure that the interests of these groups are served more effectively.

In a short period of time this large group of adult and community educators, drawn from a range of different backgrounds, achieved a great deal. It acknowledged that it had not been possible to complete its assignment and recommended the appointment of a further working party. Nevertheless it did produce a report which provided a clear justification for a change of focus and direction and made a considerable number of specific proposals including the outline of a new scheme for funding autonomous non-formal groups.

Despite this it could be argued that the group failed to achieve its primary task, namely that of finding ways of removing the blocks to cooperation and coordination that afflicted the field. One of these blocks appears to have arisen out of a misunderstanding, both of the statutory functions of the NCAE and the Department of Education, and of the ways in which the history of the previous ten years had shaped each of these organisations. In terms of the 1983 Adult Education Act, although the NCAE had the subsidiary power '...subject to the provisions of this or any other Act, to do whatever it considers necessary or desirable in order to stimulate activity in adult education', (presumably including making representations to and giving and receiving advice from the Minister), its primary statutory function was 'to furnish information and advice to...the Director of Education on any matter relating to adult education'. There was no suggestion in the Act that the Director of Education should not fulfil the traditional function of all heads of state departments of advising the Minister.

In 1974 in an attempt to break down the barriers between 'vocational' and 'non-vocational' education, the new term 'continuing education' was introduced into legislation. In the Education Amendment Act of that year 'continuing education' was defined as 'education, including vocational education, provided for persons who are no longer required to attend school under the provisions of this Act and who are not, unless expressly provided for by this Act, enrolled as pupils in any secondary school or department; but this not include education at a University or University College of Agriculture or teachers' college'. Those forms of education which were considered to be 'adult education' in terms of the 1963 Act were now considered to be part of 'continuing education'. In that year also the first Officer for Continuing Education was appointed in the Department. At that time it appeared that a re-constituted NCAE (alongside the VTC) might have a key policy development role to perform in the whole field of 'continuing education'(See Renwick, W. L., 1974). However, that was not to be. The bill to re-constitute the NCAE was never introduced into Parliament. The NCAE remained under-resourced and its role in policy development and advising the Minister in 'continuing education' over the following ten years was a limited one. Its major contribution during this period was through its establishment of innovative and pioneering projects and through its support of voluntary organisations, groups and individuals in the field of community education.

By way of contrast, the previous ten years had seen the establishment of a Division of Continuing Education in the Department of Education. The primary responsibility of this division was the administration and supervision of the growing system of polytechnics and community colleges. However it also had responsibility for schools-based community education, and had been called on to exercise a key policy development role in all aspects of 'continuing education'.

When the group thus confirmed the NCAE in its various roles, including the key one of advising the Minister of Education, and suggested that the Department of Education should have a limited role - primarily that '...of implementing developed policy and allocating resources accordingly', it was in fact proposing a major change of roles and functions and not merely confirming existing arrangements. Of course, in making these proposals the group doubtless saw itself as supporting the recommendations of the sub-committee of the NCAE which had been set up at the request of the Minister himself to examine the role and functions of the NCAE with a view to revising the 1963 Act. However in suggesting such a limited role for the Department it was in fact breaking new ground, especially in view of the growth of institution-based adult education in polytechnics, community colleges, and schools, and the expansion of functions of the Continuing Education Division in the Department since the appointment of the first Officer for Continuing Education in 1974. It could be argued therefore that such a proposal from the group required fuller justification than that which was provided in the report.

Moreover the report fails to take note of the discussions which were then taking place in another ministerial task force on the proposal to reform the administration of the polytechnic and community college system and to establish a Technical Institutes Grants Committee. In view of the key roles of the polytechnics and community colleges in the field of community and continuing education, it is clear that any recommendations from the group looking at immediate policy directions in community and continuing education should have had major implications for the working party, and vice versa. Yet it appears that there was little if any consultation between the two groups. Certainly neither John Hercus or Ian Young, the two members of the ministerial working party, participated in the group's discussions.

Finally, despite its strengths, it may be argued that the report was somewhat utopian in the sense that it did not deal with the hard questions of setting priorities between the various sectors of adult education. Thus it reads somewhat like a wish-list - there was something in it for everyone; and little attempt was made to sort out priorities.

Two months after the presentation of the previous report, the NCAE published the report of its Task Force(Lifelong Learning Task Force, November, 1985). The underlying philosophy

of the Task Force was not dissimilar to that of the previous group (of which the members of the Task Force had been a part). Like the previous report it emphasised the importance of non-formal education and of establishing structures and policies which would enable 'people experiencing inequity' to define their own learning and action agendas. Crucial to the thinking of the Task Force was the view that there was an important place for resource people - highly skilled adult educators in paid and unpaid positions who would undertake the 'animation' task. These 'animators' were to be grouped within a newly created Project Development Services Unit. It recommended that funding decisions should be made on the basis of negotiated guidelines by decision-making groups comprising one or two members of the learning group, two trusted peers, a member of the Project Development Services Unit, and a person appointed by NCAE.

The report drew attention to the very limited financial resources currently allocated by the state to 'non-formal' i.e. non-institutional community education: For 1985-6 it estimated that only \$630,532 or 0.03% of Vote: Education had been allocated to this. In order to secure the resources required to implement its proposals, the report proposed that "...the Cabinet Social Equity Committee negotiate within Government to obtain funds through Vote: Education to support a new channel for funding non-formal learning, (that these) funds would be available for learning activities in accordance with criteria which reflect the Government's commitment to social equity (and that) the criteria would be established by negotiation between the Cabinet Social Equity Committee and the National Council of Adult Education." (Lifelong Learning Task Force, November, 1985: 1)

Clearly this recommendation that a 'third channel' be established (alongside the Universities Grants Committee and the proposed Technical Institutes Grants Committee) was a major one. Its acceptance by government along with the other recommendations would have established a central role and voice in policy development for non-formal adult and community educators in general and for a re-constituted NCAE in particular. As mentioned earlier, the philosophy underlying this report is similar to that of the previous one, and there is no indication in either report of New Right influences. There are however differences in emphasis between the two reports. Possibly the most important of these was that, whereas the previous report included recommendations relevant not only to the field of non-institutional community education but also to a wide range of educational agencies and institutions with regard to their roles in community education, the Task Force appears to have had an ambivalent view of established educational institutions. Little is said of their place in the new scheme of things, and the focus is almost exclusively on new structures and mechanisms for 'non-formal' i.e. non-institutional community education.

It may be argued that this was the strength of the Task Force's report. It focused attention almost exclusively on those aspects of the total field of adult education which had been most neglected; it suggested that the NCAE should receive the mandate and resources to develop its work in those aspects of adult education in which it had in the past demonstrated its capacity and interest; and it linked its proposals with the Government's wider concerns for social equity. Moreover, because of its focus on non-institutional community education its proposals did not conflict with the other proposals which were being considered for the reform of the polytechnic and community college system. On the other hand, precisely because of its limited focus, its criticisms of much institutional education, and its claims for resources for non-institutional community education, the report was interpreted by many of those involved in institutional adult and community education (who also saw themselves as marginalised and under-resourced within their institutions) as a threat to their continued existence.

1986 - Uncertainty and new directions

Acceptance by the Minister of these recommendations hinged to some extent on his confidence in a re-constituted NCAE having the capacity to undertake the very considerable responsibilities assigned to it. As Jim Dakin has pointed out (Dakin, J. C., 1988: 123-8), however, at this crucial time there continued to be considerable difficulties and frustrations within the NCAE itself, as well as tensions between the Department of Education and the NCAE and its staff. It appears that ever since the appointment of Russell Marshall as Minister of Education, the Council's advisory officers had taken on the role of advising the Minister somewhat independently of the Council. To some it seemed that they had sought to extend their roles and influence further than could be justified by their positions as advisory officers of the Council and that the deterioration in the relationships between them and the officers of the Department was damaging the whole field of adult education. The staff argued that it was not they who had exceeded their powers or brought about a deterioration in the relationships, but rather that officials in the Department had attempted to block their access to the Minister. It was argued further that these and other criticisms levelled against them and against the NCAE failed to take into account the effects of the 1982 cuts on the NCAE and the very limited resources that had been available since then. These issues, and especially the question of staff supervision, were discussed by the Council at several meetings, and a proposal to seek the establishment of a position of director and/or executive chairperson was considered. However, at a meeting in December, 1985, it was resolved, 'that the Council inform the Minister and the Director-General that Council is not at present persuaded of the need for a Director's position and is considering the question of seeking a paid Chairman's position' (Dakin, J. C., 1988: 125). Despite this decision, the Council continued to have doubts about its capacity to undertake a wider role (Dakin, J. C., 1988: 126).

These then were some of the issues which the Minister must have taken into account in deciding whether or not to accept the recommendations of the Lifelong Learning Task Force. There were in addition other factors. The confusion over whether the NCAE had the statutory right and responsibility to advise the Minister directly rather than going through the Director-General of Education has already been mentioned. In addition there appears to have been some confusion over the scope of the responsibilities of the Council: Did its mandate embrace the whole field of 'continuing education' as defined in the 1974 Act? And if so, to what extent did this overlap or conflict with the responsibilities of the VTC and the Department of Education, as well as any new body such as a Technical Institutes Grants Committee that might be established? Alternatively, was its mandate limited to 'non-vocational' institutional and community education which had been the focus of the 1963 Adult Education Act? And if so, how was this mandate to be interpreted in the mid-1980s in the light of all the changes that had taken place in the intervening years?

Since 1984, at the request of the Minister, the NCAE had been engaged in reviewing and rewriting the 1963 Act. It had consulted widely, and by February 1986 it was in the position to distribute a draft of the revised Act for information and to state in a circular letter from the chairperson that 'The Council has been informed that the new Act will be introduced into Parliament in April (or, at the latest, July) of this year and will become operative on 1 April 1997'(Letter of 14 February 1986). On the question of the name of the proposed new council, it had opted for the term 'adult' rather than 'continuing' education firstly on grounds of international usage and secondly because it was argued that the term 'continuing education' had become more specific in its meaning and more limited in its application to certain institutions since it was first introduced into New Zealand legislation in 1974.

On the question of mandate or definition, the NCAE proposed adopting with little modification the broad definition of 'adult education' contained in the UNESCO Recommendations on the Development of Adult Education (1976). It thus stated that: "'Adult education' denotes the entire body of organised educational processes, whatever the content, level and method, whether formal or otherwise, whether they prolong or replace initial education in schools, colleges, technical institutes and universities, whereby persons regarded as adult by the society to which they belong develop their abilities, enrich their knowledge, improve their technical or professional qualifications and bring about changes in their attitudes or behaviour in the two-fold perspective of full personal development and participation in balanced and independent social, economic and cultural development; adult education, however, must not be considered an entity in itself, but is a subdivision, and an integral part of, a global scheme for lifelong education and learning'(Draft of New Zealand Council for Adult Education Act 1985 para 2). On the question of the functions and powers

of the new Council, it proposed, inter alia, that the Council was 'to advise the Minister of Education and such other Ministers as from time to time is appropriate on matters relating to adult education including the training of adult educators'(Para 17 (1) (a)).

Despite the many admirable features of the above definition, not the least of which is that it may serve to expand thinking about the nature of adult education and about the structures within which it may take place, it does contain a number of ambiguities. A consequence of this is that it is not entirely clear what processes, activities and institutions were intended to be covered by the proposed Act, and the Act offered little if anything in the clarification of roles and responsibilities, especially in the key area of advising the Minister.

These then were a number of the unresolved issues which are likely to have dissuaded the Minister from taking the kinds of action recommended in the report of the Lifelong Learning Task Force, as well as from introducing legislation to re-constitute the NCAE. There may well have been other factors as well. During 1986 the ideological differences within Cabinet surfaced and this may have diverted some attention from the development of new policy initiatives in the area of social policy. In addition, the task force which had been appointed to investigate ways of giving the polytechnics greater autonomy had been unable to reach consensus in its report presented to the Minister in August 1985, and this had forced the Minister to appoint a larger working party in November of that year.

Towards the end of 1986 the Minister made his decision on the NCAE. Following a meeting with representatives of a wide range of groups and organisations, in November, he announced that state funding of the NCAE would be withdrawn as from March 1987, that the funds thus released would be used to provide some funding of community groups engaged in community education, and that an interim advisory group on non-formal education would be appointed '...to advise him on the distribution of these funds, on the terms of reference and method of appointment of an advisory committee on non-formal education, and on the type of organisation that can best serve the needs of non-formal education and be accountable to the groups that use it'. The story of these events has already been told(Dakin, J. C., 1988: 128-135).

On the basis of the events described above it is possible to speculate on the reasons for this decision. The Minister may well not have had sufficient confidence in the capacity of the NCAE to overcome its difficulties even with the re-vitalisation that might have come had he introduced legislation to reform its constitution and expand its functions. The expansion of functions then being proposed for the NCAE would have included a very wide range of responsibilities for adult education within schools, colleges, technical institutes, and universities as well as in the community. Since the Department of Education also had

responsibilities in institutional adult education, and particularly in relation to schools, colleges and polytechnics, it may have seemed to the Minister that conflict would continue as long as there was any overlap of responsibilities. In addition, the fact that another working party was already looking at the polytechnic system may well have dissuaded the Minister from introducing legislation to extend the functions of the NCAE in this area, as well as influencing him against including polytechnic-based adult education in the terms of reference of the interim advisory group. It is somewhat more difficult to identify why schools-based community education was not included in the terms of reference of the interim advisory group. One possibility is that it had to do with the political strength of schools in some areas, and in particular in Auckland where several schools were especially well funded in community education. Whatever the reasons, they were excluded, despite the manifest need for further changes in the area of schools-based community education. Finally, of course the Minister's decision to focus on the non-formal or community education segment of the field reflected the recommended priorities of both groups which had reported.

By the end of 1986, then, very little progress had been made with the reform of institutional and community education. This contrasts markedly with changes in other areas. By June 1986 the Government had announced the establishment of its ACCESS scheme, which constituted a major educational and training response to high unemployment. It involved a major shift of resources from job-creation to training, a focus on 'targetting' state funds to provide assistance to unemployed people drawn from 'disadvantaged' groups, equal recognition of private and state training providers in the competition for state funding, and a decentralisation of decision-making to newly established Regional Employment and Access Councils consisting of equal representatives from employers, unions and 'the community'. It has been argued (Gordon, Liz, 1990) that ACCESS represents a partial victory of the New Right in the struggles against the liberal-progressives that had been waged in government in the previous year.

Whether or not this interpretation is correct, developments in the field of trade union education may be seen as a partial victory for the progressive left. The Working Party on Paid Educational Leave reported in July 1985 and the Task Force on Trade Union Education produced its first report in August of the same year. These reports were concerned primarily with the provision of education for trade union representatives. They recommended, *inter alia*, that there be statutory provision for paid educational leave for trade union representatives, and that a Trade Union Education Authority comprising representatives of union, employer, government and adult education representatives be established. In the face of opposition from conservative and New Right forces, the recommendations of the Working Party and of the Task Force in its first report were substantially accepted by Government, and formed the basis of the Union Representatives' Education Leave Act of July 1986. Despite

the restrictions and limitations on the rights to paid educational leave contained in the legislation, it nevertheless represented a significant advance, especially as far as the weaker unions were concerned, on the situation which had existed previously, when each union had to negotiate its own arrangements for the training of its representatives within the context of its industrial award.

1986 also saw the appointment of a Royal Commission on Social Policy with very wide terms of reference. It has been argued (Jesson, Bruce, 1989, 104) that the decision made in late 1985 to establish this Commission was an important early step in a fight back by a number of members of caucus and of the Labour Party who opposed the government's economic policies. Certainly the struggle within cabinet to reach agreement on the composition of the Commission (See Jesson, Bruce, 1989, 105-8) is a remarkable indication of the ideological tensions in government at the time.

By 1986 the universities were also under review by a committee established by the Vice-Chancellors' Committee. Its terms of reference were "... to assess the development of the universities over the last 25 years (since the previous review had been undertaken), their current international standing and their potential as a national resource, and to make recommendations on their future development." (Universities Review Committee, 1987:)

1987 - the first six months

During the first half of 1987 three review groups reported to government. The first of these, which is beyond the scope of this paper, was the Curriculum Review Committee (April, 1987). In November 1985 a Ministerial Working Party had been set up to investigate a range of options which had been proposed in order to give the technical institutes and community colleges greater autonomy. This Working Party reported in March 1987 (Probine, M, & Fargher, R (Joint Chair), 1987). As was implied in the title which it gave to its report, 'The management, funding, and organisation of continuing education and training', it took a very broad view of its terms of reference and recommended that a new Continuing Education and Training Board should be established which would be responsible for administration and policy development for the entire field of post-school or continuing education and training, except for the Teachers' Colleges and universities. This Board and its executive would be located within the Department of Education but would be independent of that section of the Department which was responsible for the administration and policy development for schools and teachers' colleges.

The working party envisaged greater devolution of authority and decision-making to continuing education and training institutions and agencies and recommended that this be achieved through the negotiation of charters and corporate plans between the state and the

institutions and agencies. It argued that many agencies and institutions and particularly the polytechnics and community colleges had come to serve as instruments of state labour market and social policy and that these functions could be maintained through the charter framework. In addition it recommended that institutions should be encouraged to undertake an entrepreneurial role. The working party envisaged that the field of non-formal and community education would form part of this wider field of post-school or continuing education and that voluntary organisations and community groups would receive their funding through the Board and not through any 'third channel', though some separate advisory group/s would be required.

In justifying its recommendations the Working Party pointed to the very considerable growth and diversification of the whole field of continuing education or post school education over the previous 20 years, arguing that this suggested the need for greater coordination and a clearer policy focus. It argued further that the nature of the clients and students served by post-school or continuing education and training institutions and agencies were fundamentally different from those served by schools, that their nature and functions were fundamentally different, and that the management styles and forms of teaching required within these agencies and institutions were also fundamentally different.

Despite its concern for issues of social equity and its commitment to overcome bureaucratic blocks and to give greater autonomy to institutions to respond to local requirements and demands, the report of the ministerial working party reflects very clearly the influence of the New Right and the report reflects no understandings of the political nature of the educational process. It sees the management of education largely as a technical process, emphasising the importance of including people with skills and experience in business management on institutional boards of trustees, and its advocacy of an entrepreneurial role for institutions opens up the possibilities of increasing struggles within continuing education institutions between those staff and departments which stand to gain strength and status by selling their services in the market-place and those which are unable or unwilling to do so.

Also in March 1987 the Task Force on Trade Union Education produced its second report to government (See Law, M,(Chair), 1987). Its recommendations were wide-ranging. It called for a wider recognition of trade unions as agents of change; for more democratic unionism; for action against discrimination based on gender, race or culture and for moves toward biculturalism both in unions and in workplaces; for government, employers, unions, the TUEA and educational institutions to respond positively to representations made by Pacific Island workers; and for recognition by all involved in curriculum development and teaching at all educational levels of the importance of achieving a better balance in the curriculum so that people may be assisted to become 'active, participatory citizens'.

The Task Force then went on to critique the field of adult education. It identified three trends: Firstly, it suggested that there was an increasing emphasis on narrow vocational education; Secondly, there was an emergence of adult education "welfarism" - a mix of social work and the development of coping skills, coupled with a tendency to define social and economic issues such as youth unemployment as educational problems; The third trend, it argued, was a reaction to the former two, and consisted of a resurgence of collective self-education generally taking place within the context of social movements and independently of educational institutions. The Task Force placed a high priority on the provision of support and resources for this form of education. However it did suggest that the interaction between social movements and educational organisations could be highly productive. It then called for much greater involvement by, and sensitivity towards the interests of, trade unions and working class people generally in all aspects of post school education and suggested that project funding be available for independent movement-based education and also that established educational organisations should seek to establish closer links with these movements.

The Formation of Educational Policies, 1987-89

The Election and its Aftermath

In August 1987 the Labour Government was re-elected to a second term of office. It probably won the election in part because of the increase in support that it received for its 'free-market' economic policies from middle class voters in key constituencies and also in part because large capitalist interests were prepared to finance its campaign in the mass media. Certainly it had lost much of the support of its traditional base in the labour movement. Immediately prior to the election campaign, in July, a further Task Force was appointed to review the organisation and administration of schools, and during the election campaign educational issues, mainly focused on the schools, featured prominently. Ruth Richardson, then spokesperson on education in the national opposition and a consistent advocate of new right policies, argued strongly for greater 'consumer' control of education and against state involvement in education. So successful was she in this that many political commentators argued that this was an important reason why the Prime Minister, David Lange, took over the education portfolio from Russell Marshall in the new government that was formed after the election.

A second reason for this decision by David Lange may lie in the conflicts within government. It appears that the new right in government was preparing a direct assault on education. We have already noted the influence of the new right in the development of policy in the field of transition and employment-related education and training and in the establishment of the

Royal Commission on Social Policy. By this time the new right in cabinet and in the treasury was ready to move in on education more generally, and Ruth Richardson's successes in the election campaign lent weight to their position. Upon its re-election one of the most substantial briefing documents received by government was a two-volume work prepared and published by the Treasury(The Treasury, 1987). The second volume is devoted entirely to educational issues and presents an extraordinary statement of the new right ideology and its application to education in New Zealand/Aotearoa. David Lange, who had supported Roger Douglas and the new right in the development of economic policies, resisted its intrusion into social and educational policy areas.

The Interim Advisory Group on Non-formal Education

In September 1987 the Interim Advisory Group on Non-formal Education which had been established by the Minister at the time that he withdrew funding from the NCAE, presented its report to the Minister of Education. As mentioned earlier, the group's focus had been directed to those forms of adult education which take place outside educational institutions and it accepted this de-limitation. The group argued that the essential distinguishing features of non-formal education lay in the fact that it was controlled the groups of learners themselves 'independently of imposed curricula, of outside professionals or of institutions'(IAGNE,1987: 6). It noted that probably as much as 80% of deliberate learning takes place outside institutions, but that less than 0.01% of the education budget is devoted to non-formal i.e. non-institutional education. It argued further that a good deal of this self-education is undertaken by those who have long since been alienated from formal education.

In view of this it recommended that funding to non-formal education should be progressively increased over three years to 2% of the post school education budget. In addition, the group recommended that the NCAE be disestablished and that a 12-member Committee for Independent Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand(CILANZ), elected by groups and voluntary organisations involved in community and non-formal education and serviced by a small unit in the department of education to be called the Community Education and Development Unit, be set up 'to advise the minister of education on all aspects of non-formal learning, including community education programmes within institutions, to consult with and respond to people involved in non-formal learning, to distribute funds to non-formal learning groups, and to promote and foster non-formal learning'(IAGNE,1987: 11). In addition, the group recommended that a national resource centre for adult education be set up as a trust or incorporated society with limited ongoing funding and permanent staffing. Its members would include educational institutions as well as voluntary organisations and groups and it would carry out those other functions including communications, networking and research that had been undertaken by NCAE.

It may be argued that the strength of the report lies in its strong articulation of a case for funding more adequately the field of community and non-formal education and in its recommendations setting up a democratically-based mechanism through which the Minister of Education could receive direct policy advice from those involved in this segment of the field. However the report may be criticised on a number of counts. Firstly its almost exclusive focus on non-institutional community education resulted in a failure to deal adequately with the issues surrounding institutional adult education (for example, the inequitable distribution of funds for community education in the schools) or with the linkages, existing or potential, between institutional and community education. Secondly, the report makes no recommendations on the funding of institutional adult education and provides little support for those adult educators and departments within schools, polytechnics and universities which are providing community-oriented programmes. Thirdly, it may be argued that the report fails to recognise the need (identified by the Lifelong Education Taskforce) for a commitment of resources by the state to maintain a cadre of adult educators, both paid and unpaid, who have a long-term commitment to institutional and community education. There is little recognition of the importance of providing ongoing funding so that skilled and committed adult educators may facilitate and support the development of projects and programmes of non-formal learning both on national and local levels.

Fourthly, the conception of community and non-formal education appears to be based primarily on the importance of providing funding for short-term projects. There appears to be little recognition that many community groups and voluntary organisations need reasonable levels of long-range funding as much as educational institutions. Finally, it should be noted that although there is no evidence of influences from the new right in its report, the group's recommendations were unlikely to meet with significant ideological resistance from and might indeed receive the strong support of the new right and treasury. This is because of the group's failure to locate its recommendations within a critical analysis of the wider economic and political structures, its implicit and explicit criticism of institutions and professionals (which fitted closely with the new right agenda) and its emphasis on short-term contract funding.

The Associate Minister of Education in the new cabinet, Phil Goff, immediately accepted the recommendation to set up the Committee for Independent Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (later to be called Community Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (CLANZ)), and by mid-1988 the Committee had been established.

The Universities Review

Meanwhile, a month after the above group had reported, the Universities Review Committee published its report (New Zealand Universities Review Committee, October, 1987). This report inevitably focused largely on 'mainstream' undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and research, and makes only brief references to the universities role in the provision of community services. However the brief references to this latter function serve to emphasise its importance, and it is argued that university adult or continuing education "...is not only a means of making university expertise available to the community ; it is also a means of enhancing access to the university and of updating skills"(New Zealand Universities Review Committee, October, 1987: 30).

The chief thrust of the report was to recommend to the government that, in order to increase New Zealand's economic competitiveness in the international market place, it develop, in consultation with the universities, a national strategy for the development of university education and research. It argued that a considerable increase in state funding of university education was necessary, and it based its argument, on the one hand on the view that universities were already underfunded and that student enrolments were currently lower than those in other comparable countries, and on the other hand on the view that "...the functions performed by the universities - developing human capital through higher education, generating knowledge through research and scholarship, and interacting with the community - are more important than ever"(New Zealand Universities Review Committee, October, 1987: xiv). Moreover, in the interests of "utilising fully the human resources...and of improving social equity, (it argued that) vigorous efforts to reduce existing barriers to accessibility are essential".(xv)

The committee rejected the new right argument that the benefits of university education should be seen as largely private rather than public and hence that the costs of university studies should be paid for by the clients or students. Instead it argued that the private costs of university studies were already considerable, that the balance between public and private benefits was difficult to quantify, and that the social benefits of university education and research were considerable. It therefore argued that the existing balance between private and public contributions should be retained.

The Tertiary Review, the Picot Report and 'Tomorrow's Schools'

In February 1988 the Tertiary Review Team in the department of education published its report(Tertiary Review Team, 1988). Rather than attempting to draw any conclusions its report presented the submissions that it had received and summarised these submissions. Although the views presented were very wide ranging, it would appear that there was widespread public feeling that a range of reforms was necessary in each of the areas referred

to in the earlier discussion document(New Zealand Government, 1987) viz. student support, the level and forms of funding of tertiary education, the administration of tertiary education, in relation to credentials and validation, and in research, science and technology. However it also seems clear that there was considerable resistance to the new right ideology as expressed in opposition to 'user pays' and to the suggestions that tertiary education should be 'privatised'.

In May 1988 the report of the Task Force on Educational Administration was published (Picot, Brian (Chair), 1988). It has been argued (McCulloch, Gary, 1990) that this report, which was primarily focused on schooling, seeks to reflect and reconcile the criticisms and views of both the new right and the radicals and progressives on the left. Both of these perspectives had drawn attention to the failures of traditional educational structures and institutions to provide the kind of education required to achieve equity and responsiveness as well as accountability and efficiency. The Task Force argued that the central problem was the overcentralised and overly complex administrative structure, and the consequent lack of effective management practices and lack of information required by people in all parts of the system to make informed decisions. The problem was thus defined in new right terms as essentially a managerial one, and the Task Force went on to advocate managerial solutions including the separation of the functions of policy advice and implementation (which should be located in a newly created Ministry of Education), the provision of education (which should be located in institutions, which should have elected boards of trustees and charters to ensure maximum accountability), the provision of professional and administrative services (which should for the most part be privatised and purchased on the open market by institutions out of funds allocated by the state), and the review and audit function (which would be located in a separate and independent state agency). The report makes no reference to community or non-formal education, and one is left with the distinct impression that the taskforce sees education primarily if not exclusively as an activity for children and young people! It also articulated an extremely narrow notion of community, restricting it to the parents whose children attend school. It thus had nothing to say about the wider role of schools in community education.

Following a three-month period of public discussion of the taskforce's recommendations, in August 1988 the government set out its policy position in a document entitled Tomorrow's Schools(Minister of Education, August, 1988). In general terms the government accepted the recommendations of the report, modifying them in some respects by retaining more of the professional service functions within the state and providing for somewhat greater recognition of the role of professional educators in the development of national educational policies.

The Hawke Report

In the meantime by March 1988 the government had received reports from groups reviewing every aspect of post-school education. All these reports, as well as the report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy which was published in April 1988, were referred by the Social Equity Committee of Cabinet, to a Working Group of Officials which would be convened by Professor Gary Hawke, Professor of Policy Studies at Victoria University of Wellington. It was instructed to consider the reports and advise government on changes that it would recommend covering the entire field of post-compulsory education and training. It was to advise among other things on the appropriate role of the state "having regard to the need for equity in access and process, the balance between private and social costs and benefits, the need for efficiency in delivery mechanisms, the importance of appropriate management structures, related issues such as institutional arrangements for the development of policy advice for the government, the implementation of government policy, training needs identification, certification and validation, any other relevant factors including labour market issues...and the fiscal effects of government interventions"(Hawke,G.R.(Convener), 1989: 102). It was also required to take into account the following themes which were stated to underlie all areas of social policy reform: The enhancement of family life; the implementation of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi; improvement of the social and economic status of women; provision of a legislative environment which safeguards basic human rights and freedoms, and works towards the removal of discrimination; an recognition of the needs contributions and traditions of Pacific Island peoples and other minority cultures in New Zealand'(Hawke,G.R.(Convener), 1988: 102). It will be seen that the struggles over educational policy within cabinet and the social equity committee were reflected in the terms of reference. In addition these different perspectives were reflected in the composition of the group which consisted of officials drawn from the Prime Minister's Office, the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Treasury, the State Services Commission, the Department of Maori Affairs, the Department of Labour, and the Ministry of Women's Affairs, as well as the Department of Education.

The report of the group was published on 31 July, and was released for public discussion and comment by Phil Goff, Associate Minister of Education, in August 1988. It is beyond the scope of this paper to summarise all aspects of this report. However it is important to identify the key themes and major recommendations. Post-compulsory education is defined to include senior classes in schools as well as schools-based continuing and community education, the wide range of labour market, institutional and community education undertaken by polytechnics, the pre-service and continuing professional education done by colleges of education, the advanced teaching and learning undertaken by universities, education and training undertaken by other state and private institutions, apprenticeships, on-the-job training, and non-formal education. Whilst not denying the differences between

different forms of education and training provided in different institutions the group argues that 'any distinction between education and training' should be avoided(p 15). It thus supports an 'across the portfolios' approach to education and training, treating all institutions in a broadly similar fashion. It also emphasises the lifelong nature of education. The report acknowledges its indebtedness to the Picot Report and suggests that it should be possible to apply similar management principles to the field of post-compulsory education. It thus advocates decentralised decision-making wherever possible to the level of institutions, which should be funded on the basis of their charters and corporate plans and in the light of overall national priorities. It also supports the Picot recommendations regarding the establishment of a central Ministry concerned primarily with policy. On the question of the role of the state in postcompulsory education and training, the majority in the group rejected the new right arguments that postcompulsory education should be seen primarily in terms of private benefits and hence that the only justification of state involvement was to achieve greater equity and redistribute the costs so that they were more favourable to 'disadvantaged groups. In addition to seeking to ensure that 'Maori, Pacific Island people, women and other disadvantaged groups' not only have access to a wide range of education and training opportunities, but also that the education is appropriate and supportive, it argued that the state should see its role as going beyond issues of equity and seek to achieve such goals as excellence and social cohesion.

The report may in general be seen as providing a large measure of support for adult education as a whole. The legitimacy and importance of much labour market education and training as well as non-institutional or non-formal education which had previously received little recognition within the wider field of education is affirmed. The boundaries of non-formal education are broadened to make it more possible than previously to draw in those who are working in institutional adult education and to justify the funding of institutions as well as voluntary organisation and community groups to undertake community education. Moreover the purposes of non-formal education are broadened. Thus it is stated: 'Non-formal learning opportunities can encourage re-entry to further education, employment, or community service, can provide opportunities for mutual support, especially among women, can provide basic education for those who have not succeeded in the formal education system, and can strengthen community action and development.'(p 96) Despite these progressive elements in the report, its overall philosophy nevertheless reflects the technicist and managerialist view of education which it had inherited from Picot and which perhaps was inevitable given that it was prepared primarily by a group of officials. In addition, as far as adult education is concerned, it was perhaps inevitable that it did nothing to call for a strengthening of CLANZ and the adult education resource centre or to examine any of the other issues which had not been dealt with in the He Tangata. report.

Learning for Life: One

After six months of discussion of the recommendations of the Hawke report, in February 1989 the government issued Learning for Life: One a statement of intent which reflected the framework based on cabinet decisions within which further working parties would develop detailed policies for the administration of post-compulsory education. In his introduction Phil Goff, Associate Minister of Education, claimed that 'Education is becoming a truly life-long process, necessary for us in taking our places both in the workforce and wider society'(p iii). The decisions announced endorse many of the recommendation made by the Hawke working group, while in some areas diverging considerably from them. The document stated that the reform of post-compulsory education and in particular post-school education would be based on the following principles: Decentralised decision-making (which in the past had been limited to universities) based within all institutions; Comprehensive policy advice covering all forms of post-school education and training to be provided by the Ministry of Education; A commitment by government to remaining the principal funder of post-school education and training through the provision of bulk grants based on a formula which was common to all post-school institutions, and a simultaneous commitment to increase the proportion of private funding of these institutions; A commitment to promote greater accountability and effectiveness in the allocation of funding to research and scholarship; The establishment of a National Education Qualifications Authority(NEQA) which would replace a number of accrediting and validating agencies and provide an across-the -board approach to the validation of all forms of qualifications; A commitment to encourage greater participation in post-school education and training, with particular emphasis on removing barriers to access for those groups who have so far been under-represented; and finally a commitment to encourage excellence, to enable all members of the population to 'maximise their educational potential, encourage free and independent thinking, expand the frontiers of knowledge, develop vocational skills to the highest possible level, and contribute to a dynamic and satisfying society'(p 3).

The government confirmed its adoption of a very broad definition of post-compulsory education and training and stated that it covered learning in formal institutions, on-the-job training, self-motivated learning in non-formal settings, and informal acquisition of knowledge and understanding(p 7). It indicated that a 'labour market focus will be incorporated across the post-compulsory education system where appropriate'(28), and that it had been decided to set up a free-standing agency working under a special arrangement with the Ministry of Education to be called the Training Support Agency to administer ACCESS, the apprenticeship system and assist with other forms of labour market training. With regard to non-formal education, it stated at one point that, 'Non-formal learning - including community education programmes offered within institutions- is seen by the Government as a valuable educational opportunity for people who have found formal institutional

programmes unsuited to their needs'(p 7), and at another point that 'Non-formal education and training is recognised as a significant part of post-compulsory education and training'(20).

One may interpret these statement as implying that the government wished to give its blessings to institutional and community or non-formal education, but that it was not at all sure what it was, except to the extent that it implied some notion of second chance education for those who could not cope with the requirements of formal institutions! It would therefore appear that the model of adult education adopted was very much a 'deficit' one. There is no conception of the political counter-hegemonic possibilities contained implicitly within the definition given by the Hawke working group and most explicitly in the report of the Trade union Education Taskforce. Nevertheless the government does at least confirm Community Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand(CLANZ) in its status as the advisory body on 'non-formal learning' and its role as disburser of funding for much of the non-formal learning that takes place outside institutions. In addition the document indicates the decision of the government to abolish the NCAE stating somewhat misleadingly that 'many of its functions are currently being dealt with by CLANZ.

The Working Party on Non-formal and Community Education

Immediately after announcing its decisions in Learning for Life: One the government set up a large number of working groups to take the policies a stage further. The terms of reference (or required 'outputs') of the Non-formal and Community Education and Training Working Group included the following: To produce a report which makes recommendations on the manner and method of funding and the accountability procedures for funds handled by: 1. Non-formal and community education funded by Vote: Education including that funded through the Community Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand(CLANZ) Advisory Committee; and 2. Non-formal and community education activities and programmes delivered through Universities, Colleges of Education, Polytechnics and Schools. It was required to consult with a wide range of organisations and to produce its report by the end of May 1989.

The working group sought to broaden and specify more precisely what it understood community education to be. It argued that community education 'refers to programmes and activities in which people participate to develop their potential and that of their communities. Normally, such activities are not part of a full-time education programme nor do they lead to recognised educational qualifications. They are not specifically employment directed or focused.' However it went on to suggest that there were close linkages between vocational and community education programmes, that the links could be strengthened if institutions made it possible for participants to include a selection of community education programmes in their vocational courses, and that it should be possible for non-formal and community

education providers to seek validation and accreditation through NEQA, which body should have a standing committee on non-formal and community education.

The working group made a strong commitment to a number of principles. It argued that policies, structures and operations must be consistent with the spirit, rights and obligations embodied in the Treaty of Waitangi and that any system must enable Maori self-determination, full involvement in decision-making and access to resources as accorded by the principles of partnership, protection and participation embodied in the treaty'. It argued that 'policies, structures and operations must seek to achieve equitable outcomes for people in the community - whatever their gender, sexuality, ethnicity, socio-economic status, marital status, age, ability or disability, rural or urban location. The principles of fairness and natural justice upon which equity is based require unequal inputs for equal outcomes. Persons, groups, communities and providers currently disadvantaged will require an extra share of resources'. It advocated that barriers to access be removed, including lack of information, the cost of courses to some participants and lack of affordable child-care, and that there must be 'sensitivity to the needs and preferences of the tangata whenua and ethnic groups, women and groups considered to be socio-economically disadvantaged'. It argued for devolution of decision-making and that, in the case of community education, decisions must be made in partnership with the local community and in collaboration with other providers. It warned of the dangers of marginalisation of community education and emphasised that 'the same status must be accorded to the community education sector as is accorded other sectors of the post-compulsory sector. With the notable exception of those principles which emphasised co-operation and collaboration in decision-making, these liberal-progressive principles were all in accord with the rhetoric contained in Learning for Life: One. However they were stated far more strongly in the report of the working group.

As far as state funding was concerned, the group recommended that all educational institutions (schools, polytechnics, colleges of education and universities) and all voluntary organisations and groups wishing to obtain continuing funding from the state for community education would require a charter approved by the ministry of education and subject to review by the Review and Audit Agency using criteria developed in consultation with CLANZ. They would also require a proven record in community education, and an undertaking to provide services and resources to groups without charters and not to duplicate unnecessarily the functions of another local provider. They would be funded by the ministry on the basis of a formula that would be fully comparable with that used to fund other forms of post-compulsory education, but which would take into account the special features of community education. Groups, voluntary organisations and organisations engaged in community education or wishing to do so but that did not have or want an approved charter

could apply for funds to CLANZ for special projects or seeding grants as well as to other chartered providers for resources and services.

The group accorded CLANZ an even larger advisory and consultative role in the new structure than it had had under the previous one, and it re-affirmed the recommendations contained in He Tangata(IAGNE, 1987) that a Community Education Development Unit be established in the Ministry of Education, and that a National Resource Centre with adequate funding be established. A key new recommendation by the group sought to set in place a structure which would facilitate co-operative planning and decision-making at the local level without creating a new organisation. It recommended that initial funding and assistance be made available from the Ministry to establish Community Education Networks in each district. It was envisaged that these would be built on existing local networks and would consist of members of organisations and individuals involved in community education. Their functions would include assessing local needs, monitoring and coordinating local provision, providing information to CLANZ on the granting and removal of charters, special grants to local groups, and needs for special research and other projects, and forwarding nominations to be considered for appointment to CLANZ. They would be formalised only to the extent that this would be necessary in order to meet formally at least three times a year, to report back to the wider community and annually to CLANZ. It was considered that once established they would not require ongoing funding as their costs would be borne by local chartered providers.

The report of the working group seeks to re-establish a broader framework than that implied by Learning for Life: One within which to locate policy development in community education. This is not inconsistent with the Hawke working party. It also seeks to bring the institutional and non-institutional sectors together again especially at the local level within a co-operative structure, following their separation in He Tangata and in CLANZ's constitution. It could be argued that it did not go far enough in this process, and that it should have recommended changes in CLANZ's constitution. With its wider powers it seems that CLANZ would be in a stronger position to advance the cause of community education if it reflected the diverse interests of all groups, voluntary organisations and institutions involved in the field. In broader terms the principles articulated by the group are grounded in a strongly progressive commitment to equity, social justice and the Treaty of Waitangi and in this connection it clearly assumes that community education exists to serve as an instrument of state policy. Despite its somewhat broader interpretation of community education, the language used in the report (which may have been seen to be dictated to the group in the interests of conforming with the language used in the wider process of educational reform) implies a view of education based on individual deficits or needs rather than seeing adult and

especially community education as a means through which movements and groups can work to challenge and change existing structures of power.

Because it was a group essentially concerned with the development of existing policy it does not seek to challenge the assumptions underlying some aspects of that policy. Although it does focus strongly on issues of equity it fails except possibly in the case of the Maori to locate those inequities within the wider structures of the political economy and hence fails to examine the underlying sources of inequity in society. It is for this reason that it fails to make explicit the links with organisations and movements such as the progressive wing of the trade union movement and the feminist movement. Thus the report may be viewed as a managerial and functionalist one designed to establish a place for community education within a framework of reform, the directions of which had largely to be taken for granted rather than challenged. In this respect it appeared at the time to have succeeded.

Learning for Life: Two

In August 1989, two month after the majority of the working groups had reported, the government published Learning for Life: Two its second instalment of decisions in the process of reform of post-compulsory education. With regard to labour market education and training, the government announced that it had been decided that the Training Support Agency would now be called the Education and Training Support Agency, that it would be administered by a 12-member board appointed by the minister of education after consultation with the Regional Employment and Access Councils, the NZ Apprenticeship Committees, the iwi authorities and the trade union movement and the Employers' Federation and would have regard for overall balance, including gender and ethnic balance. It would be established as a body corporate and would be chartered to the Ministry of Education. Relationships between the Education and Training Support Agency and NEQA would be investigated further and the Review and Audit Agency (now re-named the Education Review Office) would have the function of reviewing labour market programmes as well as all other programmes. The government also announced the establishment of a Vocational Guidance and Careers Advisory Agency which would be a free-standing agency chartered/contracted to the Ministry of Education. Its functions would be to: provide occupational, education and training information; provide training and consultancy for careers advisors, guidance and transition; and establish and operate a data base on vocational and careers information.

As far as community education is concerned, government accepted most of the recommendations of the working party. It re-affirmed community education as 'a legitimate form of continuing education along with general, vocational and professional provision in universities, colleges of education and polytechnics', and stated that providers could include these institutions as well as community groups, schools, and national organisations. They

could be chartered to and funded by the ministry of education or they could be unchartered and be funded through 'chartered providers' or through grants from the committee of CLANZ. The decisions announced by government included the following: The funds allocated to community education programmes in schools would be re-distributed and re-allocated, based on the total population of the 11 districts of the ministry of education; A common funding mechanism to be known as a community education unit would be devised and funds based on this formula would be paid to community education providers as part of their bulk grants, the amount of the funding being determined by the ministry during charter negotiations; Boards of trustees of schools and councils of other education institutions with a community education component would be asked (rather than required as recommended by the working party) to include a community education member on their governing bodies; CLANZ would be chartered to the ministry of education, and charters along with peer and self review would be the mechanisms of accountability for it, as well as for all groups, organisations and institutions; The National Resource Centre would be established and funded by contract through CLANZ; CLANZ would continue to advise the Minister on the distribution of grants for community education on the basis of criteria determined by CLANZ; The Ministry of Education in consultation with CLANZ would determine the criteria required for the approval of charters and corporate plans in the field of community education. In addition the government announced its agreement in principle to the establishment of the Community Education Networks recommended by the working party.

The Education Amendment Bill, 1990

In the light of these decisions there was a very general feeling among progressive adult educators that adult education in general and institutional and community education in particular was at last about to find a place in the sun. Thus it was that there was a sense of some disillusionment - not to say despair - among some experienced adult educators in Aotearoa/New Zealand when the Education Amendment Bill, which may be seen as the legislative culmination of the entire reform effort in the field of post-compulsory education, was published in April, 1990. They pointed to such issues as the following: The bill provides no statutory protection whatsoever for community education. At no point in the bill is there even any recognition of the importance of adult or community education. The National Council of Adult Education (NCAE) which has existed under its own statute since 1938 is being disestablished. The bill provides for the NCAE's assets to be transferred to an independent non-statutory trust - the National Resource Centre for Adult Education and Community Learning, which was established in the latter part of 1989. The National Resource Centre is however currently underfunded and initial indications are that it does not qualify for recognition by the new Tertiary Research Board for funding to initiate research in adult education, despite the fact that this is one of its key functions! The bill contains no reference to Community Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (CLANZ) , and it provides no

statutory mechanisms whatsoever for the chartering or funding of community education outside institutions.

Although the bill provides for greater autonomy for polytechnics and colleges of education, it also reduces the autonomy of universities and, it may be argued, may reduce the autonomy of voluntary organisations. It thus provides for the possibility of greater political control over the curriculum of adult and university education. In addition, it provides no mechanism or channel for communication and cooperation across the various sectors of adult education and appears to encourage increased competition between institutions, and increasing moves by institutions into high cost-recovery programmes and entrepreneurial activities.

The National Resource Centre is not the only adult education body that remains underfunded. Despite some increases in funding for some voluntary organisations and groups in recent years, for example the Adult Reading and Learning Association and some groups in the field of parent education, the level of funding of a number of other organisations such as the WEA remains low. Indeed despite the re-instatement by the government of the grant to the WEA in 1985 and despite the Government's stated commitment in 1984 to the work of the WEA, the grant to the Canterbury and Auckland WEAs in 1989 was in real terms about 1/3 what it had been in 1982 and no additional funds had been provided to support the work of the four new WEA branches which had been established in the last two years.(Peet, Katherine, Private Communication, April, 1990) Finally it seems that funding for staff development and conference attendance for those working in community adult education may not be as readily available as it had been now that funding for staff development will be distributed to institutions as part of their bulk grants(Minutes of the National Executive Committee of the New Zealand Association for Community and Continuing Education, April, 1990).

It is possible to argue that the above picture is an unduly pessimistic one, and to suggest the likelihood that the bill will be amended to achieve a greater degree of congruence between the government's stated intentions and decisions as contained in Learning for Life: Two and the realities as contained in the bill. At the very minimum it should be possible to amend the bill to provide for the chartering and funding of voluntary organisations and community groups through the Ministry of Education. In addition it may be pointed out that many of the policy decisions that have been announced do not require legislative change, but can and should be implemented administratively within the new framework. Thus for example it seems that there are at present opportunities for adult educators to communicate their views officially to the Minister of Education through CLANZ, the advisory body which he himself established. Finally it may be argued that the lack of statutory recognition of institutional and community education is not of significance; that ultimately it is the existence of political will on the part of governments, people and educators that make or break any system.

Nevertheless there are, I think, some things that remain to be done, even assuming the bill is appropriately amended. It seems to me that a strong case can be made for the amendment of CLANZ constitution. In the first place its position and status needs to be formalised. At present it appears that it could be disestablished on the word of the Minister. At the very least its disestablishment should be a public process and follow the kinds of procedures provided in the bill for the disestablishment of institutions. Secondly, the composition and methods of appointment or election to CLANZ should be re-examined. It seems to me that a very strong case could be made for the election of the majority of CLANZ members by two electoral colleges, the one of chartered and the other of non-chartered 'providers', with three or four members being appointed by the minister to ensure balanced representation.

Conclusion

What are the long-term prospects for adult education in Aotearoa/New Zealand? As far as labour market education is concerned it seems that there will be continuing tensions between those distrustful of the state's involvement except in the most limited way and those who believe that the state has an important role to play in human resource development; between those who emphasise the importance of training being narrowly job-related and those who see a broader role for labour market education; and between those who would prefer to see the funds going into the initial general education of young people, those who advocate the funds be used for job-creation, and those who wish the funds to continue to be used for labour market education of people of all ages. The ways in which these questions are answered will depend on future political developments as much as on anything else.

With regard to institutional and community education, it appears that there are some major contradictions contained in the proposed new system. On the one hand it does seem that the structures devised allow for the possibility of a wide range of progressive programmes and initiatives, and for a large measure of cooperative planning. On the other hand the very same structures allow for the freezing out of progressive initiatives in the name of accountability and the demands of the market place. They also allow for increasing competition for scarce resources and increasing commercialisation of the field. The struggles between the new right and the progressive forces are not yet over; indeed they have barely begun.

References

Abel, D.(Chair), Skills for Young People - a discussion paper on transition education and training, Ministers of Employment, Education and Maori Affairs, July 1985.

Advisory Council on Educational Planning, Directions for Development, Government Printer, Wellington, 1974.

Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools, The Curriculum Review, Department of Education, Wellington, 1987.

Dakin, J. C., 'National Bodies and Public Agencies' in Boshier, Roger (Ed), Towards a Learning Society, Learning Press, Vancouver, 1980. Pp 43-70.

Dakin, J. C., Focus for Lifelong Learning: The National Council of Adult Education, New Zealand Council for Educational Research and National Council of Adult Education, Wellington, 1988.

Department of Education, Educational Policies in New Zealand - Report Prepared for the OECD Examiners, Government Printer, Wellington, March, 1982.

Gordon, Liz, "The Right Way to Work: The Development of the Access Training Programme", in Middleton, Sue, Codd, John & Jones, Alison (Eds), New Zealand Education Policy Today - Critical Perspectives, Allen & Unwin, Wellington, 1990.

Hawke, G.R. (Convener), Report of the Working Group on Post Compulsory Education and Training, Government Printer, Wellington, July, 1988.

Herbert, C. M., Community Education Newsletter to Schools, No 24, Northern Regional Office, Department of Education, June 1985.

Herbert, C. M., "Continuing and Community Education in New Zealand", Continuing Education in New Zealand, 14, 1, 1982.

Herbert, C. M., "School and Community in New Zealand 1974 - 1984: The Vision and the Reality", New Zealand Journal of Adult Learning, 16, 2, October, 1984.

Interim Advisory Group on Non-formal Education (Chair: Shallcross, Jack), He Tangata, Wellington, September, 1987.

Jesson, Bruce, Ryan, Allanah & Spoonley, Paul, Revival of the Right - New Zealand Politics in the 1980s, Heinemann Reed, 1988

Law, Michael (Chair), Report of the Working Party on Paid Educational Leave, Wellington, July, 1985.

Law, Michael (Chair), First Report of the Task Force on Trade Union Education, Wellington, August, 1985.

Law, Michael (Chair), Second Report of the Task Force on Trade Union Education - Trade Union Education: Directions for Change, Wellington, March, 1987.

Lifelong Learning Task Force, Equity Policies for Lifelong Education - A Discussion Document about Strategies for Development, NCAE, Wellington, April, 1985.

Lifelong Learning Task Force, Action for Learning and Equity: Opportunities for Change - A Report to the Minister of Education from the National Council of Adult Education, NCAE, Wellington, November, 1985.

New Zealand Government, Tertiary Education in New Zealand - Issues and Comment: Have your say, Department of Education, 1987.

New Zealand Labour Party, Education Policy 1984, NZ Labour Party, 1984.

Marshall, Russell, "Opening Address", PACE, 11, 4 & 5, 1984.

Marshall, Russell, "Building a Government response to the transition problems of young people", in Korndorffer, Wanda (Ed), Transition: Perspectives on School-to-work in New Zealand, The Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, 1987.

Middleton, Sue, Codd, John & Jones, Alison(Eds), New Zealand Education Policy Today - Critical Perspectives, Allen & Unwin, Wellington, 1990.

Minister and Associate Minister of Education, Learning for Life: One - Education and Training beyond the Age of Fifteen, Wellington, February, 1989.

Minister of Education, Learning for Life: Two - Education and Training beyond the Age of Fifteen - Policy Decisions, Wellington, August, 1989.

Minister of Education, Tomorrow's Schools -The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand, Government Printer, Wellington, August, 1988.

Ministerial Working Party, The Management, Funding, and Organization of Continuing Education and Training, Department of Education, Wellington, March 1987.

New Zealand Universities Review Committee, New Zealand's Universities: Partners in national Development, Vice-Chancellors' Committee, Wellington, October, 1987.

Non-Formal and Community Education Working Group, Lifelong Learning - Non-Formal and Community Education, Wellington, May 1989.

Paterson, Alistair (Ed), A Selection from the writings of Denny Garrett, Tutor Training Unit for NZ Technical Institutes, Wellington, 1984.

Renwick, W. L., 'The Changing Shape of Continuing Education', in National Seminar on Continuing Education in the context of Lifelong Education, NCAE, Wellington, May 1974

Royal Commission on Social Policy, Report, Wellington, 4 Volumes, April, 1988.

Report to the Hon C.R. Marshall, Minister of Education, "Immediate Policy Directions in Community and Continuing Education" , September, 1985, in AKINA No 14, Oct/Nov 1985: 19 -32.

Scott, Noel, Austin, Margaret and Mallard, Trevor, Report of the Government Transition Education Committee, Unpublished document, 1984.

Simmonds, E.J.(Chair), Lifelong Education, Report of a Committee of the NZ National Commission for UNESCO, Wellington, 1972.

Social Advisory Council, Partnership: The Delivery of Social and Community Services, Government Printer, Wellington, May 1986.

Task Force to Review Education Administration, Administering for Excellence, Wellington, April, 1988.

Tertiary Review Team, Report on Submissions to the Tertiary Reviews, Department of Education, Wellington, February, 1988.

The Treasury, Government Management: Brief to the Incoming Government, 1987, Vols 1&2, Wellington, 1987.

UNESCO, Recommendations on the Development of Adult Education, UNESCO, Nairobi, 1976.

Williams, Barry M, Structures and Attitudes in New Zealand Adult Education, 1945-75, NZ Council for Educational Research, Wellington, 1978.