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SACSA evaluation
1 Introduction

The decision to conduct an independent evaluation of the development processes used in the development of the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability (SACSA) Framework was made by the Project Director and the project team as part of the initial scoping of the project. As the project developed, this decision was endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

It is intended that the evaluation report to the community on the benefits and opportunities that the process offered as well as report on areas that may need ongoing attention.

The evaluation of SACSA Framework development project will provide information that will inform future curriculum development work and will highlight areas requiring ongoing attention in the implementation of the project.

The initial audiences for the report are the Executive Director, Department of Education Training & Employment (DETE), Curriculum and the Coordinator, Curriculum and Education Services Catholic Education SA. Other audiences for the evaluation are:

- educators in SA sites, including the preschool, school and tertiary sectors
- program and contract managers in DETE and Catholic Education SA
- members of the community, including parents.

There are five main areas, which are the subject of terms of reference for the evaluation.

1. The role, operation and effectiveness of the Project’s steering committee, reference group and expert group structures
2. The processes of tendering and contracting services and providing directions to and managing service providers
3. The consultation and trialing processes for the preliminary and trial drafts of the Framework
4. The mechanisms for communicating with stakeholders
5. The nature and effectiveness of the partnership between DETE, Catholic Education South Australia and South Australia Independent Schools Board in developing the Framework.

The findings of this report are organised against each of the five terms of reference.

The report also includes a brief discussion of broad issues and themes that emerged in the evaluation.
The report includes an attachment that includes the survey and findings from the online survey. Appendices include the evaluation instruments and participants in the evaluations.

The report is accompanied by an executive summary.

The evaluation team would like to acknowledge the contributions made by those who participated in the process and their willingness to give time to the task. The work of preparing the papers required for this evaluation by officers in the Curriculum Policy Directorate is gratefully acknowledged as is the advice provided by the Evaluation Steering Committee.
2 Methodology

The evaluation timeline was from January to 30 April 2001.

Consultations were held with the Assistant Director Curriculum, DETE and the Coordinator, Curriculum and Education Services Catholic Education SA in the initial stages of the evaluation. They clarified the intentions and parameters of the evaluation. Information needed to undertake the evaluation, for example, lists of sites and addresses and documents related to the development process, was supplied by DETE and Catholic Education SA.

The evaluators reported to the Evaluation Steering Committee. The Steering Committee assessed the extent to which the evaluation process met milestone requirements, and also provided advice on the analysis of data, through the evaluation interim report, which was discussed at the meeting of the Committee on 2 April 2001. (See Appendix 3 for Committee membership.)

Data used in the evaluation was both qualitative and quantitative. Quantitative data was generated through the use of an on-line survey. The papers generated through the development process were a source of data. Qualitative data was generated through focus groups and interviews with participants in the development process.

Survey

The evaluation survey was posted electronically on a website to all DETE sites and Catholic Education SA trial sites, and other locations as required, in order to provide the widest opportunity for comment. Data was collated directly. The survey format was designed by the evaluation team and advice was given by DETE and Catholic Education SA personnel and the Evaluation Steering Committee before the website was posted. Sites were informed about the availability of the survey by the relevant sectors.

The survey had several interconnected sections to enable respondents who were involved in more than one aspect of the development of the SACSA Framework to respond, using one response mechanism only. Section/s that relate to the different consultation and trialing processes used by DETE and by Catholic Education SA were included in the survey. Members of Experts Working Groups, Band Reference Groups and the Project Coordinating Team had access to the survey and the section/s relevant to their work were included in the one instrument.

The total number of responses to the online survey was 395. 323 of the responses came from sites in Catholic Education SA and the Department for Education Training and Employment. 65 responses were logged from members of the Experts Working Groups and 11 responses came from members of the Band Reference Groups. Where percentages are cited in the report, the numbers are derived from an addition of the Lickert scale responses, collated as part of the management of the data.
**Interviews and focus groups**

All interviews and focus groups explored pre-prepared issues for discussion. The information generated in the interviews and focus groups was derived from a variety of perspectives: in particular from those responsible for the management of the SACSA development and the users of the product of that development process.

Group interview invitations were extended to all Chairs and Executive Officers of the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups. Two full days of group interviews were held as well as two additional sessions, intended to extend the options for Chairs and Executive Officers. (See Appendix 4 for the list of participants.)

Invitations were extended to a structured random sample of members of the EWGs and the BRGs to attend two focus group sessions. (See Appendix 4 for the list of participants.)

Those who attended the interviews were given information about the availability of the survey and encouraged to respond to it.

Individual interviews were held with:
- past and present members of the SACSA Coordinating Team
- all Steering Committee members
- contract managers

(See Appendix 4 for the list of participants.)

Relevant personnel from the University of South Australia writing team, the Council of Educational Associations of SA (CEASA), Erebus Consulting Partners and the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) were also interviewed. Individual interviews were held with the University of South Australia and CEASA Project Directors, the Chief Writer and the Executive Officer of the writing consortium team. Group interviews were held with two groups of writers: one with the university writers and one with the writers for the professional associations.

Principals and teachers involved in the trial sites, from both the DETE system and Catholic Education SA were interviewed following their selection on the basis of a stratified random sample. (See Appendix 4 for the list of participants.)

Information from the interviews was recorded by the interviewer/s. This report includes quotations to illustrate or give emphasis to issues that emerged through the evaluation. They are presented in italics in the text, as are the quotations from text materials provided for the evaluation.

Two focus groups were convened to allow for reflection by EWG and BRG members on the information generated through the interviews. Participants were asked to respond to a series of statements generated from data gathered at the group interviews.
Analysis of project documents

The documents provided one source of information about the Communication Strategy and the operations and outcomes of the Project work groups. They also provided data for the evaluation of the tendering and contracting of service providers.

The following documents were examined as part of the evaluation process:

- all correspondence distributed to schools about the SACSA Framework development
- minutes of all meetings of the project groups
- all correspondence and project briefs between the University of South Australia and CEASA and DETE
- the project briefs between Erebus Consulting Partners and ACER and DETE
- reports from the service providers.
3 Summary of evaluation findings

The processes used to develop the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework delivered the product to sites within the timeline established for the project.

The processes used to develop the Framework were seen to have many benefits by the participants in the process.

The benefits of the processes used were seen to have an impact on both what was achieved and how it was achieved.

The levels of professional debate and scrutiny generated through the processes were seen to contribute to a more robust and defensible curriculum. Curriculum is contested and the Framework represents the mediation, in a political context, of competing demands and levels of contestation. The processes used to develop the Framework allowed the areas and levels of curriculum contestation to be both visible and arbitrated. For some of the respondents to the evaluation, the arbitration was not the one they sought. For others it represents a series of ‘better and better compromises’ which led to a uniquely South Australian product.

Many of the respondents saw powerful benefits gained through the partnerships that were established. The partnerships were evident in the composition of the project groups and in the public problem solving that the process allowed. Partnerships in and between sites and schools, and in the project groups, were evident in the data.

The consultation processes used to conceptualise and shape the Framework were valued by most respondents. The benefits were to be seen in the impact of the consultative processes on the development of a more interactive culture between the sites and curriculum policy as well as between practice and theory. The Framework was seen to be more rigorous because it was subject to informed opinion at pertinent stages throughout its development.

Outsourcing was generally seen to be a benefit of the process. The engagement of a wider range of expertise in the development of the Framework that this provided was recognised. Outsourcing was also seen to provide independent advice external to the managers and developers of the project and therefore to provide increased transparency. Outsourcing was seen to provide access to technical expertise for the development of the standards.

The project groups were seen as contributing to the project as a whole as well as fulfilling their terms of reference. The Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups were established to provide advocacy and expertise from their specific perspective. The project intention was the development of one Framework. There is evidence of tension between these elements.

Tendering and contracting services for a project of this size was a new venture for the Project Managers. There is evidence that this was a complex and challenging undertaking. The three tenders called as part of the project’s development had a specific purpose in the overall process. Each service provider met contractual obligations. Project direction was generally effective and appropriate to the purposes of the consultancy.
The timelines established for the project as a whole and for each of the outsourced components were seen as demanding, difficult and as exacting a high personal cost for many people who were involved in achieving them. They were also seen to provide benefit because they required an accommodation of contested curriculum issues. (See Section 5.1 of this report for further discussion of these issues.)

Consultation and trialing processes for the preliminary and trial drafts of the Framework provided different levels of engagement for participants. The project groups provided access to opinions from a number of perspectives and these voices were amplified in the processes used in the consultations for the trialing draft. Many of the respondents indicate that they believe the consultation and trialing processes contributed a new and useful dimension to major curriculum development processes. (See Section 5.3 of this report for further discussion of these issues.)

A number of mechanisms were developed for communicating with stakeholders in the Framework. Communication and providing information was a planned part of the development process. Assessments of their impact vary and to some extent depend upon the respondents’ predispositions towards the project as well as on the mechanism itself. (See Section 5.4 of this report for further discussion of these issues.)

The partnerships that were established between three sectors (DETE, ISB and Catholic Education SA) and between the sectors and the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA) were seen as productive as were other partnerships that were intrinsic to the development process. The three universities were involved in all the groups and this was seen as a benefit to the process for most. (See Section 5.5 of this report for further discussion of these issues.)

A range of data sits beneath each of these broad statements. There are tensions evidenced in the responses to the evaluation and the people involved in the process experienced it differently. The range of views extends from those who found it most professionally rewarding to those who experienced the process as professionally and emotionally difficult.

The process used for this development was seen to be innovative for several reasons. One was because of the emphasis on partnerships was central to the development. The other was because the development required the people involved to engage in curriculum debate and to do so in a dynamic curriculum context.
4 The development process

The development of the SACSA Framework by the Department of Education Training and Employment (DETE) took place from June 1999 to December 2000.

The Minister for Education Training and Employment announced the new initiative on 13 August 1999 in a press release. The development of the SACSA Framework was the first major curriculum project by Department of Education Training and Employment (DETE) that had significant outsourced components. The announcement of the writing team for the new SA Curriculum followed a national tendering process. The writing team was a consortium from the University of South Australia (UNISA) and the Council of Education Associations of South Australia (CEASA).

Prior to the tender call in June 1999, the Curriculum Policy Directorate in DETE SA was developing a draft writer’s brief, a conceptual template for the Framework, and had established structures and processes to support the development. These developments were based on work undertaken by the Curriculum Group during 1998 and 1999.

There were two main strands for this work.

One was the improvement of Statements and Profiles.

The Frigo Report, November 1998, was based on a focus group process that described the views of teachers in R-12 schools in both city and metropolitan locations. The findings were outlined within a Framework of ‘keeping what’s valuable’ and identifying improvements in both the practical and theoretical presentation and use of Statements and Profiles. The Withers Report, January 1999, was based on surveys of both teachers and Principals of schools. The survey asked about matters such as the ways in which new curriculum documents are introduced into the school, access to curriculum documents, perceptions about the provision of new materials and other issues as well as a section on the implementation of Statements and Profiles. The Wallace Report, June 1999, was an analysis of materials generated through statewide consultation with teachers and other educators on both the Statements and Profiles and the Foundation Areas of Learning.

The other strand was the Leading in Learning Project, which generated a curriculum statement based on extensive consultations and discussion. The project put teachers at the centre of conceptualising how the curriculum is framed, developed standards for the teaching and learning culture and incorporated learning theory.

Policy work was focused on bringing these two strands together.
Planning the project also included attention to the intersection of curriculum policy and local management through Partnerships 21. Policy Directions May and July 1999 indicate that this context was central to the Framework’s development which was to be directed towards improving curriculum construction and delivery, standards Standards and Accountabilitys and accountability processes and mechanisms.


The Policy Directions papers also defined the scope of the Framework and its intentions. The papers indicate that the Framework will have three major components:

- Curriculum; which is in the form of comprehensive descriptions of what will be taught from Birth to Year 12.
- Standards; which are indicative outcomes organised into … levels
- Accountability for assessing and reporting to the community and to government on learners’ achievements.

The development of Essential Learnings was included in both project descriptions in the Policy Directions papers and both include a draft template of the elements of the Framework and their relationship to one another. The papers released in September 1999 by Stehn and Campagna-Wildash are complementary and provide a refinement on this curriculum policy position.

Work on the development of the Writers Brief began within the structures and processes outlined in a Curriculum Group work in progress memo dated 13.5.99. At that time the structures included:

- four Band Reference Groups
- a Steering Committee
- eight Learning Area Experts Working Groups
- three Early Years Experts Working Groups
- one Experts Working Group in each of the cross-curriculum areas of Aboriginal Education, Vocational Education, Multicultural Education, Students with Disabilities, English as a Second Language and Essential Learnings.

The groups established for the development process were to include people from the tertiary sector and from the three sectors of education and care.

The structure outlined in this memo also included a coordination team and a team of writers. The working relationships described at that time indicate that the groups would have connections to the writers and the coordination team, and that the Steering Committee would relate to all
groups. Connections between the Band Reference Groups and the Experts Working Groups would be through the Steering Committee, the coordination team and directly to the writers.

Consultation Strategy 14.5.99 Section 4 F.

*Development Principles and Guidelines* was released in May 1999. This document served as a description of the features of the developmental process that defined parameters for the Framework.

The May 1999 project timeline and associated papers indicate that the project was initially conceptualised as an in-house development, drawing on expertise within and beyond the department and managed through a steering committee, and other groups, whose membership reflected the range of stakeholders in the new development. The July 1999 project timeline indicates that the planning involved the use of consultants and that the writing task was to be tendered nationally.

Minutes of the SACSA Coordination Team meeting of 3 June 1999 indicate that the project would be outsourced and by 7 June 1999 the tendering process was being planned. There is no paper record available to the evaluation that sources or dates the change in focus and process. However, data from interviews indicates that the change was as a result of discussions with the Chief Executive.

According to data generated through the interviews, the appointment of a new Chief Executive to the department provided a different way of doing things. It was reported to the evaluation that he expected collective and connected action and expected that more minds and expertise would be brought to the task. The task was to be done in a more connected way and be done more quickly. Planning for the task was therefore mindful of the necessity to destabilise traditional working patterns and to make new connections.

The memo *Communication and information sharing across groups during the development process, July 1999*, extended the descriptions of processes to be used within the SACSA developmental structure. Until advice and recommendations were endorsed by the Steering Committee, they had no status. Band Reference Groups and Experts Working Groups were then to provide advice to the Steering Committee through the Project Coordination Team. Other structures in place by this time were weekly meetings of the Executive Officers of each of the Band Reference Groups and the Experts Working Groups and monthly meetings of the Chairs of the Experts Working Groups. Minutes of the meetings were to be distributed to all groups electronically and available in hard copy at one site. Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups were to make individual decisions about the release of their agendas and minutes.

The minutes of the Project Coordination Team meetings give a detailed record of the range of activities undertaken in the project. For example those of 21 June 1999 show that:

- consultation responses on the draft brief and other papers from the Groups were being collated
- the Equity Experts Working Group was still under negotiation
the Writers Brief was nearing completion

liaison was occurring with District Superintendents about information flows about the SACSA development

issues from the Catholic Education SA perspective were under discussion

accountability development processes required more attention

the tender had been advertised and would close on 12 July 1999.

4.1 Development of the Writers Brief

The Writers Brief and the Supplementary Instructions, developed following consultation on the drafts, formed the reference points for the product of the development process, the SACSA Framework. (The Steering Committee minutes of 31 August 1999 refer to there being three rounds of writers’ briefs; the preliminary draft, the trialing draft and the final draft.) Assessments of the extent to which the drafts were successful, and whether the writing consortium had met its obligations were to be made within the terms of the Writers Brief and the Supplementary Instructions.

The Writers Brief for the preliminary draft was developed by the Coordination Team and based on the advice and recommendations of the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups. Each of the Band Reference Groups and Experts Working Groups included a Curriculum Superintendent and they were expected to maintain connections during the developmental process. Curriculum and Equity Superintendents were to be conduits of information to their teams about the SACSA, to keep them in the information and discussion loop. Liaison as required was encouraged.

The memo Communication and information sharing across groups during the development process, July 1999 indicates that writers will attend relevant Experts Working Groups meetings and that interaction between the relevant writer(s) and any groups will be ongoing through the development process. It is to be noted that formal advice to the writers is through the Steering Committee.

Information about the groups, their terms of reference and their membership was freely available on request.

Learning Area, Early Years and cross-curriculum Experts Working Groups were advised of their initial tasks in the development of the Writers Brief on 17 June 1999 and given a series of issues or questions upon which to focus their advice. These initial tasks were followed by a pro-forma that targeted the specific areas of the Framework. Learning Areas Groups and Early Years Band Reference Groups were asked to provide advice on:

- general issues
• curriculum content and standards

• links across the bands

• the development of Essential Learnings through the Learning Areas

• information and/or resources that could be useful to the writers.

Cross-curriculum groups were asked to provide advice about:

• general issues – principles and introduction; the number of strands

• the elements for inclusion in the particular bands

• links with the bands and Essential Learnings

• any issues relating to a particular group of learners

• information and/or resources that may be of assistance to the writers.

Another paper that provided information to the project groups was the memo *The development of the draft Essential Learnings within the SACSA Framework, 5 July 1999*. This memo foreshadowed future development in this area, following further consultation. Advice on this area was to go to the writers following consideration by the Steering Committee.

The Framework’s organisation template and the Essential Learnings for the Framework were forwarded by the Steering Committee to the Chief Executive for approval on 13 August 1999. The memo of 5 July also indicates that consultation had occurred with a wide range of stakeholders in the three education and care sectors and in the tertiary sector.

At a two-day meeting from 15 – 16 August 1999, Curriculum and Equity Superintendents met with the Project Coordinating Team and developed a series of recommendations that related to issues that had emerged through the development of advice from the Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups. The recommendations were directed to either the Writers Brief or to the work of the groups and the team. A number of policy issues that continued as themes through the process were initially canvassed at this meeting, for example the:

• number of strands in Learning Areas

• number and type of Languages scope and standards statements

• decision to write Standard 6 as broad generic Essential Learnings applied in each broad field framework
• inclusion of the groups’ cross-curriculum advice as attachments to the Writers Brief and materials relating to Asia Education and Vocational Education in order to integrate these perspectives in the framework

• place of ESL as a cross-curriculum issue and the deferral of the development of scope and scales until a later stage of the project

• development of issues papers as support for the writers and then for educators and the development of teaching and professional development support

• format of the introduction and the names of the learning areas

• position that consultation would continue to shape the Framework.

The Writers Brief was approved by the Steering Committee at its meeting on 31 August 1999. The document Leading in Learning was endorsed as an attachment to the Writers Brief to inform the theoretical basis of the Framework.

The Steering Committee meeting on 13 October 1999 endorsed a further addendum to the Writers Brief, following advice from the Senior Years Reference Group, which was that the writers proceed with the development of outcomes for the Essential Learnings, described in a decontextualised way [for Standard 6] for the preliminary draft.
4.2 Project structures

Steering Committee

Oversight of the project was directed by the Steering Committee, which drew membership from the three South Australian universities, the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia, the Department of Education Training and Employment, Catholic Education SA and the Independent Schools Board. The Project Director was the Executive Director, Curriculum, who Chaired this Committee. The Steering Committee provided direction for the curriculum and curriculum standards elements of the Framework, monitored the development process, provided a quality assurance function and made recommendations to the CEOs of DETE and Catholic Education SA.

Other project groups were formed to play a part in the development of the Framework.

Experts Working Groups

Experts Working Groups provided advice to the Steering Committee in each of the learning areas (8), the Early Years (3), the Essential Learnings, vocational education, ESL learners, children and students with disabilities, multi-cultural education, equity, and Aboriginal Education. Membership included teachers and practitioners from each of the sectors as well as academics and representatives of professional associations.

Experts Working Groups were Chaired in the main by tertiary experts in the relevant field.

Band Reference Groups

Band Reference Groups were established to provide advice to the Steering Committee on the learning requirements of a particular curriculum band. Four groups were established: the Early Years Band Reference Group, the Primary Years Band Reference Group, the Middle Years Band Reference Group and the Senior Years Band Reference Group. The membership of the Band Reference Groups was intended to be representative of all stakeholders. The Chairs of the Band Reference Groups were senior officers/Superintendents of the Curriculum Policy Directorate.

SACSA Project Team

The Project team was responsible for the operational management of the project as well as to provide liaison and communication between all groups, including service providers. The membership of the team changed over the life of the project. A senior Principal from Catholic Education SA was a member of the team, as well as DETE Principals and Policy Officers. Two District Superintendents were appointed for short term specific tasks. The Executive Director Curriculum was the Project Director. The Project Manager, the Assistant Director of Curriculum, managed the team.

Other functions intrinsic to the development of the Framework were outsourced.
• Writing the Framework was let by tender to a consortium of writers from CEASA, representing the professional associations, and the University of South Australia.

• Calibration of the Standards was let by tender to the Australian Council of Educational Research.

• The development and management of consultation processes for the preliminary and trialing drafts of the Framework was let by tender to Erebus Consulting Services.
5 Evaluation findings

5.1 The role, operations and effectiveness of the project groups

As outlined in this report, a large number of groups were established to support the development of the Framework (see diagram on the previous page). The groups were intended to generate the widest range of involvement in the process as well as to provide the necessary vehicles for consultation and the inclusion of expertise from the different sectors involved in education and care.

Estimates of the number involved in these groups vary. Lists printed from the SACSA website indicate that by 13 October 1999 the number of people involved had been 470.

Information generated from the interviews and surveys indicates that the overall configuration and composition of the groups were seen as appropriate and that the role and function of the groups were appropriately conceptualised. It was seen by one of the members of the Steering Committee as a good structure if judged by their advice.

*Teachers worked together from the three sectors and the debate was good. The process generated a relationships benefit.*

*To some extent the structures were contradictory to our intent. We wanted a cohesive, coordinated and connected curriculum Framework, but set up the structure of the Experts Working Groups. We were conscious of this tension and therefore the writers, the Project Team, the Band Reference Groups and the Steering Committee task was to achieve connectedness.*

Data from interviews suggests that for some of the users of the advice:

*The roles and responsibilities were appropriate for the task. [It was] a good model, involving a lot of people.*

*I can’t imagine what other process could have delivered the outcome in the 18-month timeline.*

The groups were seen generally to provide wide access to the whole education community and provided access by that community in the process. Most respondents to the survey believe that the membership of the groups added value to the advice that was generated by the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups.

Many of the respondents indicated that group members showed high levels of commitment to the work of their group and that for all the difficulties and frustrations encountered would want to be involved again in such a professionally challenging and complex endeavour.
**Steering Committee**

Responses to the survey from Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups indicate a positive response to the statement:

> The Steering Committee’s expectations and requirements were clear to the members of my EWG/BRG.

The extent to which communication was understood and the use of advice from the groups by the Steering Committee was largely seen as positive by the survey respondents, although it is clear that a number of respondents perceived a lack of communication (20%) and were not clear about uses of advice generated by their group (31%).

Survey responses from Experts Working Groups and from Band Reference Groups indicate that the Steering Committee’s expectations and requirements were clear to group members.

There is a greater divergence of opinion about the effectiveness of communication between the Experts Working Groups and the Steering Committee, although most responses were positive.

Most survey responses indicated that the group members understood the ways in which the Steering Committee used advice from the Experts Working Groups, although one third of the responses indicated that this was not the case.

Members of the Steering Committee believe that the committee worked well, some said surprisingly well, given the complexity of the task and the timeline in which to accomplish it. Most interview respondents referred to the size of the task undertaken by the Committee. Members believe that the Committee maintained a conceptual grasp of the whole project and that this role was both necessary and valuable.

> The vision of the Steering Committee was really excellent. [It had] a constant overarching, over project management role.

The Steering Committee members believe that:

- **the committee steered**

- **the Steering Committee came to grips with issues and provided quality assurance [although] it was constrained by the practical situation [where] time was the great enemy**

- **the Committee mediated between incompatible objectives and had a reasonable degree of influence at key points and in the key debates**
• the members added perspectives and intellectual rigour and added distance and when a decision was made I was confident it was the right one

• information [provided to the Committee] was of a quality so that the Committee could steer

• the Committee worked well. There was a clear direction and good open debates and so the resolutions made [were] ones the Committee members could all live with.

Most of the Committee member respondents commented on the hugeness of the paper load or the flood of materials. For some this required what was described as selective reading. One member expressed the view that the Committee relied on high level skills [of the members] to give strategic advice and provide strategic interventions, rather than engage in the detail. Several of the members indicated that the workload placed great demands on the Steering Committee and what it could give.

Another thought that there were frustrations because of the combination of speed and volume and that a consequence of that was a heavy reliance on DETE input. Some members expressed the view that the reliance on the advice of DETE was appropriate while some described the process of mediation through DETE-managed processes as effective and acceptable because it mitigated against being lobbied by interest groups. These views were expressed while recognising there was no doubt it was a DETE project.

The Committee exercised an appropriate degree of strength in the view of one of its members.

Most of the Committee members indicated that there were issues that the project generated that had to be resolved within the Committee because

    there were different levels of involvement. People had to come from their own perspective and each had different issues and different stances.

Most of the members of the Steering Committee commented on the high quality of the Chairing of the meetings. The decision-making process was acceptable to Committee members and was described by one respondent as having been respected with no short circuiting of the process.

The data from the interviews indicated that the members believed that they worked well together and that most decisions were consensual.

Many members of the Experts Reference Groups and the Band Reference Groups reported that the Steering Committee played an important role in the process of the project.
[The Steering Committee was] like having a court of review. They followed through and challenged things [and so] it is a much better document.

Only the Steering Committee had an oversight of the whole project without having a barrow [to push].

Some of the respondents to interviews indicate that they believed the Project Director played a useful role by not being too close to the tensions, being removed from the detail of the process and encouraging the Steering Committee to move and challenge the Experts Working Groups.

Several members of the Steering Committee indicate that they believed that one of the areas that could have been improved was in being better known to the groups working on the project’s development.

Some people saw us as a nuisance, particularly if the reason for a decision was not known or the decision was not agreed by the group.

The Steering Committee was not known to the groups. [Perhaps] there could have been a mechanism where heads of groups met with the Committee and resolved issues there.

Some of the members of the focus groups indicate that they would have found it helpful if they had known the members more.

Our awareness was remote. I met one member. [They] were faceless, diminished.

There was no feedback – rationale from the Steering Committee.

Two of the interviewed respondents indicate that there was not enough time available to interrogate processes used by the tendered projects and reflected on the benefits that may have been available if there had been more direct contact with the writers.

There was a strong voice through the interviews that indicate that some of the Experts Working Group and Band Reference Group members believed that they kept putting forward a position to the Steering Committee but no-one was listening. This view was from members of groups who felt that the area in which they provided expert advice was not understood. Persistence in forwarding advice was seen to have gained ground in particular areas, for example, the Early Years and Languages. This is in contrast to the view of a Committee member, that the Committee made decisions for the common good of curriculum in SA - not in Balkanised patches like the EWGs.

Some of the Chairs of the Experts Working Groups indicate that they felt frustrated that correspondence was not replied to within a timeline that supported the work of their groups.
There were dead letters. It took ages for a response and we couldn’t do anything. There was no discussion or communication. It was an 18 month battle.

The committee members believe that the groups set up to develop advice were well placed to do so on the evidence of the advice received. They also noted that the groups were working on specific tasks and from their own perspective as opposed to the whole conceptual Framework, which was the task of the Steering Committee.

5.1.2 Experts Working Groups

The groups did the task that they were set up to do, that is to provide advice from practitioners and other experts to the Steering Committee.

The overall view gained from the information generated through the evaluation is that the Experts Working Groups were seen to work effectively in the opinion of Chairs, Executive Officers and members. Many of the respondents commented on the high levels of commitment shown by the group members to the task at hand. There was a fairly commonly expressed view that the groups involved a large number of people from a range of different perspectives and that the composition of the groups improved the quality of the advice provided by the Experts Working Groups.

The groups operated effectively in terms of decision-making and conflict management. Most responses indicated that decisions were made largely by consensus and that there was little conflict within the groups. However the operations of the groups were characterised by lively professional debates and the interactions were highly valued by the group members.

Chairs of the groups reported that without the work of the Executive Officers the tasks could not have been done. There were high levels of liaison between the Chairs and the Executive Officers in preparation for meetings and advice and in maintaining intelligence about what was going on and what was required.

Most respondents claimed that there had been considerable benefit to them because of their involvement in the project. Some of the comments reflected the personal and professional value of working with others.

*It was a wonderful experience to work across sectors with people who had the same mind set about… I miss working with them.*

*It was a privilege working with such a committed group of educators.*

*I made lots of new friends.*

*One of the highlights was establishing links with different people that will be helpful in the future.*
There was so much discussion and innovation at so many levels and it involved practitioners.

We have much better understanding of each other’s work and recognise one another’s position.

I recognise the commitment, expertise and enthusiasm of individuals in this teaching area.

Some of the pride expressed by many of the respondents centres on the product.

It was incredible to achieve what we did. [I’m] really proud to have been part of a really consultative process.

[A highlight] was meeting the challenge to produce a leading edge curriculum.

[We went from] an awful draft to one we can live with really well.

I’m really proud. The work is cutting edge, has ownership and the Essential Learnings will take the Learning Areas into the future.

Having the Essential Learnings interweaving through is just stunning. It will lead to richer educational experiences.

Many of the evaluation respondents who were interviewed believe that the group of which they were a part worked effectively and provided the opportunity for intense and stimulating professional engagement.

The group worked marvellously.

There was collective learning across the system.

I was involved in an exciting project and really enjoyed it.

Collaboration in the group was excellent.

There was huge professional development in our group.

Much of the intensity was generated by the timeline for the project. Some of the respondents believe that, on reflection, the timeline was a friend because it forced the resolution of issues. Most found the timeline extremely demanding.

The timeline was ridiculous and very stressful.
Chairs of the Experts Working Groups believe that a large part of the workload for the groups’ work was carried by the Executive Officers and many of them made particular commendations about the way this was undertaken.

*The Executive Officer was very helpful indeed.*

*The Executive Officer was brilliant. We were well looked after.*

Members of Experts Working Groups indicated in the survey that they believe that they were invited to participate because of their expertise. Some of the expertise was described in terms of the knowledge and skills that necessarily derive from the position they hold, for example:

*I held the position of … and was assigned the task of Executive Officer.*

Other expertise was ascribed to previous or current involvement in particular areas of professional interest

*I have done quite a lot of work in the field over a period of time.*

Curriculum Officers who were in the main Executive Officers for the groups indicated at interview that the Experts Working Groups were constructed by *knowing people with expertise and who had a consultation network.*

This was sometimes contrasted with the view that centred on the positioning of expertise within the project. Some of the Executive Officers reported that their role changed over time. Some believe that initially their work was seen as crucial to the process and that they were very positive about *coming together and engaging with different perspectives,* but that as the structures became more complex and the timelines tighter, their position altered: *rules were made and communicated to us if we were lucky.* Some of those who expressed this view attributed the change to the existence of the Project Co-ordination Team, which took a major role in the project as a whole: *all of our sense of interactivity was diminished.*

One of the comments reflects a view that was expressed by a number of the respondents:

*The Executive Officer was just a glorified secretary, booking venues and arranging food.*

Others believe that the role changed over time.

*We were facilitators and personal assistants to the Chairs, were perceived as these things, but it developed into using Executive Officer expertise and that was seen to be supported.*
A few respondents saw the relationship between the Executive Officers and the Chairs as hierarchical and that it did not change over time. For some this reflected the nature of communication more generally.

*Decisions were made by curriculum leadership and the SACSA team had input into those decisions. Executive Officers did not have input and their expertise was not put into it. Over time that loosened up and improved.*

*Our expertise was used as glue rather than through formal [mechanisms].*

*Informal input from Executive Officers as Curriculum Policy Officers; [this] expertise in communication, personal knowledge and skills and networks accessed were initially undervalued, but were a determining factor for success in the end.*

Some of the respondents indicated that the effectiveness of external expertise accessed through the outsourcing of the writing project should be questioned because at the end of the process they were still called upon to provide detailed advice about the Framework.

*Roles were blurred post the penultimate draft.*

The Executive Officers met regularly and these meetings were seen by many of them as crucial to the process, as a *lynch pin* and as a *conduit for information*. Some of those involved saw them as necessary but not well managed because of changes in the Chairs and a consequent lack of continuity. Most of the respondents indicated that without the informal processes following the meetings, the liaison between the Executive Officers would not have been as effective as it was. These people indicated that these encounters were a way of *debriefing what had happened and making sense of what was going on*. Some believe that if they had not had good relationships with colleagues who were co-located they would not have been able to keep up with the information nor been able to contextualise developments as they emerged in the project.

It is evident that many of the respondents had different perspectives about their role and effectiveness beyond the operations of their particular group. The nature of their experience appears to be influenced by their perceptions of the role they were responsible for and their capacity to both maintain an overview of the project as a whole and the detailed work required of them.

A number of the respondents indicated that there were increasing levels of frustration in these groups as the work progressed.

Some of the frustration came from the view that the work that had put into the Writers Brief had not been reflected in the preliminary and following drafts of the Framework.

*The writers just didn’t get it.*
Another source of frustration came from the way in which processes were altered, for example, the relationship of the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups to the writers. Some of the groups maintained close relationships with writers and have indicated that the relationships were fruitful, although the meetings were characterised by some as defensive and very delicate and by an awareness of not putting too much pressure on the writers.

Other groups believe that what they experienced as an imposed distance from the writers impeded the writers developing an understanding of the nature and intentions of the advice provided by the groups. There was an expectation that writers would be part of the thinking processes of the Experts Working Groups in the early stages of the project. This immediacy of this relationship was welcomed by the Experts Working Groups. Following the receipt of feedback to the preliminary draft, it appears that the relationship between the writers and the Experts Working Groups was defined differently. As a result writers were not to attend meetings. Much of the comment indicated that this was a flaw in the eyes of the Experts Working Group members. Some respondents talked of this in terms of the damage done to relationships within the close confines of a small educational community. Others saw it as a barrier to effective communication and as placing impediments in the path of progress through the drafts.

Some of the respondents argued that much more time should have been spent at the beginning of the project for intensive discussions between the purchaser and the providers. They believe that this, and continuous exchange from then on, would have reduced the amount of misunderstanding between the intentions of the purchaser, expressed though the Writers Brief and successive Supplementary Instructions and the drafts from the provider.

Some of the respondents indicated that they felt frustrated by the ways in which the advice of the groups was not understood and/or acted upon by the writing team.

'[We] rewrote pages and pages. We did not feel that was our job, but it is evidence of our frustration with the writers. [It was a way] to model, to provide examples of what we meant'.

*Is there something wrong with the process? They're being paid to do this!*

Comments indicated that members of the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups had considerable sympathy with the writers.

'[We] gave negative feedback to the writers. We wanted to support them, but did we support them? I would have wanted the Experts Working Group to have supported me. But everything was done so quickly, [so instructions became] get rid of this, change that. There was not a lot of supporting comment. They needed to be tough cookies to do a tough job.

*It [giving direct feedback] changed my whole relationship to one of the writers.*
There were parallel processes going on. Writers were producing materials and while they were doing this, we would have changed perspective.

Some of the groups indicated that they believe the process would have been better if there had been time to increase the level of interaction between them. In some cases the Chair of the group indicated that, for example:

The Executive Officer tried hard to assist in making connections with other Experts Working Groups but it was so driven by the timelines.

This view was particularly true of groups who were working largely in cross-curriculum areas, for example, Vocational Education, although some of the members of Learning Area Experts Working Groups also indicated that they believe closer interaction with the work of cross-curriculum groups would have assured them that their advice was as appropriate as it could be.

The Executive Officers of the Equity groups met following the formal Executive Officers meetings some time into the process to discuss equity issues, because we felt that no-one was listening. We did this for nine months. It was good but then we had to stop.

Some of the groups indicated that they believe a different structure may have been more useful. The Experts Working Groups in the Early Years maintained close contact with each other and with the Band Reference Groups through joint meetings and the exchange of information. Most people in Early Years Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups believe that an appropriate structural response to the perceived similarity of their advice would have been to merge the groups or at least to have increased the amount of interaction between them. They believe that the level of interaction could have been improved if the timeline had allowed a process of refinement, following the work necessarily done in the separate groups. The Early Years Groups did decide to meet together at critical times in the development of feedback and would have done this more if the timeline had allowed it.

When the Early Years Groups met together – three or four times – it was very productive. We need to know what came before and what went after [the year level particular to the work of our group].

There were no formal connections between the three Learning Area Groups of English as a Second Language Multiculturalism in Education and Languages. That’s ridiculous. We had very similar issues and should have connected better. We had some shared membership which helped.

There were not enough cross-groups.
The time frame did not allow groups to interact other than a written response/comment which often needed follow up/discourse. What interaction that did occur was valuable and useful.

We needed to consult with other Learning Areas but had no time to do it.

Some of the group members expressed the view that changes in the processes strained relationships and commitment to the task.

The ground rules kept changing. [First] it was a minor tidy up of the Statements and Profiles, one model of curriculum development then two months into it the process changed. No-one understood the amount of work [we had done.] We lost goodwill in our group. Decisions were made without us really understanding why they were made.

The advice provided to the Steering Committee in the changing context generated views about the Steering Committee and its role in some groups.

Our group understood from the Chair that if the Steering Committee said x, we don’t waste time debating it. It caused a lot of problems at first, but once it was accepted we went with it. By then we didn’t really care.

Some of the group members indicated that the timeline had benefits because the tasks had to be completed. They also indicated that this led to some members feeling that not enough attention was being given to the task.

It was very productive because of the timeline. We really had to work to it. I was a bit scared that the feeling of enough’s enough meant I didn’t give detailed feedback. The idea of imperfection and a limited shelf life helped deal with those difficulties.

There was a lot of professional reward and professional frustration. The timeline put on quality limits but there were valuable discussions and perceptions, pleasures and learnings.

Several of the respondents queried the place of the commissioned papers, part of the deliverables of the project contract. It is perceived that they would have been very useful in the interaction between the Experts Working Groups and the writers as well as informing the writers. It was also claimed that the Department did not have access to the thinking in them because they were not available until the end of the project.

The position of the outcomes of the Accountability Experts Working Group was called into question by a number of the evaluation respondents. This work was targeted to the DETE sector only and did not involve the Project Steering Committee.
Some of the comments centred on the relationships between accountability requirements and groups of learners and the need for development in each area to inform the other. Other respondents felt:

At times Accountability was not given the same priority as the development of the other areas of the Framework.

Accountability did not get done properly partly because the papers were not released by DETE.

The Accountability Group was most frustrating of the Experts Working Groups [because] it gave contradictory information and positions. Informal help from Angela Scarino was very helpful.

However, other views indicate that the Accountability section is terrific. It ties it all into a neat circle.

Minutes of the meetings of Experts Working Groups were examined. While the record is not entire for all groups, they show a fairly consistent pattern of meeting times and agendas, largely reflecting the timelines for the project and the tasks of the working groups. Most groups began meeting in June 1999. The Equity Group held its first meeting in October 1999.

The minutes show that several of the groups had changes in the Chairs. Some of these changes occurred because some Chairs became involved in the project as members or directors of the writing consortium.

The attendance of several groups fluctuated but the attendance patterns show that at no time was less than half the group present at any meeting and that for most groups any significant drop in attendance is evident for one or two meetings only. The timeline for the project operated through holiday periods and there may be a connection between that and the attendance patterns. There are also groups that did not keep complete records of attendances, non-attendance and apologies. In some cases where attendance was perceived to be fluctuating by interview and survey respondents, the data is not available for verification of the perception, for example Vocational Education. It appears from other records that significant amounts of work were undertaken in small groups in the case of this group and that work was fed back into the process.

Some of the groups show changes in membership. The minutes indicate that the withdrawal from the process was due to competing commitments.

Most of the groups' minutes show some contact with the writers and in some few cases with the Chief Writer, through their attendance at meetings. Some groups carried this on throughout the project, while others changed their liaison with the writers following the perceived instruction to have no direct communication with the writers.
Curriculum Executive Group members who belonged to more than one group appear to have spread themselves across the Groups and for some, their attendance at any one group fluctuated.

A Catholic Education Experts Working Group was established to develop and write a section on Religious Education for the Framework, independently of both the Steering Committee and the consortium. The members of this group believe that the group worked well and somewhat removed from the rest of the project. This was partly because of the timing of their work, which is ongoing and required previous agreement about elements of the Framework before work could begin. Members of this group also believe that because they were a small group they had a more direct relationship with the association and this gave immediacy to an effective working consultation between the Group and the writers.

_The stakeholders were relatively easy to engage with and shape the writing process. About half the members of this Experts Working Group were also writers._

Project Co-ordination Team members saw the effectiveness of the work of the Experts Working Groups in terms of their own responsibilities within the project groups. Some of these respondents saw their task as being clear about the processes and encouraging liaison between the groups. Giving feedback to Experts Working Groups was seen as a very difficult political task by one of the respondents. Others saw the tensions between Learning Areas and the Essential Learnings as generating frustrations in some officers. However it was also seen that good things came of this and the groups influenced things more than they perhaps imagined.

Several respondents noted the late entry of the Equity Experts Working Group and its consequences:

_Aboriginal Education worked as intensively as we did [in the team]._  [A full time officer from the Aboriginal Education Unit was allocated to the SACSA from the start of the project. It shows through in the draft [in comparison with the other areas].

_Because there was no specific group, everything had to be said through, fed into the other groups. It was extremely problematic and did not make for graceful or useful incorporation of the issues. Another draft might have got closer – the draft was just starting to get a grip at the last go._

Executive Officers meetings, Chairs meetings and the subsequent joint meetings between Chairs and Executive Officers were seen as valuable, although the timing of the Chairs meetings was described as difficult, given the teaching commitments of many of the group.
The minutes of the Executive Officers meetings from 25 May 1999 to 14 September 2000 indicate that the substantial tasks and issues that were emerging through the project were allocated time on the agenda; for example, the development of the Writers Brief, Essential Learnings and the Senior Years and tenders for the consultation and calibration exercises. The meeting had time with one of the directors of the writing consortium to discuss issues and raise questions. The Project Coordination Team provided reports to these meetings. By the meetings in 2000 members of the Project Coordination Team also attended these meetings.

A joint meeting of Chairs and Executive Officers had been held on 23 July 1999 which was in the main devoted to briefing the group about the development of the Essential Learnings and their part in the Framework. Other meetings were held in May and August 2000. Both meetings provided updates on information and identified issues about the project as a whole and invited question and comment.

In the last few meetings of the Chairs and Executive Officers some very good ideas came forth.

Most Chairs of Experts Working Groups noted the heavy workload and for some the workload was described as horrendous on top of other teaching commitments and a full timetable.

It was very difficult task. I would do it all again if I had an honest estimate of the workloads. 10 days to do the whole thing!!!

A special meeting of Learning Area Chairs and Executive Officers was held on 19 August 1999. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify the conceptual basis for the development of the Framework and to seek advice on issues requiring clarification, which were raised at a joint meeting of the Curriculum and Equity Superintendents and the SACSA Coordination Team. The process for consideration of the issues was forwarded to the group from the Steering Committee.

**Band Reference Groups**

There is less data available on the operations of the Band Reference Groups than on the Experts Working Groups. The role and effectiveness of these groups can be seen in summaries of the data generated through the survey.

Some respondents believe that the Band Reference Groups worked well because it was very important to have a forum for the peak bodies.

Most responses commented on the volume of the workload in the Band Reference Groups, given that materials for all Learning Areas and cross curriculum groups had to be considered.

A number of the parents who responded to the evaluation expressed the view that they were seen as the junior partner in their role on the Band Reference Groups. They
expressed the view that the language was unreadable, not understandable. It was not the terms alone that were the problem. It was the cumulative impact of the language. These views were expressed in the context of assessing parent contributions to the process and the usefulness of the Framework to parents. Some of them argued for a rationale that was understandable to Governing Councils, parents and students. They maintained that they had presented this argument in their groups and continued to do so in the evaluation, that their opinion was sought but the biggest problem [was that we] felt left out.

Several of the responses from Band Reference Group members indicate that a closer working relationship with Experts Working Groups and between the Band Reference Groups would have been beneficial to the project:

*There was no relationship between the Band Reference Group and the Experts Working Groups and [this was] a flaw.*

*The short timelines prevented connection across the Learning Areas, the bands and the cross-curriculum areas – so did the writers work across the Learning Areas? What was the role of the Band Reference Group in this?*

Field experience in developing the characteristics of learners was seen as a most valuable contribution through the Band Reference Groups.

One respondent believes that the role of the Band Reference Groups was not as clearly defined as the role of Experts Working Groups and that this led to searching for task definition in that particular group. However other responses indicate that the groups played an important role, because they were broadly representative and the groups’ focus on learners exposed gaps in the Framework.

There were changes in Chairs of the groups in some cases, which was described as leading to fragmentation and a lack of clarity about role and function.

Some respondents questioned the extent to which the work of the Band Reference Groups provided a cohesive and collective approach to the seamless curriculum.

The characteristics of learners in primary and the middle years was seen as a culmination of much work and representing a big shift in thinking.

**Senior Years Band Reference Group**

The links made between the sectors and providers of senior secondary education were seen as a most valuable outcome of the work of this group.

The group also provided advice on workable year twelve standards pulled together at the last Reference Group meeting. The three sectors worked together on this very well.
The process of working together was seen to benefit increased understandings of the different sectors for this band, despite the sense of *so much unfinished business*.

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA) was included in this group. Some respondents believe that the consultation about the Framework:

*was not early enough and until this was sorted out, it slowed the work down. Once joint meetings were established a team approach was developed and we worked together on issues. But we only had nine months to sort them out and settle down.*

In the view of several respondents there was not enough time to deal with the complex issues for the band.

Co-ordination between the Vocational Education Experts Working Group and the Band Reference Group was seen as useful and the excellent work done by the SSABSA and Senior Years Band Reference group sub-committee was highly commended.

*Collaboration on the Reference Group was excellent. We got a lot out of it.*

The student representative questioned the student role on this Band Reference Group.

*It was beyond me. It was very hard. The support to get students involved was not ongoing. The meetings with SSABSA and the Group were good.*

Minutes of the meetings show that attendance patterns remained fairly constant from about the third meeting of the group. From that time on, according to the available information, there were meetings where a third to a half of the group did not attend. One of the respondents indicated that despite the drop in numbers the group maintained *a good range of the stakeholders*. It appears that the interstate member became a corresponding member of the group fairly early on in the process.

**Primary Years Band Reference Group**

The value of this group is contested by its members. The consideration of the characteristics of learners was seen by many to have made a significant contribution to the project.

One of the respondents indicated that this Band Reference Group:

*felt squashed between the Middle Years and the Early Years groups.*

Another respondent indicated that the construction of the bands had had an impact on the legitimacy of primary schooling.
Some views of the Primary Band Reference Group members indicate that the membership felt frustrated because their advice was not heeded, particularly in relation to the Essential Learnings underpinning the Framework. This was given as the reason for a drop in attendance at the meetings, as was the changes in the Chair. One respondent indicated that there had been an in-depth consultation over this issue and when the advice was not taken, it affected the trust and commitment of the group. Another indicated that they felt frustrated as they didn’t feel that their views were valued and taken on board. Some respondents believe that the group did a lot of work and spent a lot of time, but question the influence the group had on the process.

The work of this group according to one respondent felt disconnected because it was only focussed on primary.

*Equity and Aboriginal Education + primary curriculum + students in Years 3, 4 and 5 should have been the scope. It was a challenge to meet the needs of all the groups and have a clear focus on the curriculum that moves us forward.*

Minutes of the meetings, for which records are available, indicate that for a number of meetings less than half the members attended. Some of the comments attribute this to the change in the Chair of the group while others use it as an indication that members voted with their feet in response to the perceived frustrations of the task.

**The Early Years Band Reference Group**

The work of the Early Years Band Reference Group was seen as effective and, along with that of the Experts Working Groups, was described as making a significant contribution to the outcome.

*The Early Years Groups worked together to achieve a really significant document in the end.*

There were similar levels of frustration expressed about the lack of use of the group’s advice by the writers in the Band Reference Group responses as in the responses from the Early Years Experts Working Groups.

*My and our BRG’s greatest frustration was the writers not responding to our advice.*

*People in the Early Years were so dissatisfied. They couldn’t see young children [in the drafts] and [they] were not based on current thinking. The Band Reference Group worked to change that.*

Those who responded to the survey indicated that effective contributions were made by:

- *bringing both theoretical experience and school based experience to the group’s experience*
• having small group discussion and being passionate and pro-active in the curriculum debate/issues

Minutes of the meetings, although an incomplete record, indicate that attendance was regular and that a majority of members attended all meetings.

The Middle Years Band Reference Group

The operations of this Group generated some negative comments, although again, the Group’s contribution to the characteristics of learners was valued.

One respondent saw this group as having the:

most fraught relationship: it is where primary and secondary cultures clash. It stayed individualised and did not develop a cohesive collective approach.

Another respondent indicated that:

where conflict arose, the group, generally after a few meetings was generally able to move toward a middle ground and represent a joint position. Unfortunately not all the positions were well documented by the fifth or sixth Chairpersons for the group. This led to some other conflict at a later stage which remains unresolved, due to a lack of fair representation of the group’s positions.

One respondent reported that the writers were not responsive to the advice of the Band Reference Group.

[We] spent hours developing feedback for the writers then [the draft] would come back without the change.

One respondent indicated that:

the group’s dedication to adding to the quality of the document remained unfalter[ing].

A parent member of the group identified that a valuable contribution to the work of the Band Reference Group was made through:

ensuring that families and the community were included in the introduction and bringing about an understanding of what parents wanted for their middle years students, understanding about curriculum and what adolescents needs were.

The minutes of the meetings presented to the evaluation are not complete. Those that are there indicate that there were at least three different Chairs in this group.

The minutes of 22 May 2000 include an observation about attendance:
Attendance at the recent meetings indicates a need to review membership of the group.

Minutes available for the following meetings indicate that there was no significant increase in attendance. During 1999 more people attended meetings regularly than in 2000.

5.1.4 SACSA Project Coordinating Team

This team was established in the early days of the SACSA project and underwent considerable changes and development as the project progressed.

The first team consisted of the Project Director and the Project Manager and four members: three from DETE and one from Catholic Education SA. The team included members who were Principals with high credibility in their systems. The team saw two phases May 1999 to December 1999; January to December 2000. (See Appendix 4 for lists of team members and time on the team.)

The work of the team centred on the operational management of the project in both the Department of Education Training and Employment and Catholic Education SA. There were several elements to this role and they include coordination, liaison, communication and problem solving.

The Project Team developed a management process and project infrastructure. Timelines and schedules were developed and updated as the project developed. Lead responsibilities were allocated to the team and to other personnel in the Curriculum Policy Division. The processes developed alongside the project’s development. The intention was that the processes would enable the development of a quality product, as well as impose order on a range of complex, and in terms of the project timelines, at times competing, developmental and operational tasks. They were also intended to support effective communication across the various groups involved in the project’s development.

All of the members of the team indicated that the team worked well together. Many of them indicated that they felt that had made effective contributions to the project.

The team worked really well as a team and with Curriculum Executive because it was such an intensively engaging process.

Most respondents saw the composition of the team as appropriate.

It [having Catholic Education personnel] on the team was extremely successful from a team point of view.
Involving Catholic Education was excellent. It was a very valuable connection and open to sharing and discussion.

Having Principals as part of the team was really useful. It gave a school balance and provided a reality check.

The team represented a partnership between the bureaucracy and the schools.

It was strategically smart having Principals doing the work as well as others.

We were real partners on the team and it was good to have Catholic Education involvement.

There was a very strong sense of moving on, finding solutions. There was depth of knowledge in the team.

Principals were seen to work in a collegiate style and to contribute both conceptually and practically to the process and outcomes of the project. Greater involvement of District perspectives in the project through the short-term secondment of District Superintendents was not seen to be entirely successful.

Some of the respondents indicated that there were many changes to the team and that this had both positive and negative outcomes. Some of the respondents presented strong arguments for more formal induction programs, given the speed with which matters had to be addressed and the cultural differences between State Office and the sites.

The faces changed so much. It was positive movement – a lot of people became involved.

Everyone pulled their weight. The team kept changing and different people came in. [They had to] get up to speed quickly. That was tricky. Each member provided a different perspective. That was good. The processes got better and we got better at it.

There was high turnover in the team. That’s not good for continuity. People came in without the background. It was unavoidable and unfortunate even though we worked together well.

There were confronting things. [I felt] disbelief at some things bureaucratic. It was just amazing.

Not all of us Principals can just walk into these jobs. And there are performance management issues – it is different from what happens in the Districts.

There was no induction or orientation although some people made a real effort.
We suffered from information overload at first.

If I could do it differently I would maintain the personnel. It is good to have those with recent experience [in schools and sites]. Having people from the field in there improved the quality of the working relationships.

The operations of the group were described by respondents from the team and from other perspectives in ways that indicate that the respondents saw them as effective and making a valuable contribution to the project.

The team had a real purpose and our meetings were purposeful.

We played a huge role in the development of the Writers Brief. We had to keep the curriculum officers up to speed particularly on the language of SACSA, develop proformas to streamline [activity]. [This was] true too for the development of supplementary instructions to the writers.

We did heavy work on policy and really worked through the issues.

Their work was amazing. You had a sense of a focused working team. They were flexible, accommodating of requests and could think on their feet.

Respondents from different positions of involvement in the project gave comments about the effectiveness of the project leadership and management.

They were a direct conduit. They identified issues and did a really good job – accessible and informative.

They really made the project work. Their willingness to change direction was admirable.

The Assistant Director had day to day management of the team as well as being involved in project direction.

She was really, really helpful in her overarching role with the team.

[I was] impressed by the leadership shown by the Assistant Director. It was a difficult project and managed well.

I worked through sectorial issues with the Assistant Director. She provided access to information and added value.

This was a key role. She did a most remarkable amount of work, for example writing and rewriting the project brief, the thing upon which the whole project spun. She was a reference point for the providers.
The Project Director’s leadership was commended by respondents from the various perspectives of the project.

*She has such a good presence and credibility with the Principals. She helps people reframe.*

*She is to be congratulated. The workload was so great. And the deadline was met.*

*Her Chairing [of the Steering Committee] was magnificent.*

*She was very willing to communicate and open to suggestion and saw the issues.*

Some respondents indicated that they experienced the leadership as *not accessible* and with:

*an element of aloofness, but when you asked or initiated something you learned heaps.*

Team members believe that the operations of the project could have been improved in a number of ways.

One of the ways was to have co-located the team from the inception of the project.

*I was [physically] isolated [at the beginning of the project] and missed out on the informal information loops.*

*To start with we were not all sitting together and there was not a lot of sharing and there was a lot of rushing. When we moved together and worked more collaboratively I felt much more comfortable about the work and we were extremely effective by then.*

*We worked really strongly together even through the movements of people. We were located together and even had a table to meet around!*

Some of the respondents from schools/sites indicated that the lack of human spaces and provision for social connections on site detracted from the connections that could have been made more readily in a more informal setting.

The lack of effective clerical support was identified as a major problem in the earlier stages of the project.

*It would have made a huge difference if we could have had someone who could answer the bloody phone. If only we could have delegated it and known it would all happen.*
We were typing things ourselves [for public use] and at the last minute.

We needed a really good Administrative Services team as part of the project budget. We were doing shit work. It would have made everybody’s life so much easier.

The database was not there! We needed an efficient and skilled infrastructure too.

Several respondents highlighted the context of departmental re-sizing, which was taking place at the same time as the project and its operations were being shaped.

There was enormous corporate change and it was quite difficult for the personnel. It gave us flexibility but it created tension and angst at the same time.

Some of the respondents indicated that the timing of the project and the restructure of the Curriculum Policy Directorate may have contributed to the difficulties that emerged in the relationship between the team and its function and the Curriculum Officers with responsibility for particular Learning Areas.

Matrix teams were established to achieve particular purposes, for example developing the communications strategy. The teams involved officers from the project team and from the Directorate. These were intended to both involve the appropriate range of expertise for the given purpose and to support effective interconnections between the team and other officers in the Directorate. Where comment was made about the effectiveness of this strategy, the impact was seen as positive on the Directorate’s culture.

Comment was frequently and strongly made about the timeline for the project. For many of the participants in the process, including the Project Coordination Team, the short timelines extracted a professional and personal cost.

The timeline nearly killed us. Achieving what we did without fluffing around was a good thing but...

The timeline meant that some jobs were done without attention to due process. Sometimes the collaboration and consultation fell down because there were no time extensions, so I did not do it as widely as I wanted to.

The timeline meant that everything was pressured.

The timeline was too fast. People were pushed to ridiculous limits.

One of the strengths of the team’s operations were the formal and informal process used to clarify purpose and intention, allocate tasks, identify issues and propose solutions to problems. Team members reported there was a lot of consultation and information-sharing between themselves and with curriculum officers through structures like the
Executive Officers meetings. There appeared to be a lot of informal cross-checking as work progressed.

The informal process gave us a different perspective from the formal meetings. People expanded on issues that they may not have had time to do in the formal meetings. We got an in-depth understanding of different viewpoints.

The pace of things was unbelievable. I had to use informal networks to keep up. People, their friendships, their working relationships underpinned it all.

Some people felt that they were not listened to in formal situations. Coffee worked a treat.

We would have informal briefings with the Curriculum Officers in order to manage the simmerings in some of the Learning Areas.

Formal meetings were held at least weekly for this group and, at points in the project, twice weekly. Members of the group also met with Superintendents (Curriculum Executive) and the weekly meetings were usually followed by informal meetings to debrief.

If you missed the meeting you’d totally panic for the week.

Some respondents thought some of the processes maintained a hierarchy, through the processes set up to ensure information flow and wider engagement with the project.

We called it hierarchy Tuesday. Curriculum Executive met first and then the SACSA implementation team, including the project team, followed by the Executive Officers meeting.

Minutes of the team meetings from May 1999 to January 2001 show that the team, with individuals identified with lead responsibilities, had a major role in all the stages of the project as well as the planning and delivery of information and briefing sessions, communication and liaison with Districts and sites. The minutes give evidence of multiple tasks and rapid turn around times. They also provide information about the connecting role of the team, through the identification of issues, which had cross-project implications, and record action taken to address them. The minutes also describe ongoing attention to the responses to aspects of the project as heard from the field, for example, reflection on the effectiveness of the briefing sessions for the trial sites. The team organised professional development workshops to support the trialing process and played a key role in the organisation of the trial, including the site visits that were part of the process.

The Directors of the writing consortium attended meetings with the team on occasions.
The role of the Executive Officer to the Steering Committee was seen by some as a very valuable connection between the work of the Steering Committee and the other work of the project.

Liaison with other groups was a major feature of the work of the team. It included work with identified groups of Districts, with trial sites, with the Experts Working Groups, Band Reference Groups and Curriculum and Equity Superintendents. Several of the respondents believe that the liaison, while effective, was complex. Most team members see the liaison as broad and inclusive and effective. Continuity in the liaison relationship with Districts was identified as a strength by some team members.
5.2 The processes of tendering and contracting service providers

This section of the report describes the processes used by the tenderers. It also describes the purposes of the tendered components of the services. This material is linked to discussions of the effectiveness of the projects in other sections of the report.

5.2.1 Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)

Tender applications were received on 4 October 1999 and negotiations with the preferred tenderer, ACER, began on 8 October 1999. By 19 November 1999 most issues had been resolved. Some of the issues related to clarity about the intentions, scope and methodology for the project. Others were seeking clarity about the details of the standard SA government contracts.

Catholic Education SA agreed to fund one-sixth of the project costs and teachers from that sector were involved at all stages in the calibration project (20 October 1999).

The project had several stages.

The first was to calibrate and report on the learning outcome statements of the preliminary draft by 20 December 1999. The planned methodology involved 258 teachers and carers, nominated by the sectors, in assessing the extent to which they understood the outcome statements and applying the outcome statements to six children/students.

Draft Contract Schedule 2 – Service specification

The report from ACER indicates that 125 people participated in this process. It also indicates that caution should be exercised in generalising the results of this stage of the project because the size of the samples for each key learning area and the two Early Years bands was very small, and hence estimates provided may be unstable.

Calibration of the South Australian Outcome Statements: Preliminary Draft Summary Report December 1999 ACER.

Teachers involved in this stage of the process were supported through:

- TRT release
- payment of travel and accommodation costs for country teachers
- information about the concept of standards and the calibration purposes and process
- the participation of Curriculum Officers in the relevant sessions.

The timeline for this element of the project was not met by the tenderers/contractors, but the consequently negotiated timeline was.
The second stage of the process was to calibrate the learning outcome statements in the trialing draft. A series of individual reports was prepared for each learning area and for two Early Years bands. The planned methodology was to involve 150 people (1500 in total) for each learning area and two Early Years bands (Birth–three and three–Reception).

Teachers were selected in the main from sites that had indicated an interest in being a trialing site for the SACSA Framework. Teachers self-nominated the Learning Areas they wanted to calibrate.

Each of these people received a computer program on CD-ROM which required them to apply Outcome Statements to a selection of students and in doing so respond to a series of questions. 1097 people participated in the online component of the calibration exercise.

The individual reports were generated by ACER personnel meeting with small groups of teachers from lower, middle and upper primary and from lower, middle and upper secondary schools. The teachers were selected by DETE officers. Participants discussed the attribution of levels and made judgements about the extent to which the levels in the outcome statements were appropriate. This data was the basis for the individual reports. Readers of the reports were directed to the teacher comments as well as the charts included in each report because data was missing in some cases. The research was also to be seen as indicative because of the small number involved.

The draft contract indicates that the writers of the calibration reports would have \textit{verbal discussions with the writers of any relevant areas requiring further consideration}. The contractors were not asked to do this. Interviews with the contractors indicate that they believed that they were to maintain a distance from the writers, although they also believe that a closer relationship could have been useful to clarify the meaning of particular wording in the outcome statements.

The third stage of the calibration involved the penultimate draft of the Framework. This was managed through a contract, separate from the one previously won by the ACER. The purpose of the process was to ensure that \textit{each set of the Curriculum Standards correspond to what a learner would reasonably be expected to achieve towards the end of the appropriate year level} and that \textit{there is a clear conceptual link between all five levels of outcome statements in each (sub)strand}.

\textit{From memo Re Requirements for panelling the penultimate standards}
ACER was required to provide a Standards Panelling Report by 31 October 2000. The contract began on 18 October 2000.

The methodology for this process was based on small panels of experts in each Learning Area considering the outcome statements for each area. The experts were to be drawn from people not previously involved in the writing of the outcome statements. The panels were established by the Department and logistical support was also provided.

The panels met between 19 and 24 October 2000. ACER delivered reports in each of the Learning Areas. The reports included summaries of findings as well as a record of the views of the panels in detail. The panel reports were used to inform the work of an editorial committee, established to fine tune the documents prior to publication.

Interview responses indicate that the ACER team found that working with the DETE project was a smooth operation:

- information was provided as agreed
- cooperative planning and organisation helped the process achieve its purposes in the timeline
- project direction set achievable goals
- problem solving was rapid – for example choosing new sites for the exercise if data did not come from those previously chosen
- the SA personnel were easy to talk to.

The DETE contract manager thought that communication levels were high and that the working relationship between the purchaser and provider were effective. He found the ACER team adaptable to emerging circumstances and adept in the methods that they used.

The DETE contract manager also found that the work of the Department’s procurement unit was helpful and pragmatic.

Some Catholic Education SA respondents were not persuaded that the information provided through the process was useful enough.

Several members of the Steering Committee indicated that they believe the timeline for the whole project precluded a more detailed interrogation of the process and outcomes for the ACER projects. They indicated that the process could have been improved if time had allowed.

Further discussion of the effectiveness of the calibration exercise is found in Section 5.3 the consultation and trialing processes
5.2.2 The University of South Australia and the Council of Educational Associations of South Australia

Tenders for the writing of the SACSA Framework closed on 12 July 1999. The tender was awarded to a consortium of writers from the University of South Australia (UNISA) and the Council of Education Associations of South Australia (CEASA).

Negotiations between DETE and the preferred tenderers were finalised and reflected in Schedule 2 of the contract between the parties, dated 1 October 1999.

The writers for the project were identified in Schedule 1 of the contract. All of the writers and others involved in the consultancy process who are named in the contract are those that were identified in a letter to the supply section of DETE on 3 September 1999. The list includes variations from those named in the original tender, which was attributed to the outcomes of negotiations within the consortium.

The milestones for the project were adjusted to reflect the development timeline of the Writers Brief.

It was agreed that the preliminary draft be delivered by 10 November 1999 for use in targeted consultation and the calibration of the outcomes.

The trialing draft was to be delivered by 11 February 2000 and be used for statewide trialing and consultation in nominated Government, Catholic and Independent schools and pre-schools from March to May 2000.

Milestone 3 of the contract agreed that by 1 September 2000 the penultimate draft would be delivered and used for final calibration of the outcomes.

The final draft was to be delivered by 2 September 2000 for online and print publication.

Schedule 2 includes the following service specifications:

- a description of the role and function of the consultants steering committee and the time allocations for its members

- the timing of progress reports and the presentation of them in writing and verbally to the Steering Committee and other project groups

- an acknowledgement that whatever is written by our writers will be to the specifications provided by your Steering Committee via the Experts Working Groups

- a description of the purposes of the commissioned papers. The papers were for vocational education, multicultural education, and Aboriginal education and equity (we have included equity because, although there is not a specific Experts Working Party, it is clear from the tender documentation that the project requires other equity
considerations built in across the curriculum). The commissioned writer would then turn this information into a document that would in effect provide instructions to each of the project’s writers. The commissioned writers would work with the relevant EWGs to develop their ‘instructions’ to the writers as early as possible. If DETE wanted to develop these as resources for planning and implementation, the writers could then work these documents into polished pieces. It was agreed that commissioned writers would work from the relevant Writers Brief and in negotiation with the relevant Experts Working Group to prepare … principles and guidelines for the Framework writers to be used from the beginning of the consultancy.

• an issues paper, not separate Curriculum and Curriculum Standards is required for students with disabilities

• agreement to provide an issues paper for ESL and commencement of the development of ESL scope and scales to use by specialist ESL teachers

• agreement that the Essential Learnings will be defined by the DETE, CE and ISB Project Steering Committee

• an agreed communication process which included the consortium Project Directors attending and reporting to the Steering Committee, the Chief Writer attending meetings of the Essential Learnings EWG and the Band Reference Groups and maintaining liaison with the Project Coordination Team and commissioned writers allocated to the relevant Experts Working Groups, and informing the writers

• communication processes if either party believes that any requirements of the task are beyond the terms of the Writers Brief

• other matters relating to the provision and management of resources allocated to the project by the tenderers and the fixed nature of the project timeline.

Further advice on English as a Second Language (ESL) was forwarded to the writing consortium in correspondence dated 28 October 1999, outlining decisions made at the Steering Committee about the place of ESL in the Framework. An email of 5 November 1999 from the Assistant Director foreshadows additional advice on ESL is to be expected. (The advice took the form of a Writers Brief for the ESL Scope and Scales document).

The Supplementary Instructions arising from the consultation on the preliminary draft of the SACSA Framework stated that except where indicated the requirements specified in the original Writers Brief (pp. 1–14) continue to apply, noted the amended timeline for the delivery of the trial draft and gave writing instructions under headings that related to elements of the Framework. The brief includes five attachments providing additional information to instructions included in the brief. The papers are about the Essential Learnings, the place of cross-curriculum issues in the Framework, instructions about the relationship between the English Learning Area and the ESL Scope and Scales,
information from the Primary Years Reference Group about the characteristics of learners in the band, and advice prepared by the Equity Experts Working Group on gender equity and issues for rural and isolated students. The Writers Brief for the ESL Scope and Scales was also forwarded to the Directors of the writing consortium at this time.

A meeting between the Project Directors and Managers and the Project consultants took place on 7 January 2000. This meeting canvassed a range of issues including the directional role of the Writers Brief, the significance of project reports and the attendance of the Chief Writer at the Band Reference Groups and the Essential Learnings Experts Working Group in order to enhance coherence across the Framework. The role of the Steering Committee in problem solving issues in achieving the Supplementary Instructions was noted. Correspondence from the Directors of the writing consortium indicates that there was agreement about the issues as they were recorded following that meeting.

The consultants presented to the Steering Committee a project report in late January 2000, as agreed. The report describes the processes used by the writing team and their developmental response to the instructions, amongst other matters.

Correspondence examined in the evaluation indicates that the parties to the agreement had a different interpretation of the role of Supplementary Instructions in the development process. The consortium took the view that some of the directions contained in the Supplementary Instructions included new materials while the purchasers took the view that the supplementary instructions arising from the consultation on the preliminary draft are elaborations of the original Writers Brief.

These matters were resolved and the trialing draft was completed within the parameters of the existing Writers Brief.

The penultimate draft was written in response to feedback from the consultations and trialing of the trialing draft. Correspondence from the Project Director to the Directors of the writing consortium confirm that the July 2000 Supplementary Instructions included two components that were outside the existing contract and confirmed two other areas as within the existing contract and referred to the specific sections in the Supplementary Instructions. Adjustments to the contract were negotiated with the provider as a consequence.

The July 2000 Supplementary Instructions arising from the trial and consultation process of the trialing draft of the SACSA Framework:

- stated that the requirements specified in the original Writers Brief (pp. 1-14) and the January Supplementary Instructions continued to apply, except where indicated
- provided an overview of the key requirements
- described the format required for the penultimate draft
listed a summary of the issues arising from the consultation and trial for each section of the Framework and the action to be taken by the writers and other parties in the development process.

The penultimate draft of the Framework was forwarded to the Executive Director Curriculum on 31 August 2000. Final instructions to the writers following the next round of consultation were forwarded on 18 September 2000.

In the period of final draft development, changes were made to both the development process and changes and additions made in the consortium writing team.

Following the consultations on the penultimate draft the Steering Committee did not endorse all aspects of the draft as having met the contractual requirements, despite recognition of the considerable improvements that had been made in numerous aspects of the previous trialing draft.

Correspondence from the Executive Director Curriculum indicates that in order to provide support for the development of the final draft, the timeline for the next version of the penultimate draft was extended to 17 October 2000, in the expectation that the draft would fulfil most if not all the requirements of Milestone 4 (except the ESL Scope and Scales component) of the contract, that is the final draft.

Assistance to achieve this was negotiated. It took the form of the assignment of several Curriculum Policy Directorate staff [the DETE Framework Advisory Group] to work with [the] writing team in an advisory role during this period. The letter confirms that if the 17 October draft meets the requirements of the contract, that is, milestone 3 and 4, the Steering Committee will forward it for approval to the Chief Executive of the Department of Education Training and Employment and the Director, Catholic Education SA for final approval.

Agreement was reached that the writers were to use the July 2000 Supplementary Instructions for this next stage of development and the detailed commentaries provided by the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups. Members of the Advisory Team and their roles and communication and reporting protocols were outlined in this correspondence.

Letter from the Executive Director Curriculum Policy Directorate to The consortium Directors

Prior to this, a meeting had been held between the Project Director and Project Manager and the consortium Directors in which these matters had been discussed. Following that meeting the consortium Directors informed the Project Director in writing that two new members would be joining the team and that the consortium formally agreed to the new process. On 22 September 2000 the Directors of the consortium advised further changes to the writing team. The writers in the Early Years were replaced and three other writers appointed to work on the draft from 25 September to 6 October 2000 in total.
The Project Director accepted these changes. Other writers were also appointed in Vocational Education and the Essential Learnings and another member of the staff at the University of South Australia appointed to the consortium’s management team.

The correspondence between the purchaser and the provider and notes of meetings held during this time indicate that a great deal of problem solving occurred and that the resolution of some outstanding issues, for example, payment for the Milestone 3, handling Standard 6 in the Senior Years Band, the future of the commissioned papers, and the treatment of Essential Learnings, were resolved.

The final draft of the Framework was forwarded to the purchaser on 17 October 2000 and included:

- the final draft of the SACSA Framework
- the work samples
- the ESL Scope and Scales consultation draft
- the equity papers
- the Enterprise and Vocational Education papers.

The Consultants presented a final report to the Steering Committee in October 2000. The report includes a description of process used to meet the requirements of the July 2000 Supplementary Instructions, canvassed issues the consortium believed needed further attention and commended the quality of the documents.

The Project Director confirmed in correspondence to the Directors of the consortium on 28 November 2000 that the final draft submitted by the consortium and including various amendments which have since been made by Curriculum Policy Directorate and Catholic Education SA personnel would be forwarded to the Chief Executive for approval, following its endorsement by the Project Steering Committee.

The writing teams in the consortium were made up of a key writer from the University of South Australia and a co-writer nominated through processes established in CEASA. Expressions of interest were called through the Professional Associations and the provision of a brief curriculum vitae. These were forwarded to the Project Directors and the project teams were selected. The pairs were constructed to include expertise across the bands described in the Framework, and a writing team of two was established for each learning area.

The writers were teamed in this way for the writing of the preliminary draft and the trialing draft, although not all the writers from the professional associations were involved in the second stage of the process, according to information provided through the interviews. Writers from the professional associations were not involved in the
penultimate draft as a matter of course although some were released to participate in fine tuning at this stage.

There is general agreement in the comments provided at interview by respondents from all of the sections and groups involved in project directions and management, as well as the project providers, that the process of writing the Framework was difficult and frustrating. This is not to imply that the respondents believe that the final Framework is not something that was worth the effort.

Most of the respondents indicated that this was a huge task and one that had not been done before. A Framework which was from Birth to Year 12, which integrated Learning Areas, Essential Learnings and competencies and cross-curriculum perspectives had not been undertaken before. Neither had a project of such significance and scope been produced by outsourcing the writing.

The benefits of the process were seen in:

- accessing more people
- drawing on a broader range of expertise
- exercising a commercial obligation to complete a task
- getting a better result through the great synergy and tension
- involving those who are not in-house, to freshen things up. It is reasonable for the purchaser to get what the purchaser wanted. It gave DETE the opportunity to have its mind changed, for example a stronger insistence on standards
- having to be clear and justify each thing on the basis of analysis and what teachers wanted and to be clear about roles.

Most of the respondents believe that there were difficulties and challenges brought about in this complex situation.

The issue most frequently referred to by many of the respondents was that of operating within a contractual relationship, one between a purchaser and provider, particularly when the relationship operated in a context of previous and existing relationships of a more apparently collegiate nature. The nature of this consultancy was seen as different from others in that it was a writing task and the writing was to be to a specified Writers Brief based on conceptual work done in and by the field and not by the academics.

In contrast the providers indicate that they found it most concerning that there was a division between the conceptualisation and the writing process.
It is clear that these different perceptions, despite the discussion and agreements reflected in the contract, were a source of difficulty in the working relationship between the purchaser and the provider.

Some respondents argued that the relationship could have been more collegiate, while maintaining the contractual integrity, especially in the areas were there appeared to be a lack of clarity or where there were problems to be solved.

We wanted roles and responsibilities to be kept crystal clear, but let’s find ways to deal with the complexity of the task within the contractual relationship. At the end of the day we are responsible to get it out on time and to specifications.

The curriculum issues involved in writing the Framework generated heat and created tensions. Some of the respondents indicated that some of the tensions were generated though ideological differences that could only be resolved by instruction.

Respondents indicated that they found the direction of the project by the purchaser had both good and bad parts. The difficulties were described in terms of clarity about the intentions of the purchaser and some of the processes used in the development processes.

Some of the respondents in the evaluation argued that the whole process was constructivist in its approach. It was therefore to be expected that there would be revisiting of the Framework and rethinking of it as knowledge about it grew through discussion and exposure in the education community. Others respondents did not take this point of view and argued that greater clarity at the outset would have meant less duplication of effort through repeating tasks that had been rethought or reframed.

The extent to which the Writers Brief was adequate to the task was raised by a number of respondents:

How the Framework was to be designed took a long time. The template did not fall out for a long time. We lost a lot of time early [in relation to] the Essential Learnings. We had no clear message to give them about how to fit in the three dimensions [of the Framework]. If our goals had been more clearly defined and resolved and we had then instructed the writers our quality assurance role would have been better achieved.

I defy anyone to make sense of all the instructions. Some of them were contradictory.

It was very hard to understand the feedback.

The Brief wouldn’t want rigorous analysis – it was woolly, vague.

At one level it wasn’t fair to expect that people could interpret millions of dot points on a page.
There was lack of clarity on some issues in the Brief.

Some of the respondents indicated that they believe there was a lack of clarity about processes to address matters that needed clarification and that later when the Assistant Director took on that role it was an improvement.

The Supplementary Instructions following the preliminary draft felt to some as if they were being asked to start all over again on a new Framework.

*It felt like we were starting again from scratch.*

*There were massive changes to the brief, for example a new strand in Design and Technology and six weeks to do it in.*

This was linked by some of the respondents to the perceived high level of criticism that the preliminary draft received. The writers believed that it was a very first draft and intended to test the extent to which the writing was broadly on the right track. The writing team believed that the level of criticism misrepresented the nature of the work and that the groups should have understood the draft in those terms.

*It felt like all hell had broken loose.*

Some of the comments suggested that there were difficulties in the sequencing of parts of the project, in particular the timing of the first calibration exercise.

*By the time we got the feedback from the ACER calibration we were already working on the next drafts and couldn’t take it on board.*

Many of the respondents believe that one of the main hindrances to the writing was in the ways that the relationships between the Experts Working Groups and the writers were played out. As has been previously described, these were interpreted and acted on in various ways by the groups and by the writers. Some of the writers met with Chairs and Executive Officers of the relevant group. Others maintained close informal contact with Executive Officers, while yet other groups had no contact with the writers.

*Why exclude the writers from discussing their work [with the groups]? The Experts Working Groups were not aware of our constraints or the connections we were making.*

Some of the writers believe that a closer working relationship would have allowed the project groups to understand the impact of decisions taken by the Steering Committee in relation to their advice. They believe this may have reduced some of the tensions that developed between some of the writers and members of the Experts Working Groups, which they believe were played out in the some professional association forums with the Executive Officers of some of the groups.
Some of the respondents believe that what they saw as the delays put teacher-writers under a lot of pressure in terms of their site responsibilities. Others felt that the lack of lead-time meant that beginning operations in week 6 of the term had a large impact on their university responsibilities.

Some of the respondents from the consortium indicated that it would have been helpful if they could have had trend advice between the drafts so that they could have begun thinking about how to address them. One of the respondents likened the process to being a member of a bomber crew on call in the Battle of Britain – scramble – take off – give billyo to the target and be back and wait for the reconnaissance that takes two or three times longer than the sortie.

The commissioned papers generated a number of comments from respondents from various perspectives in the process. Some of the respondents believe that there was little evidence that the writers had paid attention to them. The issues of intellectual property surfaced in relation to the papers. University staff believed that the papers were ancillary to the contract and were not perspectives to be conditioned by feedback. One of the writers lamented the lack of integration of the perspectives in the papers through the writing project as a whole. The papers were forwarded as part of the final documents at the end of the contract.

Project Directors reported that they believe the processes they used to support the writing task were as effective as the circumstances permitted.

> We met the deadlines and therefore the internal structures must have worked. Looking back I can’t think of a different way given the constraints and the circumstances.

> [The project management group managed] intensive periods of show and tell where we checked [compliance] with the supplementary instructions and critiqued the writers’ work.

> We used a good problem solving process with the writers and the team.

Some of the writers believe that the teams’ effectiveness was improved when they were co-located following the trialing draft. At this stage of the project the university writers were doing the main writing task as the involvement of the teacher-writers had diminished, as was always the model. (Additional time was gained through release time). Some of the writers reported that working part time on the Framework and maintaining their involvement in other areas of work was demanding. They reported that working full time on the project was more effective.

> Working 0.5 with each writer in each pair was intended to legitimise working in partnership but it caused practical difficulties.
Some of the respondents indicated that they were concerned when they understood that the writing teams were not working across the task until the later stages of the project.

*The writers were in separate enclaves with no links between them – an obvious flaw in the process.*

Some of the writers described confusion about the status of the feedback from the Erebus reports and indicated that the final advice from the Steering Committee was different from the information included in the reports. This seems to indicate a lack of general understanding of the processes of the project’s developmental model.

Many respondents from a variety of project perspectives commended the hard work and goodwill that went into the project, despite the pressure of the timelines.

*I added up the drafts we prepared. There were 16 for the preliminary draft, 23 for the trial draft and 29 for the penultimate and final drafts.*

*We had 8 days to put ICTs from Birth to 10 in every area.*

*The time, energy and effort that people put into this was absolutely astounding.*

Benefits for members of the team were described in terms of the increase in collegiality.

*It strengthened a whole lot of relationships and I’m glad we went into it.*

*It was very stimulating. The collective relationships were strengthened.*

Others found the experience both professionally demanding and rewarding.

*It was exciting. We did a lot of thinking and doing it at the same time as the writing created tensions.*

This was not a universal experience. A number of the writers found it frustrating and difficult, although they are pleased with product.

Some feel that a lack of recognition by the purchaser of their work has detracted from their involvement and diminished the benefit for them. Some said that their *professional kudos* had been limited by their perception that they cannot be named as writers of the Framework and that this detracted from the benefits that might have accrued to them in doing such an enormous task.

### 5.2.3 Erebus Consulting Partners
The contract for the consultancy to manage the consultations on the preliminary and trialing drafts was signed between the Department and Erebus Consulting Partners on 15 February 2000.

Planning for the contracted work began earlier. The timing of the consultations had been established in the overall planning for the project. The Project Co-ordination Team minutes indicate that a paper outlining the proposed methodology was an agenda item on 26 October 1999.

Steering Committee minutes indicate that Erebus had begun work by 22 October 1999. The Consultancy team presented its methodology to the Steering Committee for endorsement at its meeting on 11 November 1999.

The terms of the contract indicate that the outcomes of the trialing for the preliminary draft were to be reported by 3 November 1999. The report on the consultation of the trialing draft was to be presented by the 12 June 2000. The consultations included personnel from the three sectors of care and education.

**Preliminary draft consultation**

The outcomes of this consultation were used in the development of Supplementary Instructions to the writers for use in the development of the trialing draft.

The contract schedule indicates that the process would use four data sources. One was data gathered from 24 in depth interviews with key stakeholders in the 4 Band Reference Groups and 18 Experts Working Groups. 20 focus group discussions were to be held with stakeholders and networks nominated by the Department and would include teachers from the Department and from Catholic Education SA sites. 10% of teachers were to be included in a survey, which was to include in the sample people across the four bands of the Framework and those who would be able to comment on particular issues. Teachers were asked to complete a 4 point Lickert scale. Public submissions were also invited. Travel and accommodation support was provided by the Department to enable country people to be involved in the process.

The consultation report indicates that 20 interviews were held and 26 focus groups convened, involving more than 200 practitioners. The report indicates over 100 responses were received to the website questionnaire.

The report on the consultations for the preliminary draft of the Framework had 4 sections:

- a report on the outcomes of the focus groups, interviews and questionnaires
- a report on the outcomes of the focus groups for ESL educators
- a report on the focus groups for Languages educators
• a report on the outcomes of the Mathematics focus group.

There is no information about the number of participants who attended each focus group.

Changes in the contract details and the operation of the consultancy were negotiated with DETE.

**Trialing draft**

The consultations for the trialing draft were part of the same contract.

The schedule indicates that the process would include:

• 24 in-depth interviews with key stakeholders who would be representative of the project working groups and reference groups

• 15 focus group sessions with participants who could represent the range of networks and the needs of identified learners and particular sites (*rural, isolated, Aboriginal, special, low socio-economic and high ESL enrolment sites*)

• a survey of up to 10% of teachers (1200–1400), again representative of the sites, and issues identified for special attention during the consultation, published on the SACSA website and in hard copy

• the outcomes of visits to 50 trial sites.

Information was to be capable of disaggregation by sector level and learning area and if possible be capable of further disaggregation.

The report of the consultation of the trialing draft indicates that:

• 21 focus group sessions were held and involved *almost 150 practitioners*

• 20 semi-structured interviews were held with practitioner representatives of Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups

• *nearly 1000* responses were made to the website and 323 responses were made to hard copy

• 50 sites were visited.

*Report on the consultation by Erebus Consulting Partners*

Liaison and discussion between the consultants and the purchasers was through face-to-face meetings, emails and through formal reports to the Steering Committee.
The final report on the consultations about the trialing draft had 16 separate reports, some focusing on general issues and other focusing on particular aspects of the Framework.

The milestones in the contract and timelines were all met by the consultants.

Erebus Consulting Partners were described as being an informed and responsive provider who understood the nature of a contractual relationship. The reports were described as really good quality by some of the users. Project team members found the information in general to be useful, although some argued that they got more information than was really needed.

Participants in the trial sites were generally supportive of the processes used by the consultants.

Some respondents questioned the validity of some of the reports because they believe that the positions put in the consultation were misrepresented in the final reports. Others argued that the lack of information about the relative strength of responses to the survey inhibited useful responses to the information contained in the reports.

The services provided by the contractors were generally seen as supportive of the partnerships between the sites and the development process, and the processes used by the consultants were seen as having added value to the development.

Erebus Consulting Partners reported that they worked closely with the purchaser in developing the processes and instruments for the consultations for trialing the preliminary and trialing drafts of the Framework. It was described as an iterative process and given as evidence of the purchaser's strong involvement and support to work through the issues. One task took a month instead of the two days allocated to it. The relationships were described as open, clear concerning the brief, excellent.

The organisational support provided to manage the intricate steps of the consultation were well managed by the purchaser in the view of the consultants. Key stakeholders were able to talk to the consultants about what they saw as important, as were other senior people as part of the development process. Deliverables were negotiated around the existing project timeline. Key criteria were identified and it was reported that progress reports both verbal and written allowed discussions at length of the findings. The working party to support the consultation and trialing that was established by the Assistant Director was seen as important to the success of the consultancy. Communication was both informal and formal and therefore effective in the opinion of the consultants. Issues were identified and resolved as they emerged.

The process was seen to deliver a very significant plus to the project through the extensive consultations that took place across sectors, and across all the levels that were involved in developing and using the Framework.
Views about the usefulness of the Erebus reports vary according to the responsibilities of the user. Those who used the reports in tandem with other information from the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups found them useful. Some found the reports open to interpretation, as they were *a bit broad and general*. Some users saw the absence of quantitative data to be a problem as it was difficult to assess the weight of opinion. Another perceived difficulty with the reports was the inability to distinguish the source of the advice when assessing the weighting to give to the findings in the reports.

Some respondents reported that they believe that the reports misrepresented the position presented by some Experts Working Groups and that this led them to believe that the consultation was constrained by pre-existing decisions about elements of the Framework.

Some of the respondents argued that the consultations through this process were restrictive in their nature because there was no room to interrogate some of the fundamental areas of the Framework.

A number of respondents argue that a failing in the consultation process was the level of involvement with the Senior Years Band. They argue that this is a factor in what they describe as some of the unresolved issues that continue for this Band.

Some of the participants in the focus groups felt that they were constrained by the process and not able to provide feedback of the kind that they wanted to give and had anticipated that they might.

Some of the users of the feedback from the consultations believe that the structure in which the feedback was taken and recorded, along with the time constraints governing the process, meant that there was insufficient detail to provide certainty about the most appropriate directions in which to move forward.

Further discussion of the effectiveness of the consultation process is found in Section 5.3.
5.3 The consultation and trialing processes for preliminary and trialing drafts

Calibration

There is general agreement that the process for managing the calibration worked effectively.

Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups indicate that they did not give much attention to the reports for the preliminary draft and the trialing draft. They said that they largely relied on the advice prepared by the departmental officer for Standards and Accountability who was also the contract manager. The relevance of the first report was not readily apparent to group respondents because the process had developed Supplementary Instructions for the writers, so the comments related to materials that had been superseded. The writers reported that they did not spend time on the report of the preliminary draft for similar reasons.

Respondents in the site group interviews are in the main positive about their involvement in this process.

They found the software easy to use and were generally clear about the processes they were to use.

*The CD was smooth and predictable.*

*It was a very straightforward worthwhile exercise.*

They saw benefit in working together in their sites to clarify any problems.

A small number of teachers (20) involved in the calibration exercise in both Catholic Education SA and DETE sites responded to the survey. Most respondents were clear about their role in the calibration and to a slightly lesser extent, clear about the purposes of the calibration exercise. Most found the computer program used in the exercise user-friendly, although 14% (DETE) and 15% (Catholic Education SA) rated its user friendliness at the lowest level on the scale provided. Most of the respondents indicated that being involved enabled them to make a contribution to the development of the Framework. More teachers in the DETE sector believe that their involvement helped them understand sequences of learning development and their uses than in the Catholic Education SA sector. Half of the respondents read the relevant calibration report on the website. Languages teachers in the DETE sites indicate that the process they were required to use was user-friendly. There were no responses from Languages teachers in the Catholic Education SA sector.

The only criticism from participants in group interviews in the calibration was from those who expressed frustration at not being able to explain their responses. Some of the people involved believed that they would have this opportunity.
Addressing the criteria and the outcome was good but I had other comments about how to improve the program and the relevance of the outcomes but had nowhere to give that feedback.

I was simply hypothesising because I couldn’t possibly state what my year 2s could do from here and now.

ACER, which managed the calibration exercise, indicated that they did not seek comment because they believe that if data is collected there is an obligation to use it. Given the timelines for the project it was not possible to extend the research beyond the data that was collected. Some qualitative data was collected from groups and the ACER team took that on board.

Consultation on the Framework drafts

Consultation was a planned and integral part of the development process. This was to ensure that the users of the Framework would shape it as it developed. The successive drafts of the Framework were intended to be responsive to the feedback provided through the various forms of consultation used through the developmental process.

The development of the Writers Brief relied on consultation through the processes that have been described elsewhere in this report.

Consultation processes were developed for each stage of the Framework’s development.

The outsourcing of a significant element of the consultation process was described as very important because it gave comment that was external to the developmental process about achieving integrity in the content of the Framework.

Preliminary draft consultation process

The preliminary draft was the subject of a consultation that targeted members of all project groups and any site that requested a copy could participate. The consultation took place in November and December 1999.

This consultation was intended to seek feedback on whether the Framework was heading in the right direction and to provide an opportunity to shape the document. The information generated by parts of the consultation related to the extent to which the preliminary draft had complied with the intentions of the Writers Brief. Other components of the consultation sought data about specific issues.

This consultation had two elements.

One was developed and managed by Erebus Consulting Partners. This consultation took the form of a website questionnaire, interviews with project groups and focus groups that included practitioners and stakeholder representatives.
26 Focus groups were held with more than 200 practitioners, and related stakeholder interviews with 23 expert practitioners and website questionnaire, which generated over 100 responses.

The other component involved the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups and the Project Co-ordination Team. The project team prepared a summary report for the Steering Committee, based on the responses generated by the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups. The responses were generated within a Framework designed by the team.

The initial calibration exercise was also carried out at this time and the outcomes were considered in the preparation of advice to the Steering Committee.

A number of responses from a variety of perspectives indicated that they had concerns with the approach to this element of the consultation strategy. They argue that the focus for the consultation was inappropriate, in that it focused on the detail rather than the main themes in an early draft.

**Trialing draft consultation process**

**Intensive trial sites in DETE**

An invitation for expressions of interest in being a trial site was made by the Chief Executive of the Department of Education Training and Employment on 17 October 1999. The memo to the sites encourages their participation in the consultation process through being involved in the trial. Principals, Pre-school Directors and Child Care Centre Directors were asked to complete a proforma to express their interest. The memo indicated that a team would make the selection of the sites. The team was made up of members of the Project Co-ordination Team and District Superintendents. The aim of the selection process was to ensure that advice and feedback came from a broad and diverse range of practitioners.

It was expected that 72 sites in DETE and 15 sites in the Catholic SA systems would participate in the trial. Over 300 sites expressed interest in being involved in the intensive trial. 30 schools were selected to take part in the intensive trial case studies managed by Erebus Consulting Partners. 52 schools were part of the Catholic Education SA trial. The selected schools were representative of the range of sites in the sector.

Participants in the trial were expected to:

- *plan, program and teach using the trialing draft of the SACSA Framework over a two-month period*

- *use the Curriculum Standards to make judgements about learners’ achievements*
• give feedback, using the research instruments provided, about the usefulness of the SACSA Framework in supporting them to do this.

The memo also outlined the support for sites involved in the trial. It included:

• provision of advance copies of the trialing draft to provide time for preparation and planning (Week 4, term 1, 2000)
• briefing sessions to assist in setting up the intensive trial
• TRT release days for each teacher nominated to participate in the intensive trialing process
• training and development activities
• Senior project officer and Curriculum Officer liaison and support.

Chief Executive Memo 17 October 1999 Consultation and Trialing of the SACSA Framework

96 sites were informed of their involvement in the trial process in a memo from the then, Associate Director Curriculum on 15 February 2000. This memo informed the Principals and Directors of the:

• distribution of the trialing draft; that is complete copies of the draft along with support materials
• expectations of participants in the trial sites
• funding entitlement; that is four days of release time for each participant, part of which was allocated to support their attendance at compulsory briefing sessions. Some funds were available to support extensive travel. Resource support for participants in the ACER calibration exercise was also noted.

The memo encouraged each site to make decisions about the trial details and training in the context of their own site. A suggested format was also included in the memo. Sites were informed that Districts had some funding available to support the trial.

94 sites were confirmed as Intensive Trial Sites.

A SACSA Senior Project Officer was allocated to each District and a range of professional development activities were to be available prior to and during the trial for both site leaders and nominated staff. An Information Pack for leaders was also delivered to the sites and leaders were advised that they could choose to use the pack to support the trial. The Activity Pack was a collection of ideas to assist staff and parents in sites to become familiar with and respond to the trialing draft. The activities were designed to engage sites in the debate about what makes the best and most useful Framework for curriculum today.
Two papers on Curriculum Accountability were also distributed to sites: *Curriculum Accountability: A discussion paper* and *Accountability and Children and Students with Disabilities in the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework*.

District Superintendents were involved in the selection of DETE intensive trial sites and participated in the planning for the trial through the Curriculum Alliance. They were kept informed of progress throughout the process.

Participants in the group interviews held in the sample of trial sites spoke about the benefits and limitations of their involvement in the task.

A number of them indicated that they become involved in the trial because they wanted to *get their heads around the Framework* and to *have a say in it [the Framework]*.

*The trial gave us some time to get into the Framework.*

The experience of the trial varied in the sites.

For some the opportunity provided by being involved supported the direction in the school to *improve practice and to challenge thinking, realign work and think about planning*. *The trial gave us the time and the structure.*

The trial was coordinated by identified staff members in a number of the sites in the sample and in one case a school matched the resources provided through the trial in order to extend the initiative and its impact.

Those schools reported that they appreciated the self-management allowed in the process.

*Once we were notified, we [identified] a coordinating person in the school and selfmanaged all the process.*

*Being able to determine our own process was great.*

In some of the other sites there was evidence of lesser preparedness to take part in the trial.

*It was thrown upon us.*

The way in which the trial was coordinated in the site appeared to make a difference to the perceived value of the process for the individuals involved. Some reported that they experienced it as a confusing and solitary experience.
Sites that took on the trial benefited if they had a member of staff who was also involved in any of the project groups. They provided contextual information and were a conduit for communication about the project and the trial and its intentions.

The introductory briefings were not well received by many of the respondents. A number indicated they felt overwhelmed by the volume of information:

- *It was overwhelming, mind-boggling and intensive. All the new terminology! I felt inadequate.*

- *The information was very general. I didn’t have a clue.*

- *The trial meeting was a waste of time but then we were streamed into a more useful group and then went for further sessions with people in the Early Years trialing in the District.*

Some of the respondents reported that the briefings were *disorganised and messy* and in one case that the proceedings were *taken over by negative questions and so we didn’t get the information.*

Others were seeking more support from the briefing sessions.

- *We got a history of the project but no way into the document.*

- *The overheads were very dense and difficult to read - and they were gone through so quickly.*

- *We needed more time – it was overwhelming.*

While some of the participants at the briefings reported that they used the time for planning effectively, others believe that the process was *not a powerful engagement of teachers. It was disrespectful of us.*

A number of the respondents regretted that the briefings did not allow for varying levels of expertise of the participants.

- *There was no acknowledgement of prior learning.*

Changes were made to the briefing sessions following their initial implementation.

- *The SACSA training session I attended was excellent. It was interactive and process based. It was great opportunity to explore the document and, as a site, plan implementation strategies that linked with current activities and training at our site.*
In most cases, once work began at the site, views about being involved in the trial were very positive.

*It was good overall experience. My teaching has improved and my knowledge about how to teach has improved.*

*We began very cynically. Would anyone take notice of us? But in the Framework it is now clearly evident that listening has happened. The new one is a lot easier to understand. It is more user-friendly. People did listen. The glossary is good and the Essential Learnings are better defined. The standards are more specific and are easier to use.*

*It opened up my brain linking methodology to constructivism.*

*We had to think in a broader way. I felt a bit terrified but spurred on too. It made us think harder about what we were doing.*

The respondents from the sites valued the time to familiarise themselves with the document.

The Erebus case studies of some intensive trial sites were well done according to respondents who had participated in the case study component of the process.

*The process was most rewarding; saying things to someone who understands where I am coming from. Verbalising as opposed to writing is good. Previous conversations were remembered and conversations were tied back to them.*

*It was very professional. They were willing to listen and used our feedback. We were reassured that the process was genuine and felt validated. [He] asked us very insightful questions and took examples. We were encouraged to be critical.*

*The debrief with Erebus was useful.*

The online survey generated a different range of responses. Many found it repetitive and a number of respondents reported technical hitches which meant that they did not complete or forward the survey or spent many hours giving feedback.

*I’m not a fast typist and it took time to complete the survey – two half days.*

*My answers got lost.*

The website chat room was well received by those who used it and the direct access to other people’s ideas was welcomed by several respondents, and the comments are supportive of more use of this type of communication.
We needed more time for sharing by email and using the chat room (referring to the trial).

Online feedback was useful. There was sharing of ideas and concerns through the chat rooms.

There was plenty of information on the website but how much time is there to access it as part of daily work? It was good that the coordinators could access it. It suits my style of working.

There are a lot of child care centres that don’t have internet access. I used it at home.

One of the country schools that had planned professional development activities, which relied on external support, reported that relief staff had been organised and the expected personnel did not arrive. Other sites reported that they had expected workshops that did not eventuate.

We left five messages and got no contact. Finally someone could come. We took part in a conference that was locally organised and that was good.

Many of the personnel from the sites reported positively about the support and input provided by project officers, in providing professional development, being available for conversations or connecting people together.

However, a number of the sites felt that they were on their own.

We had no contact with anyone [from our sector] for four months.

We felt like we were just being pushed through the process.

Some of the respondents indicated that they felt very rushed and that this meant that they did not get through all of the trial requirements.

It was not long enough, not to go through the whole process to plan, deliver and then assess. I didn’t see the end product until after the trial.

Some respondents said that they felt that they might not have done the trialing justice because of time constraints or through lack of understanding. Others wondered if what they did was useful, because they said they did not hear about the uses of their feedback.

Could we have done it better? Were we doing it right?

Respondents from the Early Years Band sites reported that they could see continuity and that the inclusion of Family Day Care in the Framework was very important for young children as well as for the field. A number of them talked very positively about the
opportunities to network with other sites, using email and spending time sharing with others in teleconferences or through the chat room.

Focus groups, run as part of the consultation process, were reported as well received by the participants from all three sectors, although a minority view was that the focus groups did not encourage or accommodate responses outside the framework developed for the group process.

Respondents from one of the sites in the Catholic Education SA reported that the information day required them to absorb a lot of information but that there was a lot of support from the consultants who were very involved with the users. There was continuing support. They recognised that it was overwhelming and we could phone – 3 times on one day – and got priority. It was fantastic.

Most of the respondents who commented on the copies of the trial draft were concerned about what they saw as wastage when unopened shrink-wrapped packages were put into the bin at the end of the year. One respondent suggested that there be recycling provisions if everyone was to get a copy. Others thought that fewer hard copies and online access was a useful way forward. Others thought that having the capacity to develop and refine the document for individual use would be helpful.

The elements of the trial that these respondents would like to see retained in the future are:

- structures that put together supportive groups
- continued consultation
- value given to the informal networks that are invisible to the system processes
- more time to get together
- more opportunities to share curriculum work – it’s a good thing.

Satellite trial sites – DETE

Because of the very large response to the invitation to be involved in the trial, a further level of trialing and consultation was developed. Satellite sites had access to support from Districts. The level of involvement in the consultation processes was defined as perhaps being involved in the focus groups, survey or accessing the website to make their responses to the draft.

184 sites were informed of their involvement in the trial in a memo from the Associate Director, Curriculum on 15 February 2000.
Catholic Education SA - trial sites

Catholic Education SA took part in the trial and consultation on the trialing draft.

Catholic Education SA sites were not involved in the consultation on the Curriculum accountability components of the Framework, as this was under separate consideration in the sector.

Personnel from Catholic Education SA ran information and briefing sessions for the staff involved in the trial. The views of these respondents to the evaluation have been integrated into previous sections of the report.

Reviewing the penultimate draft

Consultation on the penultimate draft, from 4 – 18 September 2000, took the following form.

Copies of the entire draft were forwarded to the Steering Committee, the Project Policy Group comprising The Project Team, Curriculum Executive and Superintendents from other relevant DETE Directorates, the Chairs and Executive Officers of the Experts Working Groups and the Band Reference Groups. Other group members received all the introductory materials as well as sections of the draft related to their area. Each Experts Working Group and Band Reference Group was asked to indicate whether the penultimate draft was endorsed without amendment, endorsed subject to further amendment or not endorsed with areas for revision identified.

Executive Officer reports were developed for SACSA Policy Group. The SACSA Policy Group convened an all-day meeting on 12 September 2000 to identify key issues emerging from the deliberations of the groups, where necessary presenting draft instructions and guiding discussion and resolution of major issues if they arose. The SACSA Policy Group prepared a report for the Steering Committee, which was considered at the Committee meeting on 15 September 2000.

It was during the period of time between this draft and the next that the intensive consultation (18 Sept – 17 October 2000) took place.

Reviewing the final draft

The process for reviewing this draft followed a similar path as the one developed for the penultimate draft.

A full-day meeting was held by the SACSA Policy Group (12 September 2000) to consider the reports and the annotations that had been prepared by the groups. The reports were guided by a proforma which focused on critical issues to be resolved in order to forward the draft to the Steering Committee, following any minor amendments. Lead responsibilities were allocated to members of Curriculum Executive for managing the development and preparation of advice.
The review took place between 17 October and 7 November 2000. This period also included the development of the panelling report from ACER on the standards/outcomes, as well as significant detailed fine tuning undertaken by Curriculum Policy Directorate Officers, prior to publication.
5.4 Communication strategy and information mechanisms

This section of the report describes the intentions of the communications strategy and outlines the methods used to provide information about the project. It includes information generated through the evaluation about the impact of these elements of the development process.

Prior to the development of the project’s communications strategy, an extensive consultation process had taken place and was continued throughout the project’s development. Consultation and responsiveness were key concepts that were intended to underpin the project’s development and were seen as integral to communication about the project. The consultations were intended to ensure that the emerging Framework would be responsive to the range of stakeholders in curriculum. The early conceptual development of the Framework took into account the outcomes of consultations that had taken place in the leadup to developing the curriculum policy position expressed through the Framework. Consultation was continued through the development of the Framework, as has been described elsewhere in this report.

Consultation with the field was largely successful in involving people in the process of development and in challenging one of the prevailing cultural perceptions about curriculum and curriculum reform.

People thought that curriculum change was something DETE did to you, not with you.

This view is contested by other comments, such as

when will the powers that be realise that top down curriculum change is not going to work?

However, 61% of the responses from DETE sites indicated that the respondents believe that they had the opportunity to participate in the development of the SACSA Framework and 72% stated that they knew about the ways in which the SACSA Framework was being developed.

The range of people involved in the project groups was intended to support these principles as well as provide a range of perspectives throughout the process.

Data from the site interviews gives strong support to the value placed on consultation and involvement in the process in many of the sites.

[It is] good to know that people were listening to teachers and that they use what we say and think.

We wondered if anyone would take notice. We were very critical. Now it is clearly evident that listening has happened.
We feel listened to.

I felt they’d made up their minds, that I was wasting my breath. Then I critiqued the work and talked to the Curriculum Officer about it and that was useful.

Having input, having a say and making that effort – it’s the right way to go. Having levels, layers of involvement in outside groups and in the school trial was very valuable.

Teacher input is really great. There’s teacher talk in it (the Framework).

The communications strategy and information mechanisms that were developed as part of the overall project management had a number of intentions:

• to deliver a high level of understanding and acceptance about the SACSA Framework among schools, children’s services, child care settings and the wider South Australian education community.


• to support consultation throughout the process

• to provide accurate and consistent information about the project and its intentions and processes.

A team was responsible for the management and coordination of the communications strategy. The team was headed up by Assistant Director, Curriculum and included two SACSA project officers and the Curriculum Policy Officer, Publishing Support. The team received strategy advice and support from a group that included other DETE officers and the external SACSA website manager.

The Strategy was developed to operate over a two year period (2000–02). The strategy was intended to have several phases. The initial one was the support of the project’s consultation and trialing processes. The second phase is the implementation of the Framework. The initial strategy included the promotion of a positive and accurate representation in any media coverage of the Framework, and the provision of an environment of knowledge to support the implementation of the Framework. Key messages and target audiences were described and defined in the strategy, as well as activities to achieve the intended outcomes.

A number of the activities focused on communication through print, while others were directed towards personal interactions between professionals, for example, the briefing sessions. Electronic options were also included. A number of the activities had their intrinsic purpose, for example, providing information to site leaders at statewide briefing
sessions. They were also seen by project management as one component in a coherent and consistent approach to information and communications about the project.

The list of identified activities in the first phase of the strategy’s operations were all put into place during the project’s development.

Media clippings provide examples of targeting the accuracy of media coverage of the project. They include articles in the State and regional media and some professional and/or association journals and letters to the editor. A file of articles published in the print media and radio references was kept and used to identify emerging issues or as the basis of providing factual accounts of the project’s developments and intentions.

Information was provided to sites through a variety of mechanisms, including:

- letters from the Chief Executive of DETE, providing information about each stage of the process and encouraging participation in the project’s development
- articles in Xpress
- *South Australian Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin*, published by the Curriculum Policy Division (8 issues)
- email contact and regular meetings with the Curriculum Alliance, a group of both District Superintendents and Curriculum Superintendents/Curriculum Policy Officers, intended to be used as both an information exchange and as a forum for seeking and giving advice on processes, for example the process of engaging sites in the trialing of the draft Framework
- correspondence accompanying the distribution of Framework drafts.

Information packs prepared by the SACSA Coordination Team during the project were:

- the pack used at District leaders' briefing and information sessions, May 1999
- the activity pack to accompany the trialing draft, March 2000
- materials used for the intensive trial site briefings, March 2000
- materials used for the statewide information sessions, April 2000
- SACSA Overview: a power point presentation for site use, November 2000
The Communication Strategy was a long running agenda item on the Project Team agenda and team members contributed to it through developing materials for the *South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin*, identifying issues for *Xpress* articles and running information and briefing sessions. As well as being the journal of record, the *South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin* highlighted the experiences of sites in the sectors as they responded to the Framework in their particular locations.

All of the responses to the online survey from teachers from Catholic Education SA in the calibration exercise indicated that they used the *South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin* to get useful information about the SACSA development. A small majority of respondents indicated that they had not used the SACSA website or had done so to a limited extent.

Data generated through the survey indicates that in DETE sites not involved in the trialing or the calibration processes,

- 66% of the respondents thought that the *South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin* provided them with useful information
- 66% of the responses indicated that useful information was provided in *Xpress* about the SACSA Framework
- 50% of the responses indicated that the workshops and/or briefing sessions provided useful information about the SACSA Framework development
- 42% of respondents replied that they did not use the SACSA website to get information about the project, while 15% indicated that they used it rarely.

Communication and information was one of the issues discussed at the interviews with staff from intensive trial sites. The responses given in that process add other nuances to the information provided in the survey. Many of the respondents were not aware of the information that was available or even if they were, preferred to refer to other people. If the site had a person who was involved in one of the project groups these people were relied on as both a source of information and for the distribution of information.

> No-one here saw the Bulletin (*South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin*) except some of us got them through…. who was a member [of a group].

> I looked at what was provided by the Department. It was not memorable.

> The briefings were a marketing exercise, but there weren’t many negative comments.
The Bulletin (South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin) was a reference point for contact people and was useful in that respect.

Several respondents raised concerns about the glossy appearance of the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin. Their concerns focused on its presumed cost.

The information sessions were not initially well received according to the interview data. In response to feedback and to the team’s own professional judgement, the materials were re-examined and re-done.

The briefing sessions were pretty ordinary and not meeting needs. We left feeling they’re not quite right! The materials were not trialed because of the timeline. We changed them and I felt much more comfortable with them. They got better.

Responses to the online survey from intensive trial and satellite trial sites in DETE and in the trial schools in Catholic Education SA were not sufficient to generalise. The available data is found in section 7 of this report.

This information is based on a small sample and should be used as indicative. No supporting data emerged at interview about the publications in this sector. Perceptions of support provided through the trialing process were positive and can be found in other parts of this report.

At 14 March 2001 the SACSA website had recorded 31,194 hits.

The reflective journal for intensive trial practitioners was a component of the communication processes and provided information back to those responsible for the development process. It was part of the SACSA website in the have your say section. 85 sites logged entries between 5 April 2000 and 15 June 2000. Most responses came from the Early, Primary and Middle Years and very few from the Senior Years (4). The journal included quite lengthy entries ranging from detailed comment on particular pages of the draft to ideas for formatting and reorganising the draft Framework.

Several respondents provided reflections on the effectiveness of elements of the strategy.

The South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin and Xpress are fine documents. Writing them was fine. But what is their impact out ‘there’? Now I am ‘there’ many people don’t know what they are.

The matrix team worked. Information we get is generally positive about the Framework.

One of the project team respondents suggested that a real strength of the communication and information strategy was the Project Director talking with groups of Principals.
One aspect of the usefulness and value of the information provided through the project is demonstrated by a response from a DETE site to the online survey.

*No training has been provided at my school. I kept myself up to date by reading the information provided in Xpress and the Bulletins (South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework Bulletin). I used the trial draft in my lesson preparations and in planning units of work, not because I was expected to at my school, but because I was interested in finding out more about them. My knowledge was gained in my own time.*
5.5 The nature and effectiveness of the collaborative partnerships

Partnership was a concept central to the conceptualisation of the project and it was intended that the development process reflect the principle of partnerships in its operations and processes. The partnerships were played out in the groups that were established and were intrinsic to the importance given to consultation in the process. Partnership was seen as a benefit to the process in both the short and the long term.

*Partnerships are pulling the Framework out into the community.*

**Partnerships and the project groups**

**The Steering Committee**

The Steering Committee reflected in its membership all the stakeholders in education. The University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the University of South Australia had three members. The Independent Schools Board and Catholic Education SA were represented on the committee. The Executive Director, Curriculum and the Assistant Director, Curriculum in DETE were members and the committee was Chaired by DETE. The Director of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia was also a member of the Steering Committee. (See Appendix 4 for membership.)

Steering Committee members believe that the partnerships were effective and productive.

*This was the first committee that brought the partners together and it had a tangible impact on the Framework and its direction.*

*Everyone was involved in developing a South Australian Framework.*

*The partnership was unique and had a two-way benefit. It was an opportunity to look at curriculum in a major way.*

*Having the three sectors, the professional associations and the universities meant that a breadth of opinion was achieved. The process respected the importance of maintaining the partnership. It was excellent, an example of the way to work.*

*There was real partnership at the personal level.*

Many believe that relationships between the groups involved in care and education have been enhanced through the process.

*The whole education community was seen to be reflected [in the membership and that partnership] was facilitated by the membership of the committee.*

All of the committee respondents commented on the growth of understanding of the different perspectives represented around the table and the universities were described by
one respondent as adding insights and challenging perspectives to the project development.

*It took time to get the representation right.*

There was some discussion about the membership of the committee, given that the Framework was conceptualised from Birth to Year 12. The participation of people from the Early Years was discussed, as was the participation of SSABSA in the planning stages.

The Early Years was not included specifically, because of the perceived difficulty of providing representation for such a diverse range of settings. The partnerships in this band were seen to be well located in the three Experts Working Groups and in the Band Reference Group.

The minutes of the first meeting, 8 July 1999, indicate that the Director of SSABSA was present. Documentation shows that the Director of SSABSA accepted an invitation to be a member of the Steering Committee on 28 May 1999. Other acceptance dates range from 27 May 1999 to 7 June 1999. This followed the announcement by the Minister of Education of the new curriculum initiative. However, it was reported that consultations about the new initiative were happening without any consultation with SSABSA and this led to a *poor start* to the partnership.

SSABSA’s involvement was seen as critical to the development of the SACSA by departmental officers and by SSABSA and the SSABSA Board. The nature and extent of SSABSA’s involvement in the partnership was an agenda item at the Steering Committee meeting on 19 August 1999. The early stages of the partnership were characterised as *uncomfortable* from the SSABSA point of view. The omission of SSABSA from the list of partners in the process, published in Curriculum Bulletin 1, dated June 1999, is cited as further evidence of tension in the early stages of the partnership. These comments relate to the earlier part of the process and by the end of the time, comment from all sources commended the work of SSABSA personnel in the groups participating in the process and argued that the partnerships were effective. The joint group developed with SSABSA and the Senior Years Band Reference Group did an *enormous amount of work of high quality.*

Another area that required negotiation was the representation of a wider range of university expertise on the various project working groups. Gaps in the existing groups were made when Chairs of the Experts Working Groups left the development process to become involved as members of the writing consortium. Nominations were sought from other universities to fill these vacancies as a way of resolving this concern. One of the benefits of involving the universities in the development was anticipated through well-informed use of the Framework in pre-service training. (Where it was in use at the time of the evaluation interviews, the writers reported that *the students love it.*)
Responses from interviews from non-members of the Steering Committee indicate that the involvement of industry and business and the training sectors may have enhanced the partnerships inherent in the Committee’s membership.

One respondent suggested that in order to be consistent a teacher may have been a useful member of the group.

**Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups**

Many of the Chairpersons and Executive Officers believe that the principle of partnership was made tangible in the membership and operations of their groups:

* [The] inclusion and involvement of Catholic Education, ISB and tertiary personnel in the EWG was brilliant and really representative of educators in South Australia.

* There were good links in the committee with people in the field and the partnership was superb.

* [The partnership] brought the sectors to the same strong focus.

* The group worked well together and [its membership] helped consultation.

* Catholic Education was great to work with. They added clear values and added considerably to the group.

* People were all prepared to give input and to listen to each other.

The involvement of SABSA personnel in the Experts Working Groups and the Senior Years Band Reference Group was seen to be a productive partnership.

Some respondents in the evaluation believe that the emphasis on partnership reduced the cynicism that was attached to the project.

* This is an across-sector initiative, not just another brain-washing job.

Several respondents raised the issues of the participation of people from rural and remote locations. While accepting the logistical difficulties that this creates, the respondents believe that on the one hand the isolated individual representing these locations carries a heavy burden and on the other hand the process would benefit from more participation.

* Town people need a working understanding [of us].

Most members of the Groups and the writers expected and valued the potential of the partnership between them. Some writers did not believe themselves to be in partnership with colleagues in the Experts Working Groups. They felt themselves to have worked *in isolation from some of the best brains in what is after all a parochial, small system.*
Some members of the Groups reported that they were concerned that relationships had been *ruptured* due to the misunderstandings and conflicts that had emerged for some groups and the writers. Some of this was a reflection on the distance maintained between the advice of the Experts Working Groups and the writers. Other concerns relate to what were in some cases deep divisions about curriculum.

**CEASA’s partnerships**

Some of the respondents were pleased that the public partnership between the professional associations, through CEASA, and the University of South Australia gave a *valuable profile for teachers and positioned the organisation well*.

The association newsletters were used to keep members informed about the project. The associations established a website in the early stages of the project, but could not keep it going because of resourcing problems.

Teaming teachers and academics was seen in the main as very useful and productive.

> *It grounded the credibility of what we were doing in the sites. We could not have done what we did without it.*

Some of the partnerships worked better than others and it is evident that there were tensions in some partnerships. Quality, views about appropriate pedagogy and differential workloads and attention to the workloads were identified by the respondents as sources of tension. These issues were also reported to have been addressed in the process and the Chief Writer was commended for her role in *pulling it all together*.

> *The team worked very well to sort these things out.*

> *Overall everybody worked well and it felt like a team project.*

> *We learned a lot and would like to continue these relationships. It is good that the culture is flexible to have teachers and academics working side by side.*

The partnership was not without its tensions. Some of the tensions were attributed to the pressures of the timeline for the stages of the contracted task.

Some of the CEASA respondents to the evaluation reported that they understood their role in the process as that of the *junior partner*. This was in part because of the relative funding contributions to the project and in the development model that described their relative relationships. As well, some of this sense was expressed in relation to the comparative amount of time spent on the project.

Some of them also expressed the view that they experienced the process as *junior* because of the ways their expertise was treated by their academic colleagues who were also writers.
I was shown no professional respect for what I know and do.

Several respondents indicated that this feeling extended to the value placed on their work by the purchaser because they saw no copy of the final draft and received no personal copy. It was reported to the evaluation that CEASA was not represented formally in the accolades at the celebration of final Framework approval.

**Partnerships with the field**

Consultation was seen as an expression of partnership and is dealt with in detail in other sections of this report. Those who were involved in consultation assigned value to the process and the outcomes: that is, that they were consulted and can see evidence of their input in the final Framework.

Partnerships between staff in the sites was reported in the interviews as one of the major benefits of working on the Framework. In places where these partnerships were not well established the approach to the work involved in the consultation was seen as more difficult. Several respondents made mention of the value of the partnerships established with people in other sites.

We felt we knew what we had to do and had more confidence about it when we had links with another service.

Information from the survey indicates that 56% of those who responded had reviewed the trial draft at a significant level of engagement. 46% of the same group of respondents indicate that they had not done it with others or had done so to a limited extent.

Respondents from the pre-school and Family Day Care Centres (FDC) welcomed the partnerships that brought FDC into the curriculum area. Other respondents want to see the partnerships extended to include community-based, privately funded child care, out of school hours care and vacation care.

Partnerships with the field were expressed in part through the CEASA’s membership of the writing consortium. The view that this partnership delivered on its potential to provide effective communication with teachers’ networks was questioned by several of the respondents.

**SACSA Project Coordination Team and partnerships**

Partnerships and their development and maintenance were a central preoccupation of members of this team.

Many of their tasks of liaison, communication and problem solving, were by definition targeted to these elements of the development process.

Respondents cited the benefits of the partnerships that were established. They were to be seen in the:
• increasingly cooperative working relationships between the team members

• participation of Principals from Catholic Education SA and their contribution in shaping the whole

• way that different perspectives shaped the process and its outcomes in new and different ways

• process used for developing the Essential Learnings

• involvement of the universities and all the education sectors in a common enterprise.

Some respondents indicated that the sense of partnership between the team and the curriculum officers was not strong for all of them.

*It wasn’t good from that position. I didn’t know what was going on. There were personnel changes and they [recently appointed officers] didn’t have the history. The time we lost was very frustrating.*

**University of South Australia partnerships**

The partnership with the University and the Department of Education Training and Employment, was described as demonstrating *complementary expertise* and the fact of having to *think again* was seen as *exciting conceptually*, a benefit of the partnership. Further discussion of elements of the partnership is to be found in Section 5.3 of this report.

Many collegiate partnerships were developed and extended through the process.

*I would always wish to be involved. I got to know colleagues in the university and in Curriculum. The relationships are there. The relationships and the friendships will stay.*
6. Other issues

Implementation

Professional development was seen as the key to the implementation of the Framework by the majority of respondents. Some responses indicate a level of concern about the extent to which devolved and localised professional development process can deliver coordinated support to sites in their take up of the Framework. For some of the respondents this was linked to models that had been found to be effective for them and, in particular, the model used to support the implementation of the South Australian Certificate of Education. Some respondents expressed concern about the effectiveness top-down models of professional development.

Whatever the point of view about appropriate models for professional development, all of the data indicates that time is the most valued resource and personnel in sites identified specific closure days as one way of delivering this time.

Some sites argued that the bridge they needed was support in the how; how to use the Framework in planning, delivering and assessing curriculum. They indicated that they wanted support from people as well as in written forms. Work samples were identified in a number of responses as providing a bridging platform.

The website was identified by users who are familiar with the technology as a site for professional development support, where the technology was used as an integral source of information and exchange for people working with the Framework. Reducing the isolation of teachers’ curriculum work continues to be a challenge where information and communications technology is peripheral to teachers’ work and this has particular implications for implementing the Framework.

The evidence presented to the evaluation highlights different levels of engagement and attitudes to staff involvement in the development process. The differences appear to relate to the extent to which curriculum renewal is perceived as the ongoing business of sites and their communities. Extending this sense of curriculum growth and renewal appears to be key to the implementation of the Framework.

A number of site responses identified the industrial climate as an issue related to implementation. In that context resourcing was seen as a particularly useful support for implementation.

An extension of the Framework into all the settings for Early Childhood has been identified as a further issue for implementation.
**Maintaining the partnerships**

For a number of people involved in the management of the development process, the loss of a forum to continue and extend the partnerships is regretted. However, there is recognition that such an extension needs to be purposeful. The perceived success of these partnerships indicates that should the opportunity arise, the benefits of existing and potential partnerships should be explored.

**Contractual relationships**

As is demonstrated in the report, there were tensions in the way in which the writing contract played out in the project. Some have argued that while it is true that contracts describe commercial relationships, a balance between risk management and the access to information and clarification needs to be reached in developmental work. Learnings from the project suggest that as a minimum, communication protocols may need to be conceptualised in ways that facilitate both requirements at each level of contact between the purchaser and the provider and at the planning stages of any project.

**Models of development**

The process used to develop the Essential Learnings, both prior to and during the SACSA development, was widely commended in the course of the evaluation. The transferability of the model to other contexts could be explored. It may provide a way of generating partnerships between the field and development functions, particularly if it is used for new initiatives requiring intensive conceptual development and widely based practitioner input to shaping the concepts. Consultation processes could also be included as part of the development process.
7. Attachments

- Survey
- Survey data
Survey for the evaluation of the development process for the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability (SACSA) Framework

Thank you for choosing to complete this survey on the web site - http://online.curriculum.edu.au/sacsa.

Your contribution to the evaluation process will be aggregated with other responses and will be held as confidential material by the evaluators.

This survey has been designed for you to address the sections that relate to your involvement in the SACSA Framework development process.

It has been arranged in sections that can be accessed through links in the document. All respondents fill in one section one.
Please fill in the section that describes you and your working relationship to the development process. From there, go to the section/s of the survey that relates to your work with the SACSA Framework. You will find a series of questions for you to answer. The answers can be indicated on the scale provided for your use. There are also questions requiring a yes/no response. If your response is positive click on the box provided. The opportunity is also provided for you to add comments on the issues included in the survey.

### Section One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector:</th>
<th>-please select one-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspective:</td>
<td>-please select one-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>-please select one-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
<td>-please select one-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>-please select one-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching:</td>
<td>-please select one-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas of learning for secondary teachers:

Please indicate the Band or Phase

I have seen a copy of the published SACSA Framework

Continue to EWG or BRG

OR

Continue to Educators in DETE sites or Teachers in Catholic Schools
Section Two: Educators in a DETE site (other than nominated intensive trial educators and educators in satellite trial sites)

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

[1           2             3             4             5]

Strongly disagree                          Strongly agree

Staff at my site worked together to
consider the trial draft of the SACSA
Framework

I knew about the ways in which the
SACSA Framework was being developed

I had opportunities to participate in the development of the SACSA Framework

I used the SACSA Framework website to get information about the Framework's development

The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development

'Xpress' provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development

Information sessions or workshops provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development

I reviewed the trial draft of the SACSA Framework (March - May 2000)

I provided feedback on the trialing draft of the Framework

Any other comments
If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?
Section Three: Nominated intensive trial educators in DETE intensive trial sites

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understood the trial and consultation process for the trialing draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the SACSA Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was clear about my role in the intensive trialing process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my input helped to shape the SACSA Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used the SACSA Framework website to get information about the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework's development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin provided me with useful information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the SACSA Framework development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Xpress' articles provided me with useful information about the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACSA Framework development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sessions or workshops provided me with useful information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the SACSA Framework development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time I spent being involved in the SACSA Framework intensive trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process was of benefit to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was supported in trialing the draft of the SACSA Framework by:

☐ Using the *Trialing Draft Activity Pack*
☐ Attending SACSA Project Team intensive trial briefing sessions
☐ Using the SACSA telephone hotline
☐ Site visit from members of the SACSA Project Team
☐ Attending district meetings involving SACSA Project Team members
☐ Release time
☐ Website journal or chat room
☐ Discussions with colleagues at my site
☐ Workshops on aspects of the trialing draft

I read the Erebus trial and consultation reports ☐

Any other comments

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?

Complete & Exit
Section Four: Educators in satellite trial sites in DETE

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

[1  2  3  4  5]
Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

I had opportunities to participate in the development of the SACSA Framework 1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5

I understood the consultation process for the trialing draft of the SACSA Framework 1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5

Site or district activities enabled me to explore and provide feedback about the trialing draft of the SACSA Framework 1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5

I used the SACSA website to get information about the Framework's development 1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5

The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development 1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5

'Xpress' articles provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development 1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
Information sessions or workshops provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development

I believe that my input helped to shape the SACSA Framework

I believe that the time I spent being involved in the SACSA Framework development process was of benefit to me

I read the Erebus trial and consultation reports

Any other comments

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?

Complete & Exit
Section Five: Educators in DETE sites who took part in the calibration exercise with ACER (November - December 1999 and/or March - June 2000 and/or October 2000)

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

I understood my role in the ACER calibration exercise

I understood the purpose of the ACER calibration exercise
The computer program (March - June) used to collect data for the calibration of the SACSA outcome sequences was user friendly.

Being involved in a calibration exercise helped me understand sequences of learning development and how they can be used in my work.

I was able to contribute to the development of the SACSA Framework through my involvement in the calibration exercise with ACER.

I read the relevant calibration report published on the SACSA website.

For Languages teachers only

The process used to calibrate the outcome sequences was user friendly.

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?

Please also complete section 2 - Educators in a DETE site, or if appropriate Section 3 - Educators in satellite trial sites in DETE.
Section Six: Teachers in Trial A Catholic Schools who were involved in trialing the draft SACSA Framework

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

[1 2 3 4 5]
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

I understood the trialing process for the draft SACSA Framework 1 2 3 4 5

I was clear about my role in the trialing process 1 2 3 4 5
I believe that the introductory session run by Catholic Education SA helped me in my role in the trial process 1 2 3 4 5

The school visit/s by the Catholic Education SA SACSA coordinators helped me engage in the trialing process 1 2 3 4 5

I used the SACSA Framework website to get information about the Framework's development 1 2 3 4 5

The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development 1 2 3 4 5

I believe that my input helped to shape the SACSA Framework 1 2 3 4 5

The time I spent being involved in the trial of the draft SACSA Framework development process was of benefit to me 1 2 3 4 5

I read the Erebus trial and consultation reports

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?

Complete & Exit
Section Seven: Teachers in Catholic Schools involved in the calibration exercise with ACER

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

\[1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5\]

Strongly disagree \hspace{1cm} \text{Strongly agree}

I understood my role in the ACER calibration exercise \hspace{3cm} 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5

I understood the purpose of the ACER calibration exercise \hspace{3cm} 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5
The computer program used to collect data for the calibration of the SACSA outcome sequences was user friendly.

Being involved in a calibration exercise helped me understand the sequences of learning development and how they can be used in my work.

I was able to contribute to the development of the SACSA Framework through my involvement in the calibration exercise with ACER.

I used the SACSA Framework website to get information about the Framework's development.

The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin provided me with useful information about the SACSA Framework development.

I read the relevant calibration report published on the SACSA website.

For Languages teachers only

The process used to calibrate the outcome sequences was user friendly.

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?
Section Eight: Members of Experts Working Groups (EWG)

Name of EWG

My selection as a member of an Experts Working Group was because I...
My role on the EWG was to...

Any conflict in the EWG was managed through...

My most effective contribution/s to the work of the EWG was/were...

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

The Steering Committee’s expectations and requirements were clear to the members of my EWG

I clearly understood the relationship between the work of my EWG and the other groups established to develop the SACSA Framework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication between my EWG and the Steering Committee was effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the way the Steering Committee used my EWG advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the effect of the work of my EWG on the detailed Writer's Brief (September 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could trace the effect of the work of my EWG on the preliminary draft of the Framework (Nov 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could trace the effect of the work of my EWG on the trialing draft of the Framework (March 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could trace the effect of the work of my EWG on the penultimate draft (Sept 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could trace the effect of the work of my EWG on the final draft (October 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWG meetings were timely and well managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making processes were known, agreed and used by the members of EWG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The membership of the EWG added value to the advice provided by the Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The partnerships embodied in the membership of my EWG benefited the work of the Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any other comments

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?

Complete & Exit
Section Eight: Educators in Catholic Education schools involved in the Religious Education Experts Working Group

My selection as a member of this Experts Working Group was because I...

My role on the EWG was to...
Any conflict in the EWG was managed through...

My most effective contribution/s to the work of the EWG was/were...

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication between my EWG and the writers was effective

The expectations of the role of my Experts Working Group were clear to me

I could trace the effect of the work this EWG in successive drafts of the Framework

EWG meetings were timely and well managed

Decision making processes were known, agreed and used by the members of EWG
Reporting by group members demonstrated that consultation processes had been used with their constituencies.

Comment on the usefulness of the Religious Education Framework for teaching Religious Education in SA

Any other comments

Section Nine: Members of Band Reference Groups (BRG)

Name of Band Reference Group

SACSA evaluation
My selection as a member of an BRG was because I...

My role on the BRG was to...

Any conflict in the BRG was managed through...

My most effective contribution/s to the work of the BRG was/were...

On a five point scale please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectations of the organisation that I represented on the 1 2 3 4 5

SACSA evaluation
BRG were clear to me

The Steering Committee's expectations and requirements were clear to the members of my BRG

I clearly understood the relationship between the work of my BRG and the other groups established to develop the SACSA Framework

Communication between my BRG and the Steering Committee was effective

I could trace the effect of the work of my BRG on the detailed Writer's Brief (Sept 99)

I could trace the effect of the work of my BRG on the preliminary draft of the Framework (Nov 99)

I could trace the effect of the work of my BRG on the trialing draft of the Framework (March 2000)

I could trace the effect of the work of my BRG on the penultimate draft (Sept 2000)

I understood the way the steering committee used my BRG's advice (Oct 2000)

BRG meetings were timely and well managed

Decision making processes were known and agreed by the members of BRG

The membership of the BRG, designed to be representative of all stakeholders in the development process, added value to the advice provided by the Group

Reporting by group members demonstrated that consultation processes had been used with their constituencies

The partnerships embodied in the membership of my Group benefited the work of the BRG
Any other comments

If you have seen the published SACSA Framework, what are your first impressions of it?
EWG Respondents

- Religious working group
- Vocational Learning
- Society & Environment
- Science
- Multicultural Education
- Mathematics
- Languages
- Health & PE
- Essential Learnings
- Equity
- English as a Second Language
- English
- Early Years 5-8
- Early Years 3-5
- Early Years 0-3
- Design Technology
- Children & students with disabilities
- Birth to 3 Years
- Assessment & Accountability (DETE only)
- Arts
- Aboriginal Education

No. Respondents
BRG Respondents

No. Respondents

Early Years
Middle Years
Primary
Senior Years
DETE sites
Number of responses 274

- Staff at my site worked together
- I knew about the ways of SACSA Framework development
- I had opportunities to participate
- I used the SACSA Framework website
- The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin was useful
- Xpress was useful
- Information sessions/workshops were useful
- I reviewed the trial draft

Average response

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)
DETE Trial sites
Number of responses 11

Staff at my site worked together
I knew about the ways of SACSA Framework development
I had opportunities to participate
I used the SACSA Framework website
The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin was useful
Xpress was useful
Information sessions/workshops were useful
I reviewed the trial draft

Average response

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)
DETE Satellite sites
Number of responses 9

- I had opportunities to participate
- I understood the consultation process
- Site/district activities enabled me to explore & provide feedback
- I used the SACSA website
- The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin was useful
- Xpress articles were useful
- Information sessions/workshops were useful
- My input helped shape the SACSA Framework

Average Response

0 1 2 3 4 5

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)
ACER and DETE calibration sites
Number of responses 12

- I understood my role
- I understood the purpose
- The computer program for data collection was user-friendly
- Being involved helped understanding of learning development sequences
- I contributed to the development of the SACSA Framework
- The process for calibrating sequences was user-friendly

Average response
ACER and Catholic calibration schools
Number of responses 7

- I understood my role
- I understood the purpose
- The computer program for data collection was user-friendly
- Being involved helped understanding of learning development sequences
- I contributed to the development of the SACSA Framework
- I used the SACSA Framework website
- The SACSA Curriculum SA Bulletin was useful

Average response

(Strongly disagree) 0 1 2 3 4 5 (Strongly agree)
BRG responses
Number of responses 11

- Expectations of the organisation were clear
- Expectations of the Steering Committee were clear
- The relationship between my BRG and other groups was clear
- Communication between my BRG and the Steering Committee was effective
- I traced the effect of my BRG's work on the Writer's Brief
- I traced the effect of my BRG's work on the preliminary draft
- I traced the effect of my BRG's work on the trialing draft
- I traced the effect of my BRG's work on the penultimate draft
- I understood how the Steering Committee used my BRG's advice
- BRG meetings were timely and well managed
- Decision-making processes were known and agreed
- The BRG membership added value to the advice
- Consultation processes were used
- Partnerships benefited the work of my BRG

Average response

(Strongly disagree) 0 1 2 3 4 5 (Strongly agree)
EWG responses
Number of responses 65

Expectations of the Steering Committee were clear
The relationship between my EWG and the Steering Committee was effective
Communication between my EWG and other groups was clear
I understood how the Steering Committee used my EWG's advice
I understood the effect of my EWG's work on the Writer's Brief
I traced the effect of my EWG's work on the preliminary draft
I traced the effect of my EWG's work on the trialing draft
I traced the effect of my EWG's work on the penultimate draft
I traced the effect of my EWG's work on the final draft
EWG meetings were timely and well managed
Decision-making processes were known and agreed
The EWG membership added value to the advice
Partnerships benefited the work of my EWG

Average

0 1 2 3 4

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)
8. Appendices

Appendix 1

Evaluation instruments

Interview and focus group areas for discussion

1. Members of the SACSA Coordinating Project Team
2. Chairpersons and Executive Officers of Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups
3. Steering Committee members
4. Contract managers
5. Service providers: ACER, UNISA, CEASA, Erebus
6. Intensive Trial sites – DETE
7. Trial sites – Catholic Education SA
8. Focus groups
1 Members of the SACSA Coordinating Project Team

Format: one on one interviews: one hour

The key principles underlying the SACSA development process were:

- partnership
- collaboration
- consultation

The role and effectiveness of the project groups established for the development of the SACSA Framework:

- liaison with the Steering Committee
- liaison with Curriculum and Equity Superintendents
- operational management of the project in response to emerging situations in the development process – eg. consultation process decided on 18.9.00: establishment of the Standards and Accountability and Accountability EWG
- use and usefulness of the consultation reports and the calibration reports
- Band Reference Groups; BRGs and the support of partnerships; BRGs and consultation with constituencies
- Experts Working Groups and their contribution to the process.

Role and effectiveness of the SACSA Coordinating Team in the development of the policy Framework/Writers Brief, the development of Supplementary Instructions to the writers

Role and effectiveness of the SACSA Coordinating Team in the development and/or implementation of the Communication Strategy/information to the systems/sectors and feedback to the SACSA Project

Role of formal processes in communication/liaison/coordination – weekly meetings, sharing of minutes, agendas. Any informal processes? value?

Key successful features of the development process used for the SACSA Framework

Three highlights of your involvement in the work of the team

Improvements for the future

Any other comments?
2 Chairpersons and Executive Officers of Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups

Format: Group discussions: 1.5 hours

1 The key principles underlying the SACSA development process were:
   • partnership
   • collaboration
   • consultation.

Discuss the extent to which each of these principles has been met.
Provide 2 examples of success.
Indicate any areas for improvement.

2 Discuss the role and effectiveness of the project groups established for the development of the SACSA Framework in relation to the following elements:
   • relationship with the Steering Committee
   • relationships with other working groups – EWGs and BRGs and Project Team
   • consultation structures and processes
   • consultation and calibration reports
   • operations of your EWG/BRG conflict, consensus and decision making,
     impact on the development outcomes
   • inter-sector communication, partnership through group membership.

Record your views on the sheet provided.

3 Consider the extent to which the formal processes established to foster communication, liaison and coordination were effective:
   eg. monthly meetings with Chairs of other groups, Executive Officer meetings
   and Chair and Executive Officer meetings; with the Project Director and Project
   Manager; information to the wider education community

Were informal processes that developed during the course of the project useful?
In what ways?
Record your views on the sheet provided.

4 Identify 3 highlights of your work on your EWG/BRG

Record your views on the sheet provided.

5 If this process is used again, what does your experience indicate about changes
   and/or improvements for the future?
   Record your views on the sheet provided.

6 Are there any issues you believe need to be addressed in the implementation of the Framework?

7 Any other comments.
3  **Steering Committee members**

**Format: one on one interviews: one hour**

The partnerships characterising the committee’s membership - its benefits and any drawbacks (DETE, Catholic Education SA, ISB, tertiary sector, SSABSA, community involvement)

Role and effectiveness of the Project groups

- the Steering Committee
- the EWGs
- the BRGs
- the Project Team

Were the group roles and responsibilities and outcomes appropriate for the task?

Steering Committee role in quality assurance, eg. draft endorsement processes.

The Committee’s role in solving problems/resolving issues as they arose and developing process responses.

Views on the process uses by the service providers: ACER, UNISA, CEASA, Erebus.

Members’ views on the ‘usefulness of the outsourcing model’ for the development of the SACSA Framework.

**Steering Committee minutes of 6.1.00**

Innovation as a theme of the project: features of the innovation, extent to which this was realised - future implications

Issues for implementation

Any other comments.

4  **Contract managers**

**Format: one on one interviews: one hour**

Nature of innovation in project management - description, benefits and drawbacks, including outsourcing, support for sites

Purchaser views of the service providers’ processes: ACER, UNISA, CEASA, Erebus, eg. communication, compliance

Contract managers’ role in providing direction to and managing service providers, eg. quality assurance, conflict, usefulness of the services
The Committee’s role in solving problems/resolving issues as they arose and developing process responses

Highlights of the process

Improvements for future development

Any other comments.

5 Service providers: ACER, UNISA, CEASA, Erebus Consulting Partners

Format: one on one interviews, (interstate personnel interviewed by telephone) one hour

Innovation in the model for the Framework’s development

Partnership – the extent to which this was experienced in the project

Provider’s views of the purchaser’s processes: project direction, management, communication, problem solving

Infrastructure support for the service providers: nature and extent, usefulness, improvement

Other issues.

6 Intensive Trial sites – DETE

Format: small group interviews on site or by tele-conference: one hour

The three key principles for the development process were partnership, collaboration and consultation. Comment on the extent to which the process was characterised by these principles.

Views on DETE support for your site’s involvement in the development process:
- information, consultation processes
- number of copies of drafts
- other support, eg. time release.

Extent and usefulness of the support for site leaders in the development process

Extent and usefulness of support for educators in the development process

Elements of the process you found valuable and would want maintained in the future

Highlights of involvement in the development process
Areas for change and/or improvement

Issues for implementation

Any other comments.

7 Trial sites – Catholic Education SA

Format: small group interviews on site or by tele-conference: one hour

The three key principles for the development process were partnership, collaboration and consultation. Comment on the extent to which the process was characterised by these principles.

Nature, extent and usefulness of support from Catholic Education SA

Information and communication about the SACSA Framework as it was developed

Future plans for use of the Framework

Highlights of involvement in the development process

Any aspects of the process to be maintained into the future

Any changes and/or improvements to the process.

8 Focus groups

Format: 2 focus groups of stakeholders: 1.5 hours

The areas for discussion at the focus group meetings (26 and 28 February 2001) were as follows:

The partnerships between the three education sectors, the tertiary sector, SSABSA, the training sector and the parent community were productive and added value to the Framework.

Being involved in the development process through membership of the EWGs or the BRGs was professionally rewarding.

The SACSA Coordination Team was an effective support to the work of the Band Reference Groups and the Experts Working Groups.

Our group understood how the Steering Committee used our advice.

The consultation processes used in the development of the Framework were fundamental to the development of the Framework.
Appendix 2

Intensive trial sites selected in the evaluation

COOBER PEDY AREA SCHOOL

Narelle Perry
Alice Prybn
Roy Page
Kirsty Stokoe
Martina Whenham

PENNESHAW

John Grant
Helen Grant (ex Coober Pedy Area School Staff)

ST TERESA’S SCHOOL, WHYALLA

Toni Fitzgerald
Maxine Kittel
Liz Navarro

ELIZABETH GROVE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Barry Hill
Vera Deluca
Rosemary Stevens
Jacqui Tobitt
Live Walenczykiewcz

THE HEIGHTS SCHOOL

Irene Brownlie
Marie Gleeson
Chris Lawrence
Yvonne Southwell
Tim Thornton

NORWOOD/MORIALTA HIGH SCHOOL

Karen Andrews
Glenys Haensel
Edmund Heide
Nigel Howard
Carmine Marino
Sue McMillian
Anne Wilson

MARGARET IVES CHILDREN’S CENTRE
Joanne Heron

MT COMPASS AREA SCHOOL
Gillian Jordan
Gerry Langertake
Rachel O’Reilly

HALLET COVE PRE-SCHOOL
Rosalie Button
Gill Hosking
Neil Tregenza

ST MARY’S COLLEGE
Peter Batty
Antoinette Lindquist
Julia Neylon
Marcia O’Donnell

FAMILY DAY CARE, CLARE
Sue Coad
Kathryn Joes
Deb Kelly

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL
Olivia Colangelo
Richard Everett
Rosemary Goode
Jim Jackaman
Mik Matthew
Amanda O’Shea
Clay Reid
Leisa Westerhof

RISDON PARK PRIMARY
June Goode
Kevin Moore
Louise Richards
Sue Turner
Sharon Verco
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Minutes of meetings used in the evaluation

Experts Working Groups

Aboriginal Education
Arts
Assessment and Accountability (DETE only)
Birth to three – Early Years
Children and students with disabilities
Design and Technology
English
English as a Second Language
Equity
Essential Learnings
Five to eight – Early Years
Health and Physical Education
Languages
Mathematics
Multicultural Education
Science
Society and Environment
Three to five – Early Years
Vocational Education

Band Reference Groups

Early Years Band Reference Group
Middle Years Band Reference Group
Primary Years Band Reference Group
Senior Years Band Reference Group

Project groups

Chairs of Experts Working Groups
Executive Officers meetings 1999 and 2000
SACSA Team – minutes for 1999 and 2000
Steering Committee
Appendix 4

Participants in the evaluation

4.1 SACSA Co-ordination Team

May 1999 – January 2000

Jennifer Stehn, Associate Director Curriculum
Helen Campagna-Wildash, Assistant Director Curriculum
Wendy Engliss, Curriculum Superintendent
Marie Dorrington, Senior Project Officer SACSA, Senior Years, Catholic Education
Deonne Smith, Curriculum Manager (to end term 2 1999)
Marie O’Toole, Curriculum Manager (to end term 2 1999)
Helen Strickland, Senior Project Officer SACSA Primary Years (terms 3 and 4 1999)
Jennifer Emery, Senior Project Officer SACSA Early Years
Lia Tedesco, Senior Project Officer SACSA Middle Years (July 1999 – January 2000)

January to December 2000

Helen Campagna-Wildash, Assistant Director Curriculum
Peter Daw, Coordinator, SACSA Senior Years focus – Catholic Education
Jennifer Emery, Senior Project Officer SACSA Early Years
Michele Smith, Senior Project Officer SACSA Primary Years (January – March 2000)
Brendan Ryan, Senior Project Officer SACSA
  Primary Years (March – July 2000)
  Middle Years (July 2000 – January 2001)
Rose Chambers, Senior Project Officer SACSA Middle Years (January – July 2000)*
Mariella Hocking, Senior Project Officer, SACSA Early Years: Children’s Services
  (March 2000 ongoing)
Kaye Johnson, Senior Project Officer SACSA Primary Years (July 2000 – January 2001)
Judith Clelland, Senior Project Officer, SACSA Equity (January – April 2000)
Julie Roberts, Senior Project Officer SACSA Equity (April 2000 – January 2001)
Anne Boyle, Project Officer SACSA (January – July 2000)
Marie Sanderson, Senior Project Officer, SACSA Senior Years (July 2000 onwards)

*not interviewed
4.2 Chairs and Executive Officers of Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups Interviewed

Rick Baldock
Jenny Barnett
Roy Brown
Stephanie Burley
David Butler
Helen Campagna-Wildash
Alan Casey
Pam Cramond
Margaret Creeper
Joy De Leo
Jennifer Emery
Wendy Engliss
Susan Frazer
Christine Hatzi
Mariella Hocking
Paul Hughes
Kaye Johnson
Michelle Kohler
Susan Krieg
Ken Lounton
Denise MacGregor
Carolyn Matthews
Peggy McNeil
David McRae
Gerry Mulhearn
Des O’Connor
Peter Russo
Brendan Ryan
Marie Sanderson
Brendyn Semmens
Paul Sharkey
Georgina Smith
Philomena Stapelton
Rod Sutherland
Kath Thelning
Yin Thomas
Chris Underwood
Jackie Walter
Carol Williams
Pam Winter
Chris Witt
Yvonne Zeegens
Anna Maria Zupancic
4.3 Members of Experts Working Groups and Band Reference Groups who attended focus group sessions

Alex Batty
Julie Bishop
Ekaterina Briffa
Byrnette Brown
Julie Clune
Anne Marie Coghlan
Jason Dallwitz
Liz Horrocks
Graden Horsell
Christine Kingston
Kath McGuigan
Peggy McNeil
David Northcote
Richard Smith
Vicki Stokes
Tom Stone
John Walsh
Matt Wenham
Carolyn White
Bernada Sanchez
4.4 Participants in Steering Committee Interviews

Ms Helen Campagna-Wildash  Department of Education Training and Employment
Mr Peter Daw  Catholic Education SA
Dr Janet Keightley  Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia
Mr Gary Le Duff  South Australian Independent Schools Board
Professor Kevin Marjoribanks  University of Adelaide
Dr Michael Rowan  University of South Australia
Ms Georgina Smith  Catholic Education SA
Ms Jennifer Stehn  Department of Education Training and Employment
Dr Vin Thomas  Catholic Education SA
Professor Faith Trent  Flinders University
Ms Helen Whelan  Independent Schools Board

4.5 Writers who were interviewed in the evaluation

CEASA
Rosie Antenucci
Sally Barnes
Jennifer Harris
Chris Mutton
Mary Sayers
Larry Spry
Christine Thompson
Yvonne Oxenberry

UNISA
Mike Chartres
Steve Kerr
Kathy Paige
Lyn Tonkin
4.6 Service providers interviewed in the evaluation

Rosemary Sandstrom                          President CEASA
Ian Smythe                                  Executive Officer CEASA
Angela Scarino                              Head: School of International Studies, UNISA
Associate Professor Alan Reid                Associate Professor Dean of Education, UNISA
Dr Karen Starr                              Chief Writer for the consortium
Dr Bob Carbines                             Erebus Consulting Partners
Dr John Manefield                           
Dr Tim Wyatt                                
Adrian Harvey-Beavis                         Australian Council for Educational Research
Greg Macaskill                              
Silvia McCormack                            
Margaret W Yu                                

4.7 Evaluation Steering Committee membership

Shaun Coghlan (Chair)                       Principal, Noarlunga Downs Primary School
Helen Campagna-Wildash                      Assistant Director, Curriculum
Peter Daw                                   Principal Consultant, Catholic Education SA
Sr Josephine Dubiel                         Principal, Mt Carmel College
Sally Paterson                              Principal, Mannum High School
Chris Shakes                                Assistant Director, Children’s Services
David Butler                               Executive Officer
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