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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the area of Community Cultural Development (CCD) through a longitudinal Case Study. It postulates that the potential long-term outcomes of a successful CCD process, including the creation of communities and networks, as well as continuing cultural development for the participants, are frustrated by arts policy and funding. The analysis of the Case Study is contextualised by an examination of the history of CCD in Australia and the cultural policy framework for the funding of CCD projects.

This thesis addresses the following question: Do the long-term outcomes - of creating networks, creation of communities and continued cultural development - succeed? It is hypothesised that CCD can achieve social change through two types of long term outcomes. The two types of long-term outcomes are - personal level outcomes and community level outcomes. Both levels of outcomes are examined in relation to the Case Study.

However, the cultural policy framework for CCD does not support long-term CCD. It is problematic on many levels - funding, evaluation, and the infrastructure support of CCD. It is asserted that there is urgent need for a re-assessment on the way in which CCD is supported in Australia. And that this assessment examines whether the sector is in fact supportive of the aim of CCD - to effect social change.

CCD is a process and an artform underpinned by a social change agenda. This research aims to further develop the academic body of work in the field of CCD, to create new questions, ideas and problems for further research to build upon.
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Community Cultural Development (CCD) is an Australia Council funding category, which was developed in the late 1980s as an alternative to the 'parochial' community arts (Hawkins, 1993). CCD is a potentially powerful way of working. The ‘process’ engages practitioners, participants, community organisations, government, and cultural artforms in consultation, exploration and celebration of identity.

This thesis addresses the following question ‘Do the long term intentions of CCD - of creating networks, creation of communities, and continued cultural development - succeed?’ This question assumes that CCD projects and programs do have long term outcomes and that the three identified above are long term outcomes of CCD projects and/or processes. How did I arrive at these assumptions? What background and history do I have in CCD to bring these assumptions to bear on a theoretical debate about the sector? Following is a brief history of how my experience in CCD underlies these assumptions.

The community arts and CCD emerged and developed within a context of radical and political change. The community arts, predecessor to CCD, were developed in response to the radical social and cultural change of the sixties and seventies. The community arts movement became synonymous with an era of ‘empowerment’, ‘community’ and ‘participation’ and quickly spread throughout much of the world facilitating the establishment of ‘participatory’ arts programs in Europe, America, Canada, South America, Asia and Australia.

During this time the debate about ‘what is community arts?’ emerged. Defining the diversity of the field proved problematic, and as result, in Australia, the community arts movement transformed itself in the late eighties. Signalled by a change of name, to CCD, which emphasised process as much as outcomes, CCD has become replicated around the world, exemplified by The Rockefeller Foundation’s research into the area (Adams & Goldbard, 2001).

Questions do arise from this name change. What led to this change? What is CCD? What is the core aim of community cultural development? Is it about a social change agenda, or does it, simply, have the agenda of creating ‘arts’ and ‘culture’ with communities? Can it be both? Does one have to precede the other? This thesis tracks the emergence of CCD out of community arts via the Australia Council, which it is claimed by Hawkins, brought the concept into being.
Community cultural development comes from a “social democratic program of reform or as a socialist program of radical change” (Petersen, 1991: 7). This raises the question of where community cultural development belongs - as a program of reform, rather than a radical agenda of ‘social change’? (Peel, 1990). This brings the reader to the core debate of this thesis; what is achieved through CCD? Understanding the nature and aims of CCD is essential in order to recognise the potential of the impacts and outcomes of CCD. It is crucial for practitioners to be a part of the search for ‘what works’, what can really ‘change’ things within a community. The thesis will also examine potential impacts of CCD and the limitations the cultural policy framework has had on the potential of the outcomes of CCD.

Essential to these arguments is the contemplation of the management of CCD as an art form. Does CCD really constitute an art form or is it a process which we, as arts practitioners, use in our work with communities? CCD is quite an oddity within the ‘arms-length’ governmental funding body, the Australia Council. It is seen, traditionally as a radical sister section of a more conservative funding system (Hawkins, 1993). On the other hand, the funding history and longevity of CCD within the structures of government pose a theory; that the continued existence of community cultural development serves some purpose within the confines of the government. So what does this mean? What are the policy makers trying to achieve by persisting with CCD within a neo liberal economic framework?

**Background**

Working from a point of integrity is essential for honest communication. In his article *Community Arts and Cultural Democracy*, Alan Petersen strongly suggests that “…if community arts workers are serious about effecting cultural change, they need to closely inspect the ideologies which underlie their very own practices” (1991: 2). With this in mind, the following is an outline of my practice in CCD and the ideologies that underlie my work and research.

I have been involved in CCD for eight years. After completing my BA Communications (Theatre/Media) at Charles Sturt University – Mitchell campus, I was inspired by my studies of popular theatre, cabaret, circus, beat poetry, and community arts. The obvious next step, after dabbling in national indigenous student politics for a while, was to return home to the Hunter Valley and undertake a Masters in Theatre Arts (Community Theatre) at the University of Newcastle. With the help of my supervisor, David Watt, a practitioner and respected theorist in community arts, I
continued my interest in community arts and the newly emerging CCD. Watt was instrumental in my obtaining a traineeship in Community Cultural Development with the Workers Cultural Action Committee (WCAC) - the arts arm of the Newcastle Trades Hall Council. This traineeship was amongst the first in Australia, offered through the NSW Community Arts Association (NSW CAA). A group of thirteen trainees were attached to various CCD organisations, studying and working in the area of CCD for a year.

The course was made up of modules that we trainees were committed to doing as well as participating as a full time working member of our organisation, albeit on a trainee’s wage. This year opened my eyes to the possibilities of CCD process. I worked on many projects over that year as a CCD trainee at WCAC. These included project management roles for the Homelink and Homestart projects; as organiser for the Women Trade Unionist Activist Group; co-curator of LOOK BACK an exhibition of Women and work in the Hunter Valley, NSW, over the past century; facilitator for the establishment of the Hunter Anti-Violence Project. As well, in my capacity as an indigenous CCD trainee, I served as a member of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Arts Officer Alliance.

By far the most important project of my life so far has been SAY IT OUT LOUD! – a women’s storytelling and story writing project centred in Cessnock and Kurri Kurri, NSW. I started developing the idea for a CCD project set in my hometown as one aspect of my Masters degree. I was able to develop a draft template for a CCD project and an application for funding to the Australia Council.

Upon my employment with WCAC, and through the impetus of the traineeship module, I started to use SAY IT OUT LOUD! as the project which I developed parallel to the other course modules, demonstrating my knowledge through the establishment of the project. I went about canvassing support in the community, consulting members of the community through the establishment of a steering committee and gaining local government support. Seeing the community take control of a project is the ultimate aim of CCD. The steering committee had the responsibility for the application and funding. I was overjoyed when we received a seeding grant from the Australia Council of $20,000 to give the project a go.

I was employed as the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project manager and set about managing the project with the steering committee. It was a great success in many ways, though, in some respects, it was also flawed. I will critically examine SAY IT OUT LOUD! as a case study within the methodology section of this thesis.
The lack of employment opportunities in my chosen field, the closure of BHP, the election of the Howard Government, and the politics of the CCD community in Newcastle all led to my decision to move to Melbourne. I gained a place in the Victorian College of the Arts, Graduate Diploma in Arts Management. This postgraduate study lead me back to an area of study I had previously avoided, research. After completing a minor thesis in 1998 as a part of my Graduate Diploma, I decided I wanted to explore CCD leading to my candidature for the Masters in Creative Arts (Research) at the University of Melbourne.

**Methodological considerations**

The methodology for this case study is empirical and experiential in nature, drawing upon information gathered in interviews and on the experiences of the participants and myself in the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project, which is the case study for this thesis. The methods used include focus group interviews conducted with the two groups of participants from the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project; individual interviews conducted with the two key stakeholders from the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project and in-depth interviews conducted with CCD practitioners. Other secondary sources used in this Chapter include the application to the Australia Council’s Community Cultural Development Board (CCDB) for funding for SAY IT OUT LOUD!; the acquittal report to the Australia Council’s CCDB for SAY IT OUT LOUD! and the collection of writing produced as an outcome of the project.

In addition there is the researcher as observer, facilitator and evaluator of this project. This produces a blend of personal and professional engagement with the project. There is a more distanced perspective that develops through reflection, analysis, and synthesis. This is present in the structure and discourse of this thesis. There is also an element of narrative and anecdote present in the interviews and selected quotes featured in this thesis. This combined methodology draws on empirical, experiential, personal anecdote and more distanced analysis and theorisation of the CCD process.

The existing relationship between myself, and the individuals/community that are featured in this research suggests that this research must be viewed as reflexive. The reflection upon past experiences and work is what Jan Fook (1996) refers to as ‘critical incident analysis’. This is when reflection and reflexivity meet to explore and evaluate the process of work. This process is where the areas of practice, reflection, research and theory meet producing a critical ‘praxis’ (Freire, 1974b).
The relationship between researcher and the researched is one of mutual friendship. This relationship has been built upon foundations of trust, goodwill and admiration through the planning, implementation and evaluation stages of the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project. There is an air of truth in the relationship and the power in this relationship, certainly is fluid – the researcher has the power to call the women back to a meeting three years later and ask to question and evaluate their experiences. Though, on the other hand, the women have power by directing the sessions, being in control of the time schedule and their contribution. The mutual trust in this relationship has produced significant results.

In evaluating the long term outcomes of this CCD project I have taken into consideration the possibility of the ‘yea’ factor which Wadsworth in her text, Everyday Evaluation on the Run (1997), describes where participants are extremely positive in their responses, though as the reader will notice in the results there was a healthy discussion (definitely weighted towards the positive) that has produced some unexpected considerations.

Another methodological consideration pertaining to this group of participants is the ethics of confidentiality for the women and the ethical consideration regarding my personal investment in this research. Confidentiality was addressed from the outset. All interviewees and participants were asked to sign a consent form for the interview – one of which was kept by the interviewee and the other included in this thesis (See Appendix F(a)). The participants were also given a plain language statement which outlined the research project, contact details for the researcher and researcher’s supervisor, the institution at which the researcher is studying and a summary of the benefits of the study, what is expected of the participants and a confidentiality clause which allows for the interviewee to have editorial input on their interview as seen in the final product, the right to withdraw consent and the right to be named or kept anonymous (See Appendix F(b)).

The investment I have in this process is an ethical and methodological issue. From the beginning of the research it has been acknowledged that evaluating a project that has been a big part of my professional life is fraught with issues of subjectivity and bias. By accepting the methods of in depth qualitative evaluation, I have approached an understanding of research methodology issues of the validity, reliability, and rigor in relation to this research. I approach this thesis with an open mind and an acknowledgement of my personal investment in this process. It has been, therefore, my utmost responsibility to present the results and analysis of this research in a valid, rigorous and reliable way.
**Thesis Outline**

This thesis places the Australian community arts movement in an arts and cultural policy framework. Chapter One outlines how the arts are supported in Australia, at a federal, state/territory, and local level. Examinations of the Australia Council, Arts Victoria and Cessnock City Council will elucidate the changing nature of arts and policy within the three tiers of government in Australia. This Chapter will also detail the modifications of federal cultural policy over the last thirty years.

The establishment of the community arts, its origins and maturation lay the foundation for Chapter Two’s discussion of the development of CCD. CCD is an Australia Council funding category that despite its government birthplace has defied a common usage definition. The debate surrounding the definition of the sector and the establishment of working definitions for community arts and Community Cultural Development are components of this Chapter.

Chapter Three explores the tensions of the politics of Community Cultural Development. Primarily, the CCD sector struggles with the politics of funding CCD and the politics that inform the artform and process of CCD. Despite the expansion of CCD, the sector’s reliance on funding has created a dependency mentality. Issues of CCD’s theoretical naivete and the ever-expanding nature of the sector have created a crisis in the vision for CCD.

Ideally the outcomes of CCD support the power of the process. Chapter Four will look at the problems involved in measuring the outcomes of CCD. Key to the measurement is a detailed examination of the management of CCD – how is success identified? And therefore, how can it be measured? This Chapter reviews the difference between short and long term aims and objectives, impacts and outcomes. Through discussion of the various measurements of CCD this Chapter identifies what are commonly agreed long term outcomes, what are not and why I chose the three long term outcomes of CCD to be proven in this thesis – creation of communities, creation of networks and continued cultural development.

Chapter Five presents the Case Study of SAY IT OUT LOUD! A CCD project initiated by myself and located in the regional NSW towns of Cessnock and Kurri Kurri, SAY IT OUT LOUD! was a women’s story-writing and story-telling project implemented in 1996. The case study details the history of the project and explores its aftermath. The case study will cover the research and consultations phase; the funding of the project; the implementation and evaluation. The case study
makes use of primary materials such as the application for funding to the Australia Council, the Acquittal report to the Australia Council, group interviews with participants, stakeholders and key CCD practitioners.

Chapter Six details the ‘follow up’ evaluation with the participants of SAY IT OUT LOUD! which I conducted in 1999, four years after the completion of the project. This Chapter is divided into two sections - Six A which analyses the personal outcomes the project had on the participants, and Six B which expands the personal level outcomes into community level outcomes, expressly addressing the three key outcomes this thesis has isolated. Primary materials such as the group interviews conducted with the Cessnock women and the Kurri Kurri women as well as interviews conducted with CCD practitioners are used to illuminate these discussions.

The final Chapter will examine the role of government funding and policy in relation to CCD. A desire for a long-term approach to CCD does not sit easily in the current system of policy and funding which primarily imposes short-term time lines, tied to annual funding cycles. This has placed practitioners in an extraordinary situation. The sector is dependent on the government for its livelihood. How can issues like the development of regional infrastructure and the implementation agenda for a ‘culture of evaluation’, that need further policy debate and development, help practitioners to articulate their vision for the future of CCD?

As identified earlier, CCD is a process, a form of social intervention, which uses cultural tools to examine issues, identity and community. This research aims to further develop the academic body of work in the field of CCD, to create new questions, ideas and problems for further research to build upon. CCD is a potentially powerful tool that ultimately aims to achieve social change. If CCD aims in the long term to effect social change, what the sector needs to articulate is how our projects and programs can contribute to this agenda.
CHAPTER ONE

Arts and Community in Australia

Community Cultural Development uses community development principles of democracy, social justice, participation and advocacy in combination with cultural tools - such as theatre, storytelling, or visual arts - to create community based arts practice that is powerful, has meaning and has a beneficial long term impact on participants and audience.

Community Cultural Development sits in a unique place within the arts in Australia. One could surmise that CCD has been deemed an artform by the Australia Council, due to its status as one of the nine Council Boards. It is, however, more validly defined as a context for practice – a platform of ideals on which to base work in all art forms. Yet, it has come to represent not only a process by participatory arts are made, but also a kind of art. This art is often celebratory, constructed by community, with an exploration of identity and self. When labelling a type of art, theorists construct criteria by which to view and engage with the art. This criteria creates a framework for meaning through which recognisable characteristics, technique, and expression of the art can be understood. CCD can therefore be identified as an artform with its own unique characteristics. Even though CCD can include performance, visual arts, or writing, CCD art collectively maintains a meaning across the sector.

CCD is also a process, a way of working with communities, within a community context, through a cultural vehicle. In this thesis CCD is recognised as both a process and an artform. So how did CCD come to occupy such a key role in a federal funding program for the arts? How did CCD develop, with its social justice and advocatory role, a place within a government institution, like the Australia Council?

The policy environment has changed. Whereas once the arts were supported within their own discrete policy environment they are now only one element of a comprehensive cultural policy framework. This Chapter will explore how the arts are supported in Australia in relation to the development of CCD. To understand how arts practice is shaped in Australia, we must understand the three tiers of government, which determine arts policy and funding.
Arts Policy Framework

Federal Government – Australia Council

The Australian Council for the Arts (ACFTA) was established in 1968 by then Prime Minister John Gorton (1968 – 1971) who acted upon Prime Minister Harold Holt’s vision for a national arts body (Stevenson, 2000: 46). This newly formed body was responsible for providing the public “…with theatre, ballet, touring art exhibitions, performances of classical music, crafts and non-commercial films” (Rowse, 1985: 11). Dr H. C. “Nugget” Coombs iii became the inaugural Chair of the newly formed federal arts body until his exit in 1974 (Rowse, 1985: 13). The ACFTA became a statutory authority and changed its name to the Australia Council in 1975 under the newly passed Australia Council Act 1975 (Stevenson, 2000: 48).

The Australia Council has a charter that distinguishes it from state and local government arts policy bodies. There are three aspects of the Australia Council that make it distinct in its structure and approach to funding the arts in Australia. Firstly, it is an arms-length body with its own Act of Parliament, as distinct from those, which are directly answerable to the relevant State/Territory Minister/s or Local Government Council. Secondly, it profiles a peer-assessment approach to funding, whereby eminent arts practitioners are appointed to artform Boards and Council Committees to act as advisers and assessors. Peer assessment is also used throughout State/Territory and local governments, though in an advisory capacity only. What makes the federal peer assessment model different is the Australia Council’s use of peers as the funding deciders and policy makers. Thirdly, the Australia Council has held an unwavering commitment to excellence in the arts (Stevenson, 2000: 50). These three elements have created an arts bureaucracy that is strategic and unique in Australia in its approach to funding the arts.

The Australia Council (2003) is currently made up of nine artform Boards which assess, administer and direct funding and policy for each artform – namely the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Arts, Community Cultural Development, Dance, Theatre, Literature, Major Performing Arts, New Media Arts, Music and the Visual Arts & Crafts. The Australia Council funding and policy section also includes a number of committees – Nomination Committee, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Grants Committee, and Australia Council Multicultural Advisory Committee. These specialist Committees supplement the Boards with expert ‘peer’ advice and assessment.
The Australia Council is governed by its own Council which is made up of the Chair (appointed by the Governor General), the CEO, Chairs of the Boards and other appointments by the Federal Minister for the Arts. The Australia Council also hosts many divisions – Arts Development, Corporate Affairs, Policy Communication Research, Finance & Services, and Audience & Market Development (Australia Council, 2002). All in all, the Australia Council has developed into a bureaucracy, at arms-length from though still responsible to the government for supporting and delivering arts for all Australians.

Our vision is to: enable Australia’s arts and its artists to pursue excellence; preserve, maintain and develop the distinctive features of Australia's culture; ensure all Australians have the opportunity to engage with the arts and to enjoy a rich cultural life; and to shape a future Australia in which the arts play a meaningful and vital role in everyday life (Australia Council, 2001: 1).

Community arts became a part of the Australia Council’s agenda for access and equity in 1970 when the Council established the Special Project Fund. It was set up as an “…administrative solution to the problem of unclassifiable activities and a response to new arts developments” (Hawkins, 1993: 29). This ‘administrative solution’ was set to become one of the most dynamic Boards of the Australia Council – a responsive and directive amalgam of practice and reflection in the face of change over the coming thirty years of development. The Special Project Fund became the Community Arts and Development Committee in 1973 whose mission it was to tackle “The ‘problem’ of uneven participation in the arts…” (Hawkins, 1991: 15).

The Community Arts and Development Committee of the Australia Council did not gain independence until 1978 when it became its own Board, furnished with peer advisory Board members, staff and a pool of cash to distribute (Hawkins, 1991: 46). The five years between 1973 – 1978 were most difficult for community arts. From 1975 on, under the Prime Ministership of the Liberal Party’s Malcolm Fraser, the arts, like many other areas of government funding, faced budget cuts. Fraser reinstated a large percentage of the funding cut from the arts, later in his term in office, though the Fraser years left a severe scar on the community arts within the Australia Council. The community arts faced constant pressure and the threat of extinction. Due to successful lobbying efforts by the artists and communities, who were supported by the Federal Community arts program, the sector was able to stress the need to not only maintain but also expand the community arts.
The Community Arts Board was rewarded in 1978 when it “…received approximately 8.5% of the Australia Council’s ‘support for the arts’ budget” (Hawkins, 1991: 46). This new found acknowledgment lasted less than a decade when the Board was demoted to committee status in 1987. Now just a Committee of the Council, it sported a new and exciting name. CCD, which was now an official government invention, created a new approach to the work, with an endorsed social agenda. This gave focus to the process and practice of the sector. The Community Arts Board had become the Community Cultural Development Committee, only later to be renamed the Community Cultural Development Unit (Hawkins, 1991: 46).

All this change and movement demonstrates the dynamic nature of the ‘artform’ as it struggled with the changes of government, policy and community support. CCD became a mix of social, community and arts priorities, constantly altering its demeanour to suit current trends. Reinstated as a Board of the Australia Council in the early nineties, the Community Cultural Development Board has become increasingly streamlined to fit in with the strategic agenda of the Australia Council who are interested in not only funding individual artists, organisations and communities but also research, professional development and partnerships between government, business and community (Australia Council, 1994). By the end of the millennium, a whole new area of expansion for the sector has indeed opened up.

**State and Territory – Department of the Arts and Community Arts Networks**

Arts funding at the State and Territory level has traditionally consisted of government as patron of ‘State of the Art’ facilities maintenance – libraries, museums, art galleries, and performing arts centres (Stevenson, 2000). Today the Ministry of the Arts in each state and territory houses a funding program, which prioritises arts organisations, networks, festivals and individuals. These programs assist a majority of State companies – theatre, dance, opera, ballet, orchestral (Stevenson, 2000: 71). State and Territory funding of CCD is inconsistent across the country, with some States/Territories creating innovative CCD funding programs and others concentrating on funding regional arts, which could be understood as CCD. The funding agenda of states and territories in the nineties has been driven by an ‘industry-development’ purpose, as Stevenson details;
industry development seeks to establish and advance links between the “cultural industries” and other industry sectors; this articulation involves the following three key elements, which focus on encouraging the development of new strategic partnerships between arts organisations and other industries...Second, the discourse of industry development repositions the arts themselves as an industry sector...{and} As an “industry”, the arts may rely on government support and protection from time to time, but are expected to be (becoming) primarily self-supporting (Stevenson, 2000: 79).

The most ostentatious example of State and Territory governments’ industry-development agenda for the arts is exemplified in Victorian Liberal Party Premier Jeff Kennett’s (1994 - 1999) Arts 21. Kennett’s cultural policy for the’ twenty-first century’ aimed to place Victoria “…as an international centre for the arts” (Arts Victoria, 1994: 3). To achieve this goal Arts Victoria, the State arts bureaucracy, outlined the following six strategies – “…Into the Information Age, Providing World Class Facilities, Creating Great Programming, Promoting Leadership, Customer Focused Marketing and Delivering to Australia and the World” (Arts Victoria, 1994: 3). This grand strategic plan did not leave any room for CCD to be funded in a Liberal government run Victoria.

The State and Territory led industry development agenda for the arts have shifted the arts from a cultural framework into an economic framework. For CCD this signified a problematic shift. It places the onus on practitioners to measure, evaluate and promote the economic multipliers of the work. Since the seventies, and the advent of a sophisticated arts funding approach, there has been transference of terminology – audience to consumer, ‘the arts’ into arts industry. This has created much anxiety within the arts as organisations, communities and individuals are forced to confront and learn business planning, new financial and management skills. The outcome of this approach suggests that the arts should edge towards autonomy from government funding. All this industry development has created managerialism within the arts to which the arts has responded both positively and negatively.

The positive advancements the arts have gained from States and Territories ‘industry-development’ can be seen as a much more vigorous attitude to management, which in itself creates many more opportunities, and of course, much more work. The compulsory ‘measure and evaluate’ with a major emphasis on an economic framework has created opportunities for the arts to substantiate outcomes and achievements. Also, this positive outcome has created new challenges to the arts, as
we must now carry the burden of proof as to why the arts are important in industrial and economic terms and therefore deserve funding.

Donald Horne in his Keynote Address to the Regional Arts Australia National Conference on Saturday 12th October 2002 articulates this new terminology using the term ‘economisation of culture’. He states "It’s the kind of language that turns our society….into the economy …our citizens into …the consumers …and our public funds into …taxpayers money. It is also the kind of language that reduces poems or plays or dances to ‘product’ and that speaks of the need to give art its own brand" (Horne, 2002: 2).

The major disadvantage of the Department’s move to ‘industry-development’ by State and Territory Arts is the lack of a place for CCD. This area of the arts is not mentioned once in Arts 21 and has failed to attract policy support from Arts Victoria until the recent election of the Bracks Labor Government. Premier Steve Bracks (1999 -) has highlighted Arts and the Community as a key platform of the ALP’s Arts Policy for his second term.

The Victorian ALP State Government Election 2002 arts platform was entitled “Creative Communities”. It states “Labor believes that the arts are the heart of a robust democratic society and the creative industries are central to our prosperity. We recognise that the arts play a pivotal role in the economic and social life of Victoria” (Australian Labor Party Victoria Branch, 2002: 1). Steve Bracks committed "…$3 million over 4 years to build creative communities through arts, education and community partnerships which include small and medium company residencies in outer-metropolitan, regional and rural communities working with networks and clusters of schools and community organisations (eg senior citizens groups, service clubs, local tourism organisations)” (Australian Labor Party Victoria Branch, 2002: 5).

The new approach by a Brack’s Labor Government in their second term with majorities in both houses of parliament will, hopefully, have a great effect on the way the arts are seen, supported and promoted as ‘the heart’ of the society in Victoria. With CCD as a key player in revitalising community participation in the creation of culture and the changing of society, Victoria can begin to plan to become the “Place to Be".
Local – Cultural Planning and Development

Local Government, the third tier of government in Australia, is the closest to the ground and therefore to the community. Local Councils are responsible for facilities and maintenance of local cultural resources like libraries, civic centres, halls and meeting rooms, museums and art galleries. Stevenson claims that without specific policy direction cultural provision was “ad hoc” in local government until the 1980s when the Australia Council intervened (Stevenson, 2000: 96).

The implementation of “Cultural Planning”, strategic planning for cultural development, cultural expenditure and cultural mapping for Local Councils has created a more systematic and policy driven approach to funding cultural development at a local level (Stevenson, 2000: 96). The Australia Council engaged local councils in a strategic planning of their own cultural development by joint-funding the employment of Community Arts Officers. Community Arts Officers were introduced to engage communities in cultural development and oversee the infrastructure development in local Australia (Hawkins, 1991). Cultural Planning has been developed within the paradigm of CCD, from within the Australia Council. A management approach to mapping community resources, services and activity, Cultural Planning aims to use a CCD like process of community consultation, in order to strategically devise a cultural plan for a specific area/community.

In the late nineties, Marla Guppy and her consultancy Guppy and Associates produced a report for the Australia Council entitled Better Places – Richer Communities. The report details a policy “framework for action” as well as case studies designed to enliven Local Councils, Australia wide to engage in a cultural planning policy framework (1997). Supported by the Australian Local Government Cultural Development Strategy, the Australia Council has facilitated the third tier of government to engage their communities in the development of culture. “By responding to local pressures and external opportunities Councils’ have been key shaping forces of local cultural identity. They have over a short period of time accepted an increasing responsibility for the social, economic and environmental considerations of local residents alongside physical infrastructure considerations” (Guppy, 1997: 6).

In 2002, Cultural Development has become a key part of the Australian Local Government Association’s (ALGA) National Agenda. The National Agenda acknowledges that the role of Local Government is not only as facilities maintenance but also in community cultural development and “…environmental design in building creative, innovative and livable communities…” (2002: 16). The
Association, made up of all Australian Local Governments, also aims to “...encourage the integration of cultural planning with economic, physical, social and environmental planning” (ALGA, 2002: 16). Cessnock City Council, a local council situated in the Hunter Valley region of New South Wales, is the Council that not only participated but also auspiced the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project. In the 2002-2005 Cessnock City Council Management Plan, the Local Government Area is described as:

...a variety of geographic features, which include large areas of state forest, grazing land and areas for viticulture. The isolation of the Cessnock area, from other employment centres, coupled with the decline in the traditional economic base, has created a void in work opportunities, particularly in the manufacturing sector. These factors have also combined to place pressure on transport systems, subsequently creating a heavy reliance on private vehicles (Cessnock City Council, 2002: Part B, 3).

Cessnock City Council is primarily concerned with the maintenance of roads, rates and rubbish to a vast shire. However, Cultural Services are expanding with extensions to the traditional Library Services on offer. In 2000/01 Cessnock City Council’s Cultural Services established a Community Cultural Development Dollar for Dollar Grant Program, which distributed an annual budget of $10,000 (Cessnock City Council, 2002: 117). This is a significant development given the Council’s Cultural Services, which have been primarily focused on Library Services. Unfortunately, the Cessnock City Council voted late last year to cut the Community Cultural Development Dollar for Dollar Grant Program in order to fund roads, rates and rubbish. This clearly demonstrates the unstable support for CCD and the often-vacillating political will of Local Government Councils.

**Cultural Policy Framework**

The construction of a cultural policy framework for Australia has primarily been created in the hands of federal political parties and the policy-making peers in the Australia Council. Over the past twenty-eight years the political party in power has had a significant influence on the arts agenda in Australia and hence, produced an evolving policy framework subject to successive political agendas. The establishment of the Australia Council in 1975, as an arms-length decision making
body capable of leading the arts through a policy agenda, created a complex nexus between federal politics and arts policy. The Australia Council has the ability to make leadership and policy decisions; in fact that’s what the body was established to do. Yet, it remains at the financial mercy of the federal government, as it relies solely on it for funding. The federal government also has a role in creating new policy initiatives that it funds via the Australia Council, for instance the LOUD Festival, a youth arts festival, initiated in 1997. These specialist policy priority areas are where the influence of the federal government shapes Australia’s cultural policy framework.

Prime Minister Gough Whitlam’s Australian Labor Party government (1972 – 1975) was responsible for the expansion of the arts budget (Macdonnell, 1992: 90). Whitlam saw “…a new role for the arts, which was neither the adulation of past icons nor the throw-away culture of North America” (Macdonnell, 1992: 91). Whitlam’s government was elected after twenty-three years of Conservative government reign and during the counter-culture inspired early seventies. Whitlam’s government changed the name of the Australian Council for the Arts to the Australia Council through the safe passage of the Australia Council Act in 1975. In 1975 Prime Minister Gough Whitlam was dismissed from government by order of the Governor General, Sir John Kerr.

Malcolm Fraser became Prime Minister following the dismissal of the Whitlam Labor government; during this time Tony Staley was Minister for the Arts. Mr Staley was a staunch supporter of the arts, and an active campaigner for the establishment of a separate Board for the community arts. On the negative side, Malcolm Fraser’s Administrative Review Committee, known as the “Razor Gang”, completed the Whitlam initiated Industry Assistance Committee (IAC) Inquiry into the Performing Arts. It resulted in a 20% cut in staffing positions at the Australia Council (Macdonnell, 1992: 173-179).

The Australian Labor Party returned to office in 1983 with ex-head of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU), Bob Hawke, at the helm. Hawke campaigned that on his election to office he would match Whitlam’s funding for the arts, and increase access and participation in the arts. Hawke left Australia’s arts and cultural policy agenda with the relevant Minister for the Arts, due to his lack of understanding and interest. Macdonnell states that for Hawke sports came first and that artists are only important if they are ‘Great Australians’ (Macdonnell, 1992: 324-340). Despite that, Hawke’s time in office was a great time for CCD, as it was the era that the innovative Art and Working Life Incentive Project was introduced.

Hawke’s successor, Paul Keating, became one of the visionaries for arts and cultural policy in Australia. Keating, was the nominal ‘author’ of the seminal work Creative Nation published in 1994,
a precursor to the 1996 Federal election. Creative Nation talks about the vision for Australian culture, enacts a charter of cultural rights and enshrines the importance of excellence, access and equity, innovation, heritage, multiculturalism and Indigenous cultural rights. Much of the policy framework detailed in Creative Nation was enacted before the Australian Labor Party lost office in 1996.

The Liberal Party of Australia has not made the arts and cultural policy a priority during their three successive election wins - 1996, 1998 and 2002. The Howard Government Arts policy for the 2001 Election was entitled “Arts for All” and it states that “The Coalition’s plan for arts and culture is to encourage excellence in, and access to, all areas of the arts in Australia, and to encourage all Australians to celebrate our culture and creativity” (Liberal Party of Australia, 2001: 1). This statement can be seen as a reiteration of Creative Nation in its wish for excellence and access, and also as a reflection of the Australia Council charter. Howard, also interested in an industry approach to the arts states in the second paragraph of this policy, “That’s why my government has worked to broaden the reach of arts and culture in Australia, through audience and market development and through a strong focus on the arts in rural and regional areas” (Liberal Party of Australia, 2001: 1). The Federal government has signalled their interest in adopting a State and Territory like “industry-development” approach.

**Conclusion**

CCD, and the arts, in general, are funded in Australia primarily through the government. Federally, the Australia Council constructs the art and cultural policy framework, which provides leadership for the second and third tiers of government. Paradoxically, despite this, the Federal government is responsible for a fifth of the cultural funding allocated across the three levels of government. States and Territories allocate 47% of the cultural funding pie and Local Government 33% (Craik, 1996).

Today ‘the arts’ has a comprehensive cultural policy framework within which CCD sits as an important section. The establishment of the community arts movement paralleled the foundation of Australia’s cultural policy framework, symbolised in the establishment of the ACFTA and the Australia Council. Various governments have championed the community arts and others have failed to develop a vision for the community arts, not realising what it could achieve. Chapter Two
outlines the history of the community arts, its change to CCD leading to the current crisis of identity in which the sector finds itself today.
CHAPTER TWO

Community Arts in Australia

The original impulse behind what came to be community arts had been the desire...for a liberating self determination through which groups of people could gain, or regain, some degree of control over some aspects of their lives, and the parallel realisation that an artistic practice could itself be a form of cultural activism Kelly, 1984:29-30).

CCD is the outcome of a key paradigm shift from the Australian community arts movement of the 1970s. CCD has grown from the shortcomings of community arts, and is much more rigorous in practice, more theoretical in process, and has gained a professionalism, not previously achieved by community arts. CCD has challenged the disapproving gaze of the big ‘A’ arts, by becoming a legitimate artform and a major section of the Australian arts industry today. CCD is both a process and an artform, underpinned by a social change agenda.

As inferred in Chapter One, the birth time of Community Arts found itself intertwined with the cultural and social upheaval of the 1960s and 70s. Deborah Mills, former Director of the Community Cultural Development Unit of the Australia Council describes the era. "In those days it had its roots in the democratic upsurge we experienced during our opposition to Australia’s involvement in Vietnam, the women’s movement, the Land Rights struggle…” (Mills, 1986: 1). Internationally, the community arts movement was concerned with a return to local cultural development and celebration. Clinton recollects;

The community arts movement which began in the late 1960’s was concerned with the ‘cultural democratisation’ which, in the context of the times, meant more than access by the working class to arts and cultural opportunities – it meant enabling people to create their own cultures (1993: 6).

Originating in Great Britain’s community arts movement of the 1960s, Australia’s community arts movement gained momentum from the counter culture activist seventies. Historically, this was a
time encapsulated by a politicisation of the general public, a feeling of empowerment and social action. This awakening led to demonstrations of public strength, as unionists, communities of political ideologies, and divergent groups united against war in Vietnam reclaimed the streets. People in developed countries were active in recognising the rights of minority groups and marginalised sectors of society. A tidal wave of humanity rallied against mechanistic governments and bureaucracy. The slogans ‘Peace not War’, ‘All you need is love’ and ‘Think Global, Act Local’ epitomized the baby boomers’ generation.

The Australian Labor Party, under an oath of ‘democratic socialisation’ and led by Gough Whitlam, created social policy that encompassed the progressive public’s vision for the future. Elected as Prime Minister in the early seventies, Whitlam reformed the recalcitrant bureaucracies of the Liberal Government’s reign in office, with, amongst other policies, a commitment to the arts and to community. Gay Hawkins, in her book From Nimbin to Mardi Gras, states that the historical context which heralded the establishment of the Community Arts Board of the Australia Council was, “…shaped not only [by] the emergence of various social movements, from the counterculture to sexual liberation, but also by new trends in social policy” (Hawkins, 1993: xviii). Professor Andrea Hull, Director of the Victorian College of the Arts, recalls “There were five main areas where people were encouraged in that period of the Whitlam government, of which the arts was one – community education, community health, community assistance plans, community arts, and community planning…” (Appendix A, 1999:118).

The resurgence of localism resulting from this political awakening prioritised access and equity. Politically, governments saw the advantages of capitalising on the social and cultural action, which spearheaded the push to make our Western societies more egalitarian. The Australian community arts movement demanded that the government fund not only High Art. This was the beginning of the spread of a cultural egalitarianism and the blurring of the rigid distinctions between High and Low arts.

This Chapter investigates the debates surrounding the establishment of the community arts movement in Australia. The endless search for a universal definition for the sector has created a mass of meanings, which have proliferated throughout the arts, creating opportunities for practitioners to define their own framework for practice. Yet, it would seem that the lack of a unifying definition has impacted negatively on the community arts movement. The struggle between the ‘High’ and ‘Low’ arts has created class divisions within the arts. Has the acknowledgment of culture as ‘the whole way of life’ of a society over the past thirty years alleviated the socio-economic divisions in the arts? The transformation from community arts to CCD has potentially created a
more considered approach to working with community, foregoing the old practice of working for community. This Chapter will unravel the modification of process and definition in the early nineties that accompanied the development of Community Cultural Development.

High and Low arts

Whitlam’s commitment to artists, the arts and the democratic right of disadvantaged communities to access the arts are, in principle, a part of the vision of the Australia Council’s charter, reflecting access and participation in the arts as a primary aim of the nation’s arts funding body. The emergence of a federally funded program of community arts was a sign of political activism, when the younger generation actively achieved voice in the socio-economic environment of post-Vietnam Australia.

The arts had always been a haven for individual artists, crafts people, trades people, students and children. Traditionally, audiences of big ‘A’ arts, or ‘High arts’, were the upper class and bourgeoisie. Working class, under class and disadvantaged communities had little access to resources or education in the arts and even less access to viewing the 'high arts'. This economic distribution of cultural power found resonance within the community arts movement.

The upper and middle classes in Australia have been exceedingly successful in gaining power and influence over the shape of the society through government, institutions, business and services. The Australian Council for the Arts (1968 – 1975) prior to the Whitlam government’s social democratic agenda was content with servicing the class power of the upper and middle classes with their appetite for theatre, ballet, opera, and classical music. In consequence the concentration of capital was expended on ‘High arts’.

The working class, underclass and disadvantaged communities in Australia have traditionally concentrated their class-consciousness on improving working conditions, access to public health, affordable housing and social welfare conditions, as these policies are of major importance to the development of a better lifestyle. Graham Pitts, a writer and community arts practitioner, discusses class in his interview with Mike Foster featured in Australasian Drama Studies April 2000; “Class is about knowledge. The working class can be defined as the class which regards values and respects knowledge but not as a commodity” (Foster, 2000: 66). Pitts makes an important point; even though the access to knowledge is based on class, the way in which knowledge is valued and
used by each class is fundamentally different. Pitts argues that the working class value knowledge, yet do not exploit knowledge for economic gain. This, however, is a traditional and somewhat dated view of the working class. The rise of the importance of knowledge to the structures of class has always been important, yet today, as society values knowledge, and demands it as a basic minimum for employment; knowledge is synonymous with class power.

The use of class power for influence on government must be seen as relative to the role the classes play in capitalism. Traditionally, the Australian Labor Party was the champion of the working class and their policy priorities provided for working class communities to access services that were close to home and within reach, economically, socially and geographically. Today many would say that the Labor Party has lost touch with these values, yet the fact remains, as Hull states;

...everyone's entitled to have a return on their tax dollar, and we thought that everybody similarly was entitled to a return, and investment...from their dollars in terms of a cultural life (Appendix A, 1999:116).

“The original Community Arts objectives of ‘access to’ and ‘participation in’, were largely interpreted as a need to spread the civilising influence of art” (Feral Arts, 1999: 24). The hegemonic power of the Australia Council’s funding for touring ‘excellent’ art exemplifies the federal arts funder’s perception of fulfilling its responsibility to the Australian general public in terms of access and equity. This clearly placed regional, working class and disadvantaged communities and indeed the entire arts attending public, in the role of audience and consumer. This relegated the working class to a passive role, placed in the position of having to observe bourgeois cultural values through the artistically excellent production values of ‘High art’.

The terminology of ‘High’ and ‘low’ arts is problematic, as it implies a class bias. Hence the introduction of community arts, what Hawkins describes as an “official invention” by the government. “Community arts were not valued for their therapeutic effects but because they were a mechanism for maintaining collective identity or consciousness amongst different groups” (Hawkins, 1993: 15). Practitioners, in the CCD field, object to the concept that the federal government invented community arts and CCD. This is a disputed view of the history of the community arts in Australia.

It is widely accepted that community arts were well-established in Britain and that the Australia Council appropriated the name. There were many names, internationally, that labelled this process and artform, such as socio-cultural animation, cultural work, social action, local arts, and
participatory arts (Adams & Goldbard, 2001). On one hand the naming of the Community Arts Board in 1978 gave the Australian participatory arts a name. Yet does the labelling of an artform and process create it? Doesn’t the mere fact that ‘local arts’ or ‘participatory arts’ were happening throughout Australia, in many guises, create the impetus for government to consider funding it? Then again maybe the real question is ‘what is community arts?’

**Defining Community Arts**

Community Arts is about “enabling people to create their own cultures” (Clinton, 1993: 6). The term community arts came from Great Britain, although it was sometimes referred to as “…local arts or participatory arts” (Clinton & Glen, 1993: 93). Clinton and Glen describe, in their Chapter “Community Arts” in Butcher et al Community and Public Policy, how the Arts Council of Great Britain decided in 1945 that they needed to decentralise access to the arts. This sparked the beginning of the community arts movement and signified the first big fight between practitioners and bureaucrats – democratisation of culture versus cultural democracy. The crux of this debate is centred on the passive viewing of culture versus the participatory involvement in making culture.

As suggested earlier community arts is community-based participatory arts practice. This implies artists working with, for, and on behalf of communities or in a community context. Deidre Williams defines community art in her publication “What is Community Art?” as “…the artistic activities or artistic expression of a community” (1995: 1) Her definition denotes a passive rather than active tense, activities rather than the participation and the word artistic can be alienating. These small differences embody what has created a sea of many and varied definitions for the two words that make up the term ‘community art’.

Peel describes community arts as,

…practice [that] operates at a grassroots level. It is located within a community of interest or a geographical community. It recognises cultural diversity, the oppressed nature of people in society, and issues of gender, poverty, and alienation. Good community arts practice includes participation at all stages of the process and in its decision making processes (Peel, 1990: 10).
Peel’s definition relates the role of community and consultation in the ‘practice’ of community arts. It acknowledges that community arts is a practice of class-consciousness. In fact, community arts is closer to what would be defined as CCD, the key difference being the choice of the word ‘practice’ rather than ‘process’. Community arts were primarily artist-driven. The practice of community arts was the practice of relating the artists-driven project to community. These explications populate our common cultural framework and create a confusing and conflicting muddle of ideas.

The existence of such a loose term for an even looser gaggle of exemplifying projects and programs, has always been problematic for the community arts Movement. Graham Pitts recalls; “We feared definitions would exclude whereas we were about ‘inclusiveness’. Also we were convinced that if we defined what we were doing we would provide fixed targets for those who sought to prevent the development of the community arts movement” (Foster, 2000: 59). The burgeoning movement, according to Pitts, feared a sort of ‘death by definition’, a general malaise and misunderstanding. Owen Kelly, a British researcher, asserts very clearly the problematic issues that arise when attempting to define the field.

…community and art are both descriptions of processes which are, for our purposes, aims and goals, then we can see that the term community artist, while being a convenient label to use in some circumstances (most of which are concerned with funding), does not, in fact, describe what we do, but only why we do it (1984: 58).

The community arts movement has primarily acted as a collective vehicle for artists who worked collaboratively, in a teaching environment, with community. The emphasis for the community arts movement was the artist as initiator, teacher, and organiser. Artist led community arts had an enormous impact on the arts environment in Australia. Community arts reached directly to participants and engaged their creativity in collaborative art making. “The community arts movement in many countries has incorporated strategies to stimulate local creativity and improve skills and standards by using contributions from professional artists” (de Cuellar, 1995: 242).

Unfortunately the opposite view, a perception of working as a ‘missionary’ or of community art as ‘arts for therapy’ also defines the community arts. “Community Arts claimed to represent those who did not recognise art, to rescue these ‘others’ and improve them” (Hawkins, 1993: 13). This way of working defeats the key purpose of the community arts agenda, to create opportunities for access and participation in the arts for those who do not and, possibly, can not participate (Clinton, 1993: 6), exemplifying the problematic nature of the community arts. Is it for the community or with the
community? The lack of participation in the art making process of a community arts project created discord in defining the work of the movement.

The failure of community arts has been in the labelling of it as artist driven, with no community participation. The labelling of artist-only arts projects, that are placed in community contexts, as community arts is problematic. Furthermore, the labelling of projects whereby artists consult with communities and then create their own artistic work, such as a play or visual arts piece, as community art also confuses the concept of community art. The implication that community arts workers act on behalf of disadvantaged and working class people negatively implicates an already artistically maligned collective of artists and arts workers. However, it exposes the two-sided argument; should we take arts to the people (democratisation of the arts); or enable communities to initiate their own arts practice (cultural democracy).

The lack of a unifying definition for the community arts has created difference, divergence and debate. The majority of predominantly Australian academics, in writing about the community arts in Australia, start by trying to define this indescribable artform – David Watt, Mike Foster and Graham Pitts, and Deidre Williams, are just a few of the key writers in this area. All writers construct definitions based on their own premise of what the ultimate aim of community arts is. This has created an unease and has created a predicament in which the community arts cannot define or denote the key characteristics of the artform and process – the professionalism, the participation, the cultural context, the community consultation process, and the importance of the role of community and the art of community arts.

Community Arts to Community Cultural Development

By the mid-eighties there was a distinct adjustment of the way community artists and the Community Arts Board of the Australia Council were seeing their role as cultural interventionists. “Whereas Community Arts was in part a response to cultural lack, Community Cultural Development set out to respond to cultural difference” (Hawkins, 1993: 73). The relationship between CCD and cultural democracy was established as communities were enabled, through funding, to create their own cultural expression as compared to the traditional approach of democratising culture through touring art to regions and making it accessible to the masses. The concept acknowledged that communities Australia wide had established vibrant and diverse cultures and that the arts needed to embrace and encourage this rich cultural landscape.
“The ideas that constitute cultural democracy both enable and depend upon direct participation, and take as their aim the building and sustenance of a society in which people are free to come together to produce, distribute and receive the cultures they choose” (Shelton Trust in Watt in Binns, 1991: 63). The introduction of a new notion of the form of CCD placed emphasis on cultural democracy and the integral role communities play in the development, application, implementation and evaluation of the community arts projects.

Gay Hawkins attributes the change of name, from community arts to CCD, to the following impulse; “Getting rid of art allowed the program [Australia Council’s Community Arts funding program] to emphasis[e] community ‘empowerment’ and organisation as the primary objective of funding” (Hawkins, 1993: 78).

However, in 1987 the Community Arts Board of the Australia Council, demoted to a committee of the Australia Council, changed its name to the Community Cultural Development Unit. Surprisingly this apparent demotion created positive outcomes. A “historic conjuncture”, led by a philosophical interaction between members and staff of the Community Arts Board and the Chair of the Australia Council for the Arts, Mr Donald Horne (Mills, 1999: 3), saved Community Arts and provided them with a new name, new process and new approach.

Community arts practitioners applauded the expansion of the conceptual framework behind their work, which had been contributed to significant change throughout communities in Australia. Andrea Hull claims that CCD “…has been one of the great success stories of the Australia Council” (Appendix A, 1999: 118). Malcolm McKinnon in his article “Reconciling the Soft and Fuzzy with the Sharp and Pointy” argues that the shift is “…a theoretical and political repositioning intended to move beyond a ‘soft’, marginalised realm to a more credible, central location within the larger cultural discourse” (1998: 7). He also goes on further to imply that community arts has now, through its shift to CCD, "evolve[d] as a sophisticated, multifaceted and potent practice in this country" (1998: 8).

Meg Simpson, former Director of the NSW CAA and a leading practitioner in the field of CCD argues the line that McKinnon started to pick up about moving ‘community arts’ into the broader cultural discourse. Simpson asserts that, "The broadening of community arts to community cultural development has meant that the sector now places greater emphasis on the educational and learning role of community cultural development as a way of achieving social, economic and environmental change” (1994: 2). The emphasis of social change as compared to artistic change is
a step towards acknowledging the role CCD has in creating authentic social change from the
ground up.

Towards a definition of Community Cultural Development

The conceptual framework of what came to be termed CCD achieved broad support “…based on
the belief that there were many communities as communities of interest based around class,
gender, ethnicity and race, rather than just communities in place” (Mills, 1999, 3). CCD became the
illuminating term to describe a political process about engaging communities in the collaborative
creation of their own culture.

However, CCD did not escape the fear of ‘death by definition’ that was symptomatic of the
community arts. The inability of the sector to agree on a sole definition has created a plethora of
definitions from practitioners, policy-makers and academics. Meg Simpson defines it through what it
isn't: “CCD is about culture not art.” Then she goes on to fully describe CCD by saying “It is a
process linked intrinsically to community development which is based on the rights of people to
actively participate in the decisions that affect their lives and results in bringing about social change”
(1992: 1). This definition touches on the key points in defining CCD – its link to community
development, the role of democracy, the importance of participation and the vision for social
change. The Community Arts Network of South Australia (CAN SA), defines CCD as follows:

Community Cultural Development (CCD) is about communities at a local
level participating in arts and culture. It is about communities controlling
and managing their own cultural and artistic activity and developing their
distinctive cultural identities. CCD is community-based arts practice, which
affirms the principle of self-determination. It supports communities from
different cultures and backgrounds to influence and be a part of
Australia’s cultural development (1995: 1).

The definition asserted by CAN SA, determines the same ideas as important – democracy,
participation, cultural diversity, and social change. The Australia Council, in their 2002 CCD
handbook Hands On, deconstructs the term community cultural development. “A community can be
any group of people who choose to identify with each other.”; Cultural – “…’cultures’ within any
community…expression of identity…” arts”. Development – “This is the doing part of CCD…building
on and strengthening those positive aspects which already exist” (2002: 5). The deconstruction and
definition of CCD relates specifically to the Australia Council’s policy and funding framework. This definition within this publication is intending to open the field for applicants by widely embracing all communities, cultures and positive cultural expression.

Given the difficulties in defining CCD, including the ideological commitment to avoiding any definition that might appear exclusive, as a CCD practitioner I have arrived at a definition in which to frame my CCD practice. Community Cultural Development uses community development principles of democracy, social justice, participation and advocacy in combination with cultural tools - such as theatre, storytelling, visual arts - to create community based arts practice that is powerful, has meaning and has a beneficial long term impact on participants and audience.

To deconstruct this definition the key template for CCD is that of community development principles. CCD also owes half of its name to the well-developed field of theory and studies that is community development (Hawkins, 1993: 79). Community Development is an approach used by community workers, activists, advocates, social workers and the like, that relies on the principles of democracy, participation, social justice and advocacy.

The use of the principles of democracy in CCD establishes the foundation for a process within projects, or organisations that is fair and equitable. Democracy is a fundamental building block of our society. It is a system of relating to people, a place where each person has a say, that each person is accepted and celebrated for who they are. Key to democracy is that each person has a real sense of power in decision making through participation. Participation is more than having an idea and calling for participants. It's about making sure that the planning for the selection of participants does not discriminate in any way, and allows for as broad a range of participants as possible. These ethics within the process of CCD create a 'spatiality' (Rose, 1997) of security for participants. This creates a community of confidence, a respect for confidential practices, a supportive web of relationships that provides the CCD process with a solid and equitable foundation.

The principles of social justice and advocacy are also key to a true CCD process. These principles contribute to the creation of a safe area within the process of CCD for all the people and organisations involved. This means the inclusion of people from a range of backgrounds, ages, areas – people of non-english speaking background, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered people, women, working class people, people with disabilities, older people etc... The space invented, by the artworkers and participants, within a CCD process, must be one of safety to participate, but also to imagine, invent and take risks.
These integral principles, combined with an arts based community experience, create the dynamic process, which is CCD. This employment of the arts as the medium that explores social and personal, local and international issues is what makes CCD unique. The cultural tools that are employed in the CCD process must be relevant and inclusive. The process of CCD, and therefore the management of CCD projects and organisations, must also integrate these community development principles as a part of creating authentic and holistic CCD process. What makes the CCD process unique in its approach is its foundation of community development principles coupled with cultural tools and an attention to management protocols highlighted by consultation, respect, and flexibility.

**Conclusion**

The discussion of the historical development of CCD, from the foundations of community arts to the contemporary CCD, asserts the dynamism of the process and artform. By definition community arts and CCD share similar character traits in that they both emphasise communities working with arts practice. However, CCD applies a process, a way of working with communities and working with arts practice, that is dynamic and flexible. It is this developmental process that is essentially political.

CCD ultimately aims to achieve social change. Therefore, internally, each project and program has a political profile. Outside the practice of CCD, the process and artform itself resides in a cultural policy framework. This framework is politically informed by government priorities, policy and peer assessment. Chapter three asks, how can CCD continue to grow with these competing political agendas?
CHAPTER THREE

The Politics of CCD

Community arts, as a movement, ...allowed itself to be fashioned by its desire to seek funding, and by its willingness to ignore the price that was exacted for that funding – in the form of a progressive loss of control over the direction of the movement and its ability to construct a programme to put its aims into practice (Kelly, 1984:25).

This Chapter identifies some of the tensions of the politics of CCD. There are two areas of debate to acknowledge when discussing the politics of CCD – the politics of funding CCD and the politics that inform the artform and process of CCD. The political nature of the CCD process, and artform, demands constant rigorous political engagement by practitioners, academics and cultural policy workers. The policy and criteria that shape the way in which CCD is funded in Australia have implications for the type of work that gets implemented, where and by whom. Political awareness of those who work in the CCD field informs the content, context and process of the work communities engage in. Kelly emphasises the need to accept the political nature of working through CCD with community. He believes that in some ways it is an act of oppression to ‘work with’ a community on a professional basis (1984: 50). What seems essential, is that practitioners need to possess a full awareness of the innately political position of power they find themselves in through their role in implementing the intervention that is CCD.

The funding of Community Cultural Development in Australia is a multi-government department affair. CCD is funded by Federal, State/Territory and Local governments, and not only via the usual arts and cultural development departments. CCD is increasingly funded through Health Promotion, Social Services, Housing, Environment, and Tourism by diverse government departments. A variety of governmental funding partners for CCD have emerged as government recognises the power of the CCD process to achieve more than purely aesthetic outcomes. This is a process that can achieve social, personal, educational and economic outcomes. The ALGA states in its Agenda for 2002 that it, “…supports…the development…of cultural services to provide personal, community and civic development” (ALGA, 2002: 30). This Chapter, however, will concentrate on the Australia
Community Cultural Development, which has led policy development in relation to CCD, and the relationship between the Australia Council and the sector.

CCD has an unashamedly social change agenda. The politics that inform this agenda and approach are obviously motivated by a progressive view of society and culture. The ‘politics’ of practitioners inform practice, the way in which CCD is implemented and developed within communities. The articulation of this political agenda, however, has been rather loose. The sector participates in many conferences, has created forums for Case Studies and dissertations about the field. Yet, despite this apparent wealth of experience and thinking on the sector, by the sector, relatively little has been published or distributed. This Chapter will discuss the development of a political framework for CCD and the effects of the sector’s anti-theoretical stance.

**Criteria for the Funding of CCD**

The dependence on government funding to support the working life and incomes of CCD workers and artists has, as Hawkins explains, constructed a dependant constituency (1993:59). On the other hand, it is also important to argue that the arts are a fundamental responsibility of government, a key building block of our culture and society. It is important to acknowledge the co-dependent relationship between governmental arts funding bodies and the arts sector. In a positive sense, this relationship has produced a synergy for the development of cultural policy framework, creating opportunities for practitioners and policy makers to inform each other’s work. However, all co-dependent relationships have negative aspects. There is a perception in the arts community that the Australia Council is running a cultural policy agenda that is inaccessible to the practitioners. Cultural policy and strategic planning documents, that underpin the policy framework for CCD, are not accessible to the general public. These supposed internal documents provide a key to the future planning of CCD, yet the sector is in the dark on future policy priorities and funding changes from within the Community Cultural Development Board of the Australia Council.

So who is gaining funding? Do communities have a task in front of them in order to gain funding from the Community Cultural Development Fund? There is a gaggle of usual suspects who know the system, know the language and terminology and are known within the government bureaucracy as cultural workers with a proven track record. There is a cynicism surrounding the funding of the arts. This environment creates a barrier to new communities and non-CCD practitioners who might apply for funding to engage with a CCD process in their own local area. Simon Eade, Manager of
Cultural Services at Cessnock City Council and a key stakeholder in the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project related his reflection on Australia Council funding, “I still haven’t come across many other people working for councils who have had Australia Council funding at all…” (Appendix L, 1999:260). How can communities engage as an equal partner within this cycle of dependency?

Arts funding is a system of evaluation; the practice of patronage demands public criteria for assessment and selection (Hawkins, 1993: 22).

The evaluation of policy and the shaping of new policy directions has been the business of arts bureaucrats inside the Australia Council in conjunction with the peer assessors, drawn from the field. The challenge that these policy shapers find is the balancing of achievement of excellence of artistic product, innovation and marketing, the Australia Council’s emphasis, whilst cementing the importance of the progressive social outcomes that CCD has come to represent. It is acknowledged that the Australia Council has always emphasised its commitment to artistic excellence. On the other hand, social criteria were developed in the late seventies and throughout the eighties when the Community Arts Board of the Australia Council mirrored in policy the concerns the community arts movement had about emphasis on aesthetic criteria. “…the community arts programme began to reflect the pluralist ideal of supporting the integrity and worth of the cultures of different sub groups, that is, a commitment to social rather than mainly aesthetic criteria” (Petersen, 1991: 2).

Professor John Frow, English Department, University of Queensland, commented during a symposium held by Feral Arts entitled they shoot feral’s don’t they: debates in community cultural development, in Brisbane, 1999, that the shift to social criteria was a strategy to build social capital.

Certainly there’s a shift away from aesthetics criteria towards those of community building and that's in line I think with a lot of the emphasis of the Keating Labour government in particular, and with the whole conception of governmentality as a structure which integrates a whole range of different areas including the arts into citizen building, community formation and so on (1999: 42).

The concept of governmentality, simply put, the way in which CCD is governed suggests a construction of participants as ideal citizens. Frow suggests that the shift towards social criteria has created a political framework within which CCD policy implies participants with a sense of self. This discussion, again, intimates a cynicism within the government agenda for CCD. There is certainly need to develop this argument further through future writing.
Excellence debate

The advance towards a more holistic social criterion stems from the raging debate around "excellence", "access" and "equity" from the eighties and nineties. Hawkins locates "excellence" as "...a category that arts funding bodies are keen to invoke but less keen to define" (Hawkins, 1993: 11). The lack of official definition for the highly strategic objective of excellence has sparked an ongoing debate regarding its relevance to the community arts and CCD sector. How does one prove excellence of product when engaging volunteers, community groups and, dare we say it, 'amateurs'? The key tensions of the debate are - Where does 'excellence' sit within the CCD sector? Is the term excellence, which implies "'standards', 'quality' and 'professionalism'", relevant to the CCD sector? (Hawkins, 1993: 11).

The emotive 'excellence' debate within the community arts and CCD sector characterises the duality of excellence and access/equity. Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope address the issue of excellence and community arts in their article "Vocabularies of excellence: rewording multicultural arts" in Gunew & Rizvi's (ed) book Culture, Difference and the Arts, by strongly stating that "Community arts, at best, is classified as being on the margins of excellence, potentially excellent but not yet excellent. At worst, being a community artist involved a pronouncement that the work is of such a kind that it can never be truly excellent in terms of the canonical artforms" (1994: 16).

The Australia Council prescribes and defines the sector for practitioners, who seek funding for CCD projects and programs. The community arts and CCD sector's commitment to social criteria has created a new kind of 'excellence' which has been accepted within the Australia Council. This has come to mean an excellence of access and equity. CCD is naturally anti-establishment, anti-canon and anti-academy. To have certain incongruous terminology fixed upon the funding criteria for CCD, like the term 'excellence', creates an inhibitor to the expansion of the sector. The true relevance of excellence to CCD, as Clinton and Glen refer to it is "'excellence of participation and access'" (Clinton & Glen, 1983: 107).

In the year 2003 terminology and criteria constructing CCD, as set out in the 2003 Australia Council Handbook, are increasingly inclusive, consultative and embracing though the Australia Council still emphasises artistic excellence, albeit in a new manner. The selection criteria for the Community Cultural Development Fund's New Work category 2003 states:
* Artistic merit and innovation;
* Calibre of the artists and/or facilitators, with artistic and community cultural development skills appropriate to the project;
* That the project has adequate resources and support and is well planned, including strategies for the evaluation of the project's outcomes; and
* Evidence of the advancement of community aspirations and effective community participation in the creative process, direction and management of the project (03: 31).

What hasn't changed in the whole funding scenario, is the consistent lack of funding coverage. This in part is due to the ever-increasing demands on funding made by an expanding sector. There is a naïve attempt by funding bodies to seed projects, or partially fund projects as applicants are expected to gain a proportion of funding from diverse funding sources. "What invariably happens is that projects...are attempted on minute budgets which often lead to further marginalisation" (Simpson, 1992: 3-4). Attempts by funding bodies to seed fund as many projects as they can, is supported by governments’ traditional efforts to inject capital to create new opportunities for its citizens. Yet this creates situations where practitioners and organisations are forced to make difficult decisions based on achieving planned outcomes for a percentage of the price. This leads to two inevitable situations, underpaid workers and undercooked projects. Both situations have the same result, of marginalising CCD outcomes and therefore participants, practitioners and communities. This has serious ramifications for the goals of social change. Partially funded projects, and under-funded projects lead to other industrial issues for CCD practitioners as Lawrence, Prest & Newmarch explain, “One of the issues I’ve faced is that it’s so underpaid for the enormous amount of work that you do that people can’t stay involved, year after year. So people withdraw, exhausted and poor” (1991: 20).

**Role of CCD**

The practice of CCD is explicitly political. When examining the role that CCD plays in the implementation of a social change agenda, it is necessary to investigate the place it is relegated to in the social policy agenda of the government, and to ask whether it has a role at all. Gay Hawkins reinforces the notion that community arts and CCD are not a ‘therapy’ for the nation: “Community arts were not valued for their therapeutic effects but because they were a mechanism for maintaining collective identity or consciousness amongst different groups” (Hawkins, 1993: 15). This implies that the motives of the state in funding CCD are not merely for the development and well being of the citizens of Australia. This goes further to suggest that there is an ulterior motive...
behind the funding of CCD. Gertsakis hints on this in her article “Australia: A community in-cont(in)ent? The ‘contents’ of culture”, “The trouble is they are obliged to ‘report’ back to a cultural centre for support and patronage” (1991: 41-42).

Still the social change agenda of the CCD sector comes up again and again throughout the literature, illuminating the true grassroots understanding of the role of CCD. Meg Simpson in her article, “What should be the scope of commonwealth involvement in community cultural development?” writes, “CCD is the way people can use creative methods to explore, celebrate, question their world and through that affect change in it” (1992: 1). J. Coleman puts clearly in his article “Community Cultural Development and Community Education”; “When people and communities educate each other, the learning is deep and potential for social, environmental and vocational change is enormous” (1994: 24).

Rick Flowers asserts that “…there is a real absence of discussion of the politics of CCD. There’s this loose talk about empowerment, community development, needs based planning and so on…we need to revise some activist traditions in CCD” (Appendix B, 1999: 124). The loose talk Flowers alludes to is exemplified by practitioners’ lack of understanding of evaluative management of long term outcomes of CCD. It is easy to say that a project has empowered people or met their needs; what isn’t easy is proving it. When practitioners and artists in the field depend on policy makers to prescribe priorities, definitions, limitations of the field of CCD, the cynicism rises.

Gertsakis raises the possibility that CCD is actually an integral part of the government machinery and the maintenance of the government’s gaze on community. “The state then, through public patronage, remains informed as to the activities and transformations of its people. But what is this relationship about? Is it in fact another kind of nationalism? Does community arts practice and its rhetoric help preserve the ideas of cultural elite, naming and maintaining similarity, familiarity, re-enforcing marginality helped by the latent jingoism of personal affirmation of identity within a group” (1991: 41-42). Is the role of community cultural development about conditioning communities to embrace the margins in which they live? Is the role of community cultural development to retain the status quo? Further Gertsakis evokes nationalist images through her questions “What kind of arm of social order is it? What is the training for?” (Gertsakis, 1991: 42).
The continuing expansion of CCD

CCD is a growth industry. Academic institutions and sector based training bodies have developed courses in CCD over the past seven years tailored by practitioners, educators and policy makers. The 1996 Census of Population and Housing stated that there were 156,739 people working in a cultural occupation as their main source of employment. In 1998-99 1.2 million people were employed in cultural and leisure activities. The expansion of cultural industries from 1996 to cultural and leisure industries in 1998/9 has widened the pool of occupations this statistic represents. Occupations within this new category range from graphic designers and architects to leisure and recreation workers. This creates problematic access to statistics to prove the growth of CCD. More specifically, there have been a steady number of enrolments in CCD courses like Community Arts Network S.A.’s Graduate Diploma in CCD. Conversations with both CAN SA and CCD NSW (the new name for NSW CAA) suggest that the numbers of enrolments in CCD specific courses have remained steady at around 12-16 each year.

The increased focus on the field, which began in the 1980s, was often referred to as the ‘professionalisation of community arts’. Concern for questions of training, the conditions of art workers, state organisations and the production of glossy information materials like Caper was regarded, in some quarters as a threat to the simplicity of earlier days, to the ‘integrity of community arts’ (Hawkins, 1993: 69).

The professionalisation has created a boom in CCD practitioners and increased demand on the limited financial resources of the three tiers of government. Celia Moon, CCD Officer with CREATE Australia, the national arts and cultural training body, believes that “There is the…accredited training developed for CCD so there’s that professionalisation of the sector. It’s a very small sector, that’s true, and most people are working on a contract basis, part time, there’s no career path, it’s badly paid and overworked…There are limited jobs…” (Appendix C, 1999:130). Alan Petersen agrees that there is “…an occupational culture of community arts workers that is becoming increasingly professionalised and developing its own distinctive discourse” (1991:5).

Two points raised by Moon and Petersen in relation to the professionalisation of the sector relate to its uneven growth and lack of unified lobbying power. On one hand, the insistent industrial concerns of the sector have been left unaddressed for most of Australia. Leading the way Brisbane and the Queensland Community Arts Network (QCAN) have created a CCD worker fee negotiation.
schedule and an art-workers guide to Occupational Health and Safety. Yet, this sector is benefiting from an intellectual, experiential learning training agenda, which Petersen describes as “developing its own distinctive discourse”.

In 1995, the NSWCAA (now CCD NSW) developed in conjunction with the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) a Certificate III/IV in Community Cultural Development - an accredited traineeship. This was followed by the CAN SA, the first state body to offer a Graduate Diploma in Community Cultural Development in 1996. The Queensland Community Arts Network also offers courses in CCD and the Community Arts Network of W.A. (CAN WA) offers professional development courses in CCD. These specialist courses create a new type of CCD worker; practitioners who have immersed themselves in a theoretical framework that has led them to construct their CCD process.

…there is an influx of practitioners to the professional domain of community arts, inheriting its boundaries without concern for its origins and/or its ideals (Fensham, 1990; 10).

Rick Flowers, co-ordinator of the writing for the NSWCAA/UTS Certificate III/IV in Community Cultural Development, emphasises key questions that the writing team pose to students studying the CCD course. “…what do you think people should be learning? How are you going to help them learn? And how are you going to evaluate, how are you going to know that they’ve learnt?” (Appendix B, 1999:121).

Are the practical approaches of students graduating from these Certificates and Diplomas different from the artform practitioners and the generalist CCD organisers that populate this sector? What’s different about their approach to CCD projects, or is it, in fact, different? The background to these questions implies a certain generationalism in the sector which is an anecdotal feeling that the sector is divided between those relatively new to the sector and those practitioners who built the sector on the back of projects and programs, through art and community interventions. This tension between approaches, desire or apathy to engage in theoretical debate and critical discussions about all that is CCD, is what drives the answers to these questions.

Community arts will have emulated community work in becoming a profession with a hierarchy of trained and untrained workers, in which the training is centrally controlled and functions as a closed orthodoxy. Those who began community arts, and who sustained and developed it, will come to be regarded as untrained old-timers, with little place in the
modernised and regulated community arts career structure (Kelly, 1984:38).

Kelly’s dis-utopian vision for the future of the English community arts sector creates a question. Does the CCD sector value academia over experiential learning? In Australia, the approach of training and academic institutions in teaching CCD process and practice is via experiential learning, a key factor in putting theory into action and reflecting on that experience through evaluation and reflexive review. The power of Freire’s praxis, “It is reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (1972b: 28), as opposed to Marx’s praxis analysis is fundamental to the application of CCD in an Australian context. So in answer to the above question, experiential learning is still valued highly above theoretical argument.

The relative ease with which the sector has embraced the rise of the importance of management - planning, evaluative, analytical measuring of our work - has created a sense of legitimacy in the power of CCD work. The CCD process and artform is being measured, assessed, brought into economic paradigms of worth and efficacy, creating a future through concrete results. It rises above what David Watt explains as an, “…ignorance…by the continual reproduction of an habituated practice with little sense of its purpose beyond the maintenance of funding” (1992:7). Yet, as Watt asserts, the movement as a whole is so tied into the funding structures of federal, state and local governments that the threatening environment of ‘phasing out’ CCD and community arts funding forces the sector into a battle for legitimacy and evaluation. “I think they [the sector] sort of trade in on the danger that they are going to be phased out for 15 or 20 years now, and I just think they should relate themselves strategically with current debates and with current theories and stop seeing themselves as this radical departure” (Winning, Appendix D, 1999:141).

**Theoretical ignorance**

Owen Kelly declares that the downfall of the community arts movement is that it has failed to engage in the theoretical side of the practice. Kelly reminisces,

> From the beginning, the community arts movement was reluctant to engage in serious theoretical debate of the sort needed to establish a political framework and a resulting practical strategy through which the work of individual community arts groups might achieve a cumulative
strength. This reluctance played into the hands of the pragmatists in the movement who regarded such questions as ‘academic’. They were quick to dismiss any such debate as a utopian soft option; a retreat from the ‘real battle’, which was perceived in terms of short-term fights to obtain money and resources, to pay decent wages and to ‘achieve recognition’ for community arts (1984: 26).

In an Australian context, David Watt details the implications for CCD in Australia.

This historical and theoretical weakness is the result of a number of factors, which has seen the surrender of responsibility for serious theorising to the CCDU seems the easiest course. Three factors, though, emerge most clearly. Firstly, the paucity of documentation made history almost entirely memorial and anecdotal. Secondly, the urgency to churn out ‘product’ in extraordinary haste, a result both of project funding and the drive to keep work relevant and immediate, placed much more emphasis on doing than thinking about it. Finally, the general indifference of the arbiters of taste within our culture, from newspaper reviewers to publishers and academics, has denied the movement the possibility of an intellectual forum beyond that which it can muster itself with very limited resources and less spare time (1992: 7).

This account explains the lack of formality in the sector, which has led to the void of literature on current happenings in CCD. And as Petersen states, “…without theoretically informed practice, one can never be sure that one is ‘on the right track’ towards effecting any change” (1991: 7).

It is understandable, on the other hand, that CCD practitioners and artworkers don’t have the time or the inclination to produce literature documenting, exploring the issues of, and critically examining their work and that of their peers. Internal reflection and learning from your previous experience is valid, though it seems that many artworkers believe that they and their work innately embody Freire’s concept of praxis. How does the sector move forward towards a critical debate? Practitioners are starting to espouse the same ideas as the academics “I think that once we start getting that critical debate stimulated again, it’ll start building up” (McIlvenny, Appendix E, 1999:147). Graham Pitts also asserts the need for new debate; “The new critique must enliven practice, open it up, be a sort of reciprocal deal between theory and practice. Like an argumentative marriage” (Pitts in Foster, 2000: 66).
The sector has started building a momentum by critically analysing and debating the process, artform and politics of CCD. This includes engaging in national projects, through web based e-forums, through sector conferencing and individual academic pursuit. This articulate advancement is inspiring for CCD researchers and practitioners alike. Martin Thiele succinctly put the dilemmas that CCD researchers have with the current state of knowledge within the sector; “Serious debate and dialogue in Australia on community cultural development practice remains a rarity. And no one understands this point better than a community cultural development researcher hungry for reference material” (Thiele, 2000: 8). Responding to his own need for more reference material, Martin Thiele and his colleague Sally Marsden will publish a book entitled Engaging Art: The Artful Dodgers Studio, A Theoretical Model of Practice in 2003 through the Jesuit Social Services. This book will critically analyse and present the potent process of long term CCD process engaged in an arts program based at the Artful Dodgers studio in Collingwood, Victoria.

Also commissioning writing on CCD is VicHealth, the Victorian Health Promotion body. They appointed consultant Claire Keating, Effective Change Pty Ltd, in 2001 to develop an evaluative framework for their funded community arts and health projects and programs. Entitled Evaluating Community Arts and Community Well Being, the report asks project managers and communities to assess and evaluate their own projects’ outcomes. The sector is expanding and constructing its own paradigm that is analytical, measurable as well as anecdotal.

**Conclusion**

The CCD sector’s relationship to its funders is problematic. It creates an uneasy marriage whereby the future of CCD has become stifled. The sector needs space and autonomy in order to provide leadership direction for the creation of new cultural policy. The CCD sector must embrace the theoretical, evaluative and managerial side of the practice if it is to provide balance in the practice of CCD. The Australia Council, leading by example in its recent balancing act between excellence and social criterion, sets the pace for the sector. Can the sector transform the recent academic enthusiasm in CCD, coupled with the growth of training and education in CCD, into a call to articulation?

Ideally the outcomes of CCD support the power of the process. Chapter Four will continue to look at long term outcomes of CCD by examining the problems involved in the measurement of outcomes. This Chapter will further explore commonly agreed long term outcomes of CCD and where, if at all,
the three community level outcomes explored in this Chapter sit within the framework established by the sector.
CHAPTER FOUR

This Chapter will examine the way that CCD is managed, and the consequences of management styles on the evaluation of CCD. The way in which CCD is managed plays an important role in the measurement of the achievements of CCD process. The processes of CCD practice, and the underlying ideologies that inform the management approach to CCD, are examined in this Chapter. This information will allow a detailed investigation of the outcomes of CCD, the theories, research and assumptions made by the sector. The policy arena has given rise to a more overtly professionalised management approach that has, in turn, influenced the sector’s interest in ‘evaluation’. This has been established through the creation of a maze of terms – goals, objectives, impacts, and outcomes. This Chapter aims to isolate the key outcomes, as outlined in the hypothesis, and supported by the CCD sector. If the role of evaluation is to examine the practice of CCD, how do we move to answering the question – has CCD achieved success?

Outcomes of CCD

In his book *Community Development and the Arts*, Clinton claims that,

> ...The fact that this work can only be properly evaluated in the long-term should be firmly argued, and the criterion of value for money should be applied only in conjunction with other stated goals when adequate resources have been invested to sustain arts development programs to maturity (1993: 17).

If, therefore, it can be demonstrated that CCD has the potential to achieve positive social change and build social capital through long-term evaluation, this will provide validation for policy makers to commit resources to CCD in the long term. Yet, how can we achieve this without current commitments to long-term funding and evaluation?

CAN WA believes in the need to realign how CCD practitioners engage with CCD, “...a shift from project-based CCD activities to an emphasis on the creation of a vision, an overarching plan, based on communities’ past, present and future aspirations” (Drew, Kasat, & Sonn, 2002: 13). The sector
is showing an increasing interest in the long-term commitment to CCD work with communities and
the establishment of cultural infrastructure in communities to assist with longitudinal support for
CCD work.

Commitment to long term goals in engaging with the CCD process with communities is essential to
the future development of the sector's core interest. Adams and Goldbard succinctly describe the
core interest of CCD in their introductory Chapter to the book *Community Culture and Globalisation*.

At community cultural development’s core is Friere’s concept of
"conscientisation"… This describes the process by which one moves from
“magic thinking” toward “critical consciousness,” breaking down imposed
mythologies in order to reach new levels of awareness through dialogue,
thus becoming part of the process of changing the world (2002: 18).

In embracing Friere’s concept, the sector is acknowledging CCD’s basic commitment to social
change. This core drive and key achievement of CCD demands that there be more structure and
certainty during the planning and evaluation of long-term outcomes of CCD. By ascribing ‘social
change’ as the mission of CCD, practitioners, artists and organisations can devise a diversity of
aims, objectives, impacts and desired outcomes.

Evaluation in the CCD sector is now important to policy makers, practitioners and researchers. E-
forums, research projects, and conferences in the sector, over the past three years*, have focussed
on the essential need for in depth and longer-term evaluation. Through the use of various
evaluation methodologies, measures, and tools, practitioners can source raw material to track not
only projects and programs that they work on, but also the measurement of the “impact” and the
unplanned “outcomes” that the work has on participants. Evaluation has become a key contributing
resource for the development of arts policy and a criterion for the demonstration of excellence
within CCD projects and programs.

Now funding bodies are employing stricter, more detailed and specific evaluation methods that must
be employed by practitioners to comply with funding guidelines. In 2002, as a result of the Effective
Change Pty Ltd consultancy, Vic Health implemented a detailed guide to *Evaluating Community
Arts and Community Well Being*, which is essentially driven by ‘management type’ aims, objectives,
and performance indicators. This guide was supplied to all successfully funded Health Promotion
projects and programs for 2002. As criteria to acquit the grant correctly, practitioners and
organisations are being asked to complete the guide in relation to their CCD process and report on the findings in the short, medium and long term (2002).

It could, and some would argue should, be argued that CCD evaluation must maintain its focus on gathering information on the effectiveness of the process and the artform for the participants and the community, rather than as an evidence gathering exercise to prove the “worth” or “dollar value” of CCD. The problematic term of ‘social capital’, which has increased its profile in the CCD sector, implies an economic worth to the cultural and social outcomes that have resulted from CCD. The Statistical Advisory Group, a division of the Australian Bureau of Statistics National Culture Recreation Statistics Unit, reports directly to the Cultural Ministers Council, regularly updating the Council on quantitative research from the cultural industries, such as multipliers, employment figures, and financial snapshots.

There is a fairly consistent reinforcement that cultural industries are steadily growing and that the employment multiplier for the industry is above the national average (Statistical Advisory Group, 1995). The government has the Statistical Advisory Group producing figures and reports on economic multipliers for the arts and cultural industries as well as the Australia Council and State/Territory arts departments producing statistics and reports on the worth of the arts. Can the policy makers expect that the sector would be able to produce a valid statistical report on the economic effects of CCD? The sector needs to focus on the evaluation, management and planning of the social and artistic criteria of CCD projects and programs. Thiele challenges the CCD sector; "If we are to advance thinking within our sector about how our participants modify their social trajectories – we will firstly need to investigate, understand and map patterns of engagement" (2001: 2).

**The role of CCD in shaping Partnerships**

The role of evaluation in CCD must be determined as a community development outcome for the project. Evaluation appropriately designed can complement CCD outcomes, and encourage the sector to develop a culture of evaluation. This process driven evaluation approach is an issue for the management of CCD. Management of a CCD project incorporates pre-conceptual planning and establishment of projects taking into consideration the role evaluation will take, and must take, within the process and the artform of CCD. The strategic milieu of performance measures, outputs and targets must be taken into account when addressing how to measure success; for example,
What are the short and long term objectives for this project? What is the project aiming to do through this intervention?

This complementary evaluation approach must be contextualised within a holistic community approach to cultural development. A whole of community approach could create a space for the project to activate people within the community towards the greater goals and dreams of that community.

It seems that one challenge for community is to address issues of sustainability – environmental, cultural, social and financial. The vision for the future can be as much a community-led vision, as it can be a planned government-led initiative. The role of the CCD practitioner is to break this simple either/or situation and broker partnerships between individuals, community, government and business. What seems important is the establishment of a common vision for the towns, regions and states of Australia. CCD practitioners need to decide how the work, the art and processes can bring about a shift in the participants’ perception of their own power in their own communities.

A significant outcome of CCD in the Australian context has been the ability for the artform and process to cross sectors – within both government and with non-government organisations, as well as small and big business. CCD has gained a profile for being a process that is flexible in delivery and adaptable to various situations, issues and areas. Sarah Monynihan and Norm Horton from the CCD organisation Feral Arts, further assert the impact that CCD work in other sectors can have, “The CCD sector has developed unique expertise in the infrastructure of the Australian arts industry and has been especially successful at influencing the policy and programs of other sectors of government such as health, social services and social planning, as well as other sectors with the arts and cultural industry” (2002: 205).

The influence of CCD on various sectors has allowed the sector to view its own development from afar (Adams & Goldbard, 2002: 205). This ability to create partnerships across sectors and to influence public policy making has made CCD a powerful player in the cultural development of Australia. In Cessnock the local government Council developed its first Cultural Development Plan in 1999. This plan outlines 16 principles, which the Council will use to foster its cultural development. Number two of these principles states,

Council will encourage the community, Councillors and Council staff to adopt a holistic approach when considering the City and its future development, so that effective integration of the City’s cultural, social,
economic, environmental and physical requirements can be achieved (1999: 1).

This integration of culture as a key platform for the development of a sustainable Cessnock has placed Cessnock in step with local governments around Australia. Today, Cessnock City Council is expanding its cultural agenda towards a holistic approach to community, through representative democracy-led sustainability. This ultimate aim implies a desire for social change. Cultural development, in particular CCD, can lead the Cessnock City Council towards their mission.

**Managing Success**

A successful project is one in which the community ‘own’ the outcomes, and the involvement and the role of CCD is either difficult to identify or easily forgotten. A ‘sleight of hand’ is at work. Participants, whether they be individual community members or powerful institutions, are subtly encouraged to think about key agendas and consider new principles. These ‘process’ outcomes are often the real objective of the work. The arts objectives provide a focal point – a device through which dialogue takes place, the margins gain a voice and change can be negotiated (Feral Arts, 1999: 55-56).

The key to understanding long-term impacts and outcomes of CCD lies in the effective management of CCD projects, programs and organisations. It is not easy to operate on relatively short time frames, from project to project, which many practitioners and organisations do, in order to survive. So the key to making a genuine long-term impact is through the utilisation of CCD as a long-term process that effects social change. This requires an extended commitment, new partnerships and collaborations to create the financial resources to allow the work to flourish. All this work requires sound management of CCD.

Isolating the core reason for why we do CCD is essential to the long-term vision practitioners and organisations have to their contribution to this sector. I would argue that historically, through the development of the community arts in Australia, the agenda of social reform and nourishment of the creativity of the many communities that make up this nation, has firmly been set. Peel supports this argument; she asserts, “Creativity can be the starting point for involving people in the process of
social change” (Peel, 1990: 10). Today, thirteen years later practitioners in the field still agree with this notion. At ‘Groundswell’ the Regional Arts Australia National Conference last year, Jon Hawkes reasserts the importance of creativity’s role in social change.

If culture describes how we make sense, and the results of that sense, then art describes that aspect of cultural action in which creativity and imagination are the key drivers, where we discover meaning and community in ways that are intuitive, non lateral and unpredictable, irrational even. With the arts we can imagine the future, unpack the past, confront the present. We can predict change, focus our visions and face our fears (2002: 2).

The CCD agenda for social reform has been set with reference to the sector’s acknowledgement of class divisions and socio-economic disadvantages. Some of these rigid prejudices that drive the need for social reform include the inherent racism within the Australian culture and society towards Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and people of non-English speaking backgrounds. Other issues include the isolating factors of geography, access, employment status, all of which inhibit communities, youth and families from participating in a democratic society.

Contemporary Australia Council guidelines for the CCDB state that it “...encourages applications from artists and communities who, as a result of economic, geographic, or social factors, have limited access to cultural development” (2003: 30). The Australia Council is directing, as well as responding to the leadership shown within the CCD sector, with a social change agenda. In their 2003 Handbook “Support for the Arts” the CCD Board highlights its new priority “the intersection between art and well-being whether through environmental, health or other themes” (2003: 30). By actively encouraging diverse communities, exemplified by their ‘Arts for a Multicultural Australia’ policy and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Arts strategy, the Australia Council is advocating for social change and development of a cultural democracy in Australia.

Management approaches

Arts management education and employment is a growth sector in the arts. As the arts industry strives to replicate the management styles and strengths of the private business sector, graduates from arts management courses are being appointed to jobs that were traditionally safeguarded for
respected and experienced practitioners after a considerable length of time in the arts (Kelly, 1984: 38). This continues to be true to some extent in 2003. However, the popularity of experienced practitioners, with the funding bodies, communities and CCD organisations is still an important draw card. Sadly, more experienced practitioners like Fiona Winning and Celia Moon, just to mention two well-known names and practitioners that were interviewed during the research for this thesis, have moved beyond CCD project work into related arts jobs. The generationalism that has been generated between these two different groups of CCD workers must be overcome to ensure that the sector retains the high calibre of practitioners it has sported in the past. What these new arts management graduates have brought into the arts sector is an approach that is methodical, practical, time-consuming, and accountable. This new planning milieu has brought about the possibility to track and evaluate, plan and account for the effect and outcomes of CCD work on communities with which we work.

It is through a long-term dedication to a holistic management approach that the sector’s commitment to the principles of CCD can be achieved in tandem with those visions of the communities with which we work. The holistic management approach could be taken to mean the vision that a practitioner, team or organisation has for the community/s they are working with. However, this holistic approach must be a) wanted; b) supported; c) challenging; and d) achievable. It must be a management approach that the project or organisation employs to demonstrate their dedication to true community and social outcomes.

Holistic management approaches incorporate organisational and financial goals with community and social outcomes. This approach can be successful in CCD. Practitioners and CCD organisations must be up front and honest about their missions and visions with the communities with whom they work. Furthermore, the sector must ensure the feasibility of CCD projects and process before engaging with communities on these interventions. Practically this can mean the assurance of participation by the community through management/steering committees, public meetings, research, consultation and primarily, participation and ownership to create the holistic approach desired.

Built into a holistic management approach to CCD is a range of assessments and indicators, which can assist evaluation both during and post project to gauge the overall success of the plan. It is important to set indicators that can show a valid and reliable measure of the goals and outcomes. Tony Mayo suggests that performance indicators need to be identified as either internal, to monitor the organisation or project aims and achievements; or external, as a part of the process of transparency so that outsiders can assess the achievements of the organisation or project (1990:...
1). Through the constant assessment and monitoring to ensure that the planning of the process ‘works’ we can keep on track to our higher purpose – to achieve long term impacts of social change within the communities in which we work.

The traditional approach to evaluation has been the post-project evaluation session, sometimes surveys, sometimes written responses. The effectiveness of this evaluation method in guiding the project “in-train” is valuable for future projects only. This post-project evaluation acts more like a record of the process for the organisation or community, rather than an interactive guide to the achievement of success. Tony Bovaird suggests that “Intellectually, “ex post” evaluations are the most important because they are the most penetrating – if they are done well, then the organisation has fully explored what it means to succeed or fail on its own terms. Once such an evaluation has been carried out, it automatically highlights those factors which need to be built into the appraisal of future options and which need to be monitored regularly during implementation” (1991: 4).

By emphasising a management approach in the CCD sector that encourages post-evaluation only practitioners and managers miss out on the valuable information participants and stakeholders can feed back to the management during the project. The establishment of a project plan – aims, objectives, potential impacts and long-term outcomes – can only be assessed if they can be measured. Winikoff explains in Places not spaces: The Placemaking Process, that “The successful results of a project will be in direct proportion to its efficient organisation, planning and management” (1995: 85).

The management approach to evaluation maintains the need to plan for achievable objectives, which can be measured through pre-set targets to demonstrate the effectiveness of the project. This rigid approach does place limits upon an often-anecdotally driven CCD sector, which relies on feedback and emotional content to record effectiveness of projects. Paul Harrison argues that “One of the biggest barriers to goal setting in arts and cultural activity has been the assessment and measurement of aesthetic quality. The rationale for this is that the assessment of the work is largely based upon the notion that artistic work is an experiential good, and therefore achievement or quality of the work is based on perception rather than the more tangible aspects used for measurement in other industries such as manufacturing, which may measure production outputs or lost time frequency injury rates” (1999: 34).

There are many measures and targets that CCD practitioners can devise in the pre-planning of their work. These include such measures as monitoring the mission statement; tracking the commitment to the community development principles of democracy, participation, social justice, and advocacy;
realising sponsor and financial targets; reaching artistic goals; accountability of the steering committee; integrity in the management, artistic implementation and participation of the project (Harrison, 1999). What’s important is that the planning and evaluation approach maintains the guiding principles of CCD, the community and the project. This rigorous process will create a sense of ownership, deep understanding and ultimately commitment to managing CCD as a social change agent.

**Short-Term and Long-Term, Aims and Objectives, Impacts and Outcomes**

So what are generally understood as short-term and long-term, aims and objectives, impacts and outcomes? The terminology can sometimes inhibit exploration of these meaningful tools of assessment. Short term implies the immediate consequences of the intervention (the production of a cultural product or arts experience), whereas long term seems to imply that a discrete intervention can have post-project ‘flow-on’ effects on participants and/or communities. Aims and Objectives, in the planning sense, are used to describe specific planned intentions and their planned results that the project will endeavor to achieve. Impacts suggest that the result of the project has created these results which impact upon the participants’ and communities’ lives, whereas outcomes are primarily unplanned results of the project, logical consequences of the intervention.

Effective Change Pty Ltd in their Guide for Community Arts Practitioners outline a matrix which signposts the practitioner through the evaluation of CCD. This matrix attributes short term as ‘process’, medium term as ‘impact’ and long term as ‘outcome’. It also goes on to divide process, impact and outcomes according to their relevance to participants, project/organisations, and community (2002: 15). The matrix is a fully rounded structure that designs the evaluation for the practitioners, and suggests examples for possible process, impacts, or outcomes. A long-term outcome for community Effective Change Pty Ltd poses the question, “What do we want to happen in the long term to/for the community, as a result of this project?” (2002: 15).

Jon Hawkes in his manifesto *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability*, commissioned by the Cultural Development Network of Victoria, attaches an Appendix of indicators developed by the RMC Research Corporation. These indicators outline a comprehensive framework for the result of community arts intervention with citizens. A selection of the indicators as listed are, “The Arts community’s connections to larger community issues and expectations; diversity of opportunities for arts participation including opportunities for continuous and deepening participation; and, diversity
of institutions involved in the arts, including non-traditional examples” (2001: 57-59). These indicators supply the CCD sector with an outside perspective and a range of long-term outcomes. RMC Research Corporation has designed objectives underneath the indicators that impartially suggest how to measure the achievement of these long-term outcomes.

Deidre Williams, a CCD practitioner and consultant based in Adelaide, was commissioned by the CAN SA to conduct an evaluative research project. The result of this research project was the production of a report on the long-term benefits of community based arts projects and funding. This report, titled Creating Social Capital published by the CAN SA, identifies the economic, social, artistic and educational indicators to evaluate community based arts projects (1995).

Williams proposes that the long-term objectives of CCD projects which lead to creating and replenishing social capital are the social benefits of “forming or maintaining communities, driving community action and facilitating social cohesion”. Educational benefits “advocating for social change, producing better public facilities, promoting cross cultural understanding, and expressing community pride and identity”. Artistic benefits “develop[ing] creative talent and generat[ing] further work of artistic value”. Economic benefits “generat[ing] employment for artists...[and] develop[ing] new arts supporters and arts markets as a result of the work” (1996: 12 - 40). Williams critically links social criteria to the outcomes achieved by CCD. Her categorising of social, educational, artistic and economic benefits demonstrates the breadth of the achievement that CCD has on the creation of social capital. The key perspective missing from Williams’s evaluation of the long term benefits of CCD is the political dimension, which may be implied in the notion of ‘social capital’ and its goal to build active citizens.

The literature supports an abundance of benefits, outcomes, impacts, objectives of CCD process and art. Deidre Williams devised a list to demonstrate her findings into the long-term benefits of CCD. A selection from that list is as follows, “Creating new artistic work; Increased participation in the arts; Establishment of valuable networks; Development of community pride; Decrease in social isolation; Improved understanding of different culture” (1995: 1-3). Clinton and Glen identify the objectives of CCD as “…activities that: Emphasise active involvement; Generate collective creative expression, discover and release latent talents and skills; Positively reinforce and communicate collective identity, culture and a sense of community; Help vocalise social, political and economic concerns of communities” (1983: 95). As stated in the hypothesis of this thesis, the three long-term outcomes I am interested in are supported by the research. They are - creation of communities, creation of networks and continued cultural development.
Embracing long-term CCD

The politicisation of the local community through cultural intervention is what Peel describes when she profiles the CCD work of well-known organisation Street Arts. "Street Arts approached the project with a long-term view of community development, believing that for a concept to be truly successful the community must be given the resources and opportunities for skills development to determine their own directions" (1990: 10).

The approach to CCD that rings true for a large proportion of the sector is the long term objective of working with a community, who takes on the work themselves and the result is the CCD worker moves on, effectively working themselves out of their own job. Or as Alan Petersen phrases it in his article "Community Arts and Cultural Democracy"; "If community arts is really about cultural democracy and empowering communities, then community arts workers must be serious about working towards creating the conditions for popular power" (1991: 7).

Similarly, the Ran Dan Club, profiled in Mary Reid’s book Not A Puppet, displays their interest in working with communities over the long term for long term objectives and maximum impact and outcomes. Lauchlan McDonald stated, “Ran Dan’s preference is for long-term community cultural development, with multiple phases for skills development…We don’t necessarily like coming in, working on a show for six weeks and then leaving…I’m not convinced you can teach people and empower them to do the whole thing themselves in that time” (1997: 14-15).

The preference to work over long time periods with the same communities may be the favoured option for some CCD practitioners and organisations but the reality is that this opportunity is rare. This demands the long-term strategic integration of CCD into local and/or state government cultural and strategic planning in order for practitioners and organisations to gain financial support to attempt these long-term approaches.

Marla Guppy emphasises this approach in her 1997 publication Better Places, Richer Communities, when she highlights that “Effective integration of cultural development with other aspects of Councils’ roles will be enhanced by action in six key areas:

- Raising awareness of cultural development issues
- Coordinated community involvement
• Recognition and development of staff skills
• Strategic and corporate planning
• Organisation structure and decision-making processes
• Regional cooperation and inter-governmental relations (1997: 8).

Long-term outcomes are often seen as the unplanned opposite to objectives. Nevertheless it's important to be prepared in evaluation to assess what other outcomes the project or the CCD work has influenced, as Maud Clarke coined, the ‘flow on effects’. Maud Clarke, director of Somebody’s Daughter Theatre talks about the ‘flow on effects’ their play *Tell Her That I Love Her* has had. “The group was asked to contribute a training session to Victoria Working With Women Prisoners Training Program and to perform the show for a group of 40 magistrates. In 1993, the script of *Tell Her That I Love Her* was selected by the Victorian Curriculum Arts Board for the Theatre Studies and Drama Review list, for study by secondary students” (Reid, 1997: 37). These unexpected or unplanned ‘flow on effects’, as Maud Clarke terms them, are quite important in distinguishing the difference between objectives and outcomes. CCD work and projects generate their own sense of ‘good will’ which generates great outcomes like those of Somebody's Daughter Theatre.

Owen Kelly states in his manifesto, *Community, Art and the State: Storming the Citadels*, that:

… the **overall** effect is an increase in competence for the communities in which they participate, and a conscious realisation that this competence has been achieved. For this to occur, individual projects, or pieces of work must be tied to a larger vision; a cumulative period of growth of what may be termed **social capital** (1984: 102).

The anecdotal evidence of the creation of social capital as the most important long-term outcome of CCD work is overwhelming from the literature. However the mass of short-term projects and lack of long term vision remain at odds with the research. It is important that both the sector and the Australia Council create an agenda to implement and fund longer-term CCD projects. Clinton reiterates this agenda when he states “Such activities can provide opportunities for people to make their voices heard, to develop skills needed to interact more effectively, and thereby to become more resourceful and dynamic participants in the local scene” (1993: 7). Local politicisation of communities is one path towards active citizenship, which develops social capital. When citizens activate and demonstrate their power as members of this democracy, social capital is built and cynicism diminishes.
Conclusion

Skilful management of CCD is as crucial to the success of the project or programs intervention. A thorough understanding of the mission of CCD – to effect social change – coupled with the development of tailored short and long-term objectives for CCD creates a starting point for the development of an evaluation approach to CCD. The evaluation during and post CCD process is invaluable in establishing the effect of this powerful process. The issue of determining success should not seem so elusive. Theoretically, practitioners, researchers and managers can infer the achievement of social change through measuring, subjectively, the lives and feelings of participants, stakeholders and community. This can establish evidence of success.

Effective Change Pty Ltd proposes that success in the long-term could be achieved if community representative were involved throughout the project and if participants developed skills to continue on their own cultural development (2002: 20). Compared to the proposed long-term outcome of CCD that I have proposed these outcomes seem shortsighted, in the case of the former, and presumptuous, in the case of the later. Can we assume that after a short project of eight-ten weeks, participants will develop the skills to continue this type of cultural expression? What seems loud and clear is the need to take each project or program as a unique process and develop it from beginning to end with the community. Marsden identifies a paradox at work within the sector’s turn to evaluation that echoes this sentiment. “I would be concerned if any evaluation mechanism might then be used to ‘ritualise’ processes. If this were to happen, I suspect it would in fact undermine the success. The organic nature of the creative process cannot be contained and still succeed on the same level. Perhaps it’s a paradox?” (Marsden & Thiele, 2000: 68).

The next Chapter examines the case study of CCD project SAY IT OUT LOUD! The case study aims to pinpoint the successes and failures of the project, which was constructed within a theoretical context with a strong practice based component.
CHAPTER FIVE

CASE STUDY – SAY IT OUT LOUD! 1996

SAY IT OUT LOUD! was a project by the Workers Cultural Action Committee (WCAC), Kurri Kurri Community Centre (KKCC) and the Cessnock Community Centre (CCC) – auspiced by the Cessnock City Council. The project came out of research by myself, into the history and cultural background of Cessnock and surrounding areas. This Case Study is structured in five key sections identified at the outset of the project:

1. Development
2. Grant Application
3. Networking
4. The Project
5. Evaluation

Firstly, though, I would like to present an explanatory preface to the Case Study, which will detail the project concept, key project partners, and the study I was undertaking which informed the development, implementation and evaluation of the SAY IT OUT LOUD! Project.

PREFACE

The concept that shaped the project that is now known as SAY IT OUT LOUD! was my drive to create a project that addressed two specific aims, to unearth women’s stories and to empower women through skill development and performance. Originally the concept centred on the model of the Women’s Circus, based at Footscray Community Arts Centre. The Women’s Circus is an excellent feminist organisation established to encourage women to reclaim their bodies after episodes or sometimes years of physical and sexual abuse.

Upon further discussion with my supervisor, David Watt, senior lecturer in Theatre Arts, University of Newcastle, I decided that that type of project would be seen as an imitation of the Women’s
Circus. Another concern was that it might not gain support from the community because of the confrontational physical theatre element of such a project. Upon reflection now, a circus-based project would probably have sunk very quickly. It was a useful reminder that each community must find the right project to create a perfect fit. What SAY IT OUT LOUD! became after rethinking, was the right project, for the right place, for the right participants, at the right time.

The key partners of the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project were the KKCC, the CCC, the auspicing body Cessnock City Council and the WCAC. The WCAC is the cultural committee of the Newcastle Trades Hall Council. Established in 1974, WCAC moved from acting as a sub committee of the Council, to become a separate incorporated body in 1992. WCAC has become a world renowned working class cultural organisation responsible for the verbatim theatre play Aftershocks by Paul Brown and most recently the Molten Arts Project which recorded the closure of steelmaking in Newcastle through the collection of interviews and writing that culminated with Tailing Out by P.P.Cranney.

My association with WCAC started in 1995 upon my return to the Hunter Valley. As acknowledged earlier, prior to this I was a student in Bathurst studying for my BA Communications (Theatre/Media). The external examiner in my final year at Bathurst had been David Watt. Convinced that my future lay in further study, I enrolled in the Master of Theatre Arts (Community Theatre) at the University of Newcastle, where David Watt was the Co-ordinator of the course and my main lecturer. Amongst many subjects in Cultural Theory and Community Arts history was a research project. David Watt, as my supervisor for this subject, encouraged me to devise a CCD project that meant something to me. I was expected to develop a plan and funding application for this potential community cultural development project. The result was the draft funding application to the Australia Council’s CCDB and plans for SAY IT OUT LOUD!

David Watt’s involvement as the Secretary of WCAC encouraged me to get involved on a committee level. I joined the WCAC Committee of Management in 1995. Later in 1995, Steve Wilson, the Arts Organiser of WCAC heard of a traineeship being run through new training provider NSWCAA. NSWCAA was calling for interested organisations and potential trainees to express interest in a newly developed Certificate IV in Community Cultural Development. The WCAC proposed the idea that I become a CCD trainee attached to WCAC, I accepted this great opportunity and began my paid employment/training at WCAC.

Under the indenture of my traineeship I was expected to work as an employee of the WCAC and complete ten modules which made up the Certificate IV Community Cultural Development. The
main task of the theoretical module was the devising of a ‘CCD project’. I decided that the idea I had researched during the first year of my Masters degree – the project I had named SAY IT OUT LOUD! – was the one to propose to WCAC as a potential solo project that I would co-ordinate during the year of my traineeship. The WCAC agreed with this proposal and encouraged my work in expanding the WCAC’s reach into the Lower Hunter Valley.

Up until 1996, when I began work at WCAC, the organisation had been slowly changing the diversity of the communities it worked with, from traditional union based cultural activities to more diverse community based participatory projects. During 1996 Steve Wilson and I expanded the WCAC’s reach into outer suburbs of Newcastle and the Lower Hunter Valley. We engaged with gay and lesbian community groups, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community groups, single mothers, caravan park residents and many more.

The modules of the Certificate IV in Community Cultural Development gave a context to the structure, concerns, process and evaluation models I developed whilst working at WCAC. The Certificate modules were co-ordinated, edited and co-written by Rick Flowers. The Certificate was made up of five core modules:

Module 1 Define Goals and Models of Community Cultural Development
Module 2 Plan and Evaluate Community Cultural Development Projects
Module 3 Develop Community Cultural Development Strategies
Module 4 Manage Community Cultural Development Work
Module 5 Support Communities with their Cultural Development

There was also a range of elective modules. SAY IT OUT LOUD! fitted nicely into the work I prepared for Module 2. It was further expanded and reverberated throughout the other core modules and elective module I chose.

**Part One - Development**

The ideas for SAY IT OUT LOUD! developed from my research into the socio-economic issues of the Hunter Valley, the demographics, historical, industrial and social development of the towns in the Lower Hunter Valley and various texts accessed through the Local History collection at Cessnock City Library. The history of Cessnock and Kurri Kurri rests on the invasion of Europeans
around the 1820s into that area which wiped out virtually all of the Wollombi aboriginal people, belonging to the Dakinung Tribe. The land was subsequently divided and convicts in chain gangs built roads. Wine growing was established twenty years before the Greta coal seam was found in 1886. The population grew enormously in the fifty years from 1860s to the 1910s as a result of the discovery of the coal seam.

Industrial issues shaped the town over the 20th century, changing Cessnock from a farming area into an industrial community. They included significant events such as the lockouts in the late 1920s, the Bellbird mine disaster, Rothbury riots and the depression, all of which shaped Cessnock as a one-industry town. Since the seventies, miners have been using Cessnock and Kurri Kurri as dormitory suburbs because their work has moved further up the Hunter Valley as the coal seam is depleted. Families, women and children have had to re-create the town.

SAY IT OUT LOUD! in many ways was a project about discovering and upholding women’s stories from the area. There was little access to women’s stories in the history of Cessnock, let alone current accounts of life in the Lower Hunter Valley. It became vital that the project uncover women’s subjugated voices and open them up for the towns to discover. While the project served to create an oral history account, available to all through the Cessnock City Library branches, it was also about me finding out more about the amazing women in my hometown community. Growing up in Cessnock, I had one dream, to get out of the place as soon as I could! Why? What was wrong with the town? Had it changed? These questions prompted my probing and development of the proposal that resulted in SAY IT OUT LOUD!

I consulted widely with members of the community about my ideas. Firstly, I met with the Member for Hunter, Mr Joel Fitzgibbon. Joel advised me to talk to Ken Phelan at the local Council. This led me to the Historical Society and Gary Wilson the head of Community Cultural Services at the Cessnock City Council. Meetings were also held with local community organisation Healthy Heartbeat, the ex-Mayor of Cessnock Maree Callaghan, Historian Ken Victor, Cessnock City Council employee Peter Gogarty, and Kurri Kurri High School teacher Dennis Cork. I then spoke for hours with Jack Delany, a local historian who had been around during the riot-ridden coal mining days.

It was at this point that I had the great pleasure of meeting and watching a rehearsal of the Dapper Tappers. The Dapper Tappers are a group of older women who have learnt, or re-learnt, tap dancing later in life. The Dapper Tappers perform around the Hunter Valley to bring the music of yester-year to the nursing homes and a smile to many an audience member. The contact list filled
with excellent people and organisations such as the Miners’ Auxillary, the Civilian Widows Association, the new Aboriginal Co-op, Marthaville - the local cultural and visual arts house, the CWA, the View Club, and the Business and Professional Women’s Group. I had accessed the local gatekeepers Vanessa Delaney, - Cessnock Information Networks, Shelly Williams – CCC, and Ben Gruska and Susie Bryant from the KKCC.

Ultimately, after explaining the possibilities SAY IT OUT LOUD! was conceived. A women’s writing and storytelling CCD project which would articulate a three part public outcome – two story-telling performances in each town, a video of the performances and a collated book of the women’s stories to become a part of the Cessnock and Kurri Kurri local libraries for future reference. This project which started as a research/academic assignment now metamorphosed into a living breathing part of Cessnock and Kurri Kurri’s cultural history. As Simon Eade, Cultural Services Manager for the Cessnock City Council stated in an interview in 1999, “…I still see that [SAY IT OUT LOUD!] as one milestone in the community’s journey through cultural development” (Appendix L, 1999: 259). Ben Gruska recalls the process with his positive evaluation;

It was an excellent process from beginning to end. Its inception, giving birth to the idea and discussing it and establishing some links with some other workers at the time in the area…Forging some links between Kurri and Cessnock which is important as you would be aware…It was also really heartening to see that what we said we would do, what you said you would do, and what Simon [Eade] said he would do and everybody that was involved said they would do happened. So it was an inception, a conception if you’d like and a birth…and like all things that come to life and have a useful, positive beginning its had a very positive legacy that people are still talking about it. So it’s here for the duration (Appendix J, 1999: 233).

Part Two – Grant Application

Throughout 1996 I worked solidly on the consultation, networking and establishment of SAY IT OUT LOUD! The initial action was to form a Steering Committee made up of local gatekeepers, the Workers Cultural Action Committee and myself. Our first Steering Committee Meeting was on the 7th March 1996 and the Committee consisted of Shelly Williams, Susie Bryant and Ben Gruska,
Vanessa Delaney, Steve Wilson and myself. The Steering Committee discussed the project proposal, agreeing to an investment of time, space and energy and for the project to take place in their venues. They advised on participants and acted as drivers and researchers for the project.

The finalised project timeline was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/10/96</td>
<td>CCD Organiser commences work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Planning and co-ordination begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/96</td>
<td>Writer commences five-week appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/96</td>
<td>Director commences five-week appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/96</td>
<td>Writer concludes project involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13/12/96</td>
<td>Performance week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/12/96</td>
<td>Director concludes project involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/12/96</td>
<td>CCD Organiser concludes project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most exciting part of this early stage of the project was the enthusiasm of Simon Eade as the new Manager of Cessnock City Council’s Cultural Development Department. Simon had recently taken up this position, having relocated from England. Due to his enthusiasm, the Cessnock City Council agreed to auspice the project for the WCAC. This hands on approach and belief in the importance of the project to the cultural life of women in the community gave SAY IT OUT LOUD! a certain legitimacy that was invaluable.

The expected long-term benefits of SAY IT OUT LOUD! as outlined in the successful application (See Appendix G) to the Australia Council were:

- …the heightened level of community awareness relating to women’s histories, which will contribute to the wider cultural appreciation of the region’s history. SAY IT OUT LOUD! will enable local women to utilise their development skills in other projects of a broader cultural significance and the council will endeavor to foster these skills by consulting with the community through established networks in planning for future cultural projects.
- The long-term benefits for the communities of the coalfields will be through developing skills in performing/documenting writing stories, a group of women interested in nurturing women’s stories of the coalfields. Future projects could be involving the community in local
radio series, a publication of works and continuation of community skill development (Appendix G).

**Part Three - Networking**

Once the application was submitted I went about organising, through the Steering Committee, two community consultations – one in Cessnock and one in Kurri Kurri. These were primarily conducted to source participants for the project. I concentrated on consulting with culturally diverse community groups and organisations to actively encourage participation in the project such as the Multicultural Mothers Group, the newly established Aboriginal Corporation, the local high schools, the Community Radio Station, the local chapter of the National Register of Women, the Country Women’s Association, Kurri Kurri Helpers, Dapper Tappers and the Cessnock Writers’ Group. Participants were gathered from these five groups.

The Kurri Kurri Community Consultation took place at the KKCC on 16th August 1996 and ten women attended that meeting. The Cessnock Community Consultation was held on 27th September 1996 and eight women attended that meeting. We had enthusiastic turnouts in both towns and the enthusiasm was electric. At this early stage it became apparent that the two groups were quite different. The Cessnock group was made up of a majority of mid-age women who were, for the most part, homemakers. Some women knew each other, while others had never met; they were diverse in their backgrounds. The Kurri Kurri group was made up of women who were over seventy years of age, retired workers or homemakers, who mainly knew each other. The different dynamics of each group were a joy to work with.

**Part Four – The Project**

On the 20th September 96 our funding was confirmed, though we were granted only half of what we had applied for. As CCD organiser I was responsible for the management, promotion, consultation and development of SAY IT OUT LOUD! Posters and media releases were distributed highlighting
the funding received, advertising the commencement of the workshops and inviting general public to attend.

One of the major flaws of the project (from a management perspective) occurred at this point. My enthusiasm for the project saw me re-work the budget and aim to do exactly what we had proposed on half the budget. The main compromise was in the amount of time the artworkers had with the women.

Fiona Winning (storytelling) and Alison Lyssa (writing) both signed on as the artworkers for the project and a timeline was constructed to start the project in mid October 96. Each artworker had five weeks with the two groups of women meeting once to twice a week to workshop writing and performance skills. This culminated in a Night of Entertainment in Cessnock and Kurri Kurri, featuring local entertainers and the highlight of the shows – storytelling by the women.

In the end 12 women attended the Cessnock workshops with a core group of nine. Nine women attended the Kurri workshops with a core group of eight. At this time I also started to involve a group of young women, via Kurri Kurri High School. Both artworkers worked with this group though no public outcome resulted. Eight girls attended workshops with a core group of five.

Workshops were held once a week in each town and were very much anticipated. Alison Lyssa, an award winning writer, was employed as the writing artworker. Alison employed the use of a “bubble” system to start the women writing. The idea in the centre of the page would spark a range of memories, stories and issues that were linked. The women started each workshop by employing the “bubble” method to spark off their ideas and eventually the story that was ready to be written emerged. Each woman would spend time writing and then reading and discussing their stories. These sessions were very enjoyable and satisfying for all involved.

The introduction of the performance artworker, Fiona Winning, a well-known professional theatre maker, was very interesting. For weeks the women had been peeling back the memories and layers and had created a wonderful safe space to explore themselves, their family and their own memories. At this point the introduction of Fiona was a challenge for the women. The workshops changed from writing, reminiscing and storytelling to the physical activity of getting to their feet and telling their stories standing up in front of each other. Fiona used theatre games, stretching and vocal exercises to expand the women’s voices and stories into the performative.
As already mentioned, the culmination of this CCD project had multiple public outcomes. These included two story-telling performances in each town, a video of the performances and a collated book of the women’s stories, which as initially agreed, became part of the Cessnock and Kurri Kurri local libraries for future reference. The ‘Nights of Storytelling’ were true spectaculars. As CCD organiser, I had created a program of entertainment to warm the audience, featuring local performers, children, choirs and singers. The first ‘Night of Storytelling’, attended by 100 people, was held in Kurri. This was the first time the two groups of women had seen and meet each other. The second ‘Night of Storytelling’ was held in Cessnock and attended by 80 people. The audience feedback from each night was phenomenal. “The town was buzzing with it, with the people that attended it, it was buzzing for weeks and weeks later because you never went anywhere that wasn’t mentioned. And they said ‘When’s it going to be repeated?’”(Eileen, Appendix H, 1999: 184).

**Evaluation**

The Steering Committee meetings continued throughout the workshop series and supported the entire project from development through to the long-term evaluation, which provided the case study for this thesis. An evaluation was conducted the week after the ‘Night of Storytelling’. Reviewing the project acquittal highlights key points. Following is an excerpt from the acquittal (See Appendix I).

“It was a cathartic experience for all. Maude, Pelaw Main born and bred commented ‘I didn’t think I had anything to give. It (SAY IT OUT LOUD!) did a lot for my self esteem.’ Sandra, a proud Cessnockian said “I wanted to write, not tell stories, but I enjoyed it thoroughly. The thing that got me was they (the audience) laughed!” (Appendix I, 1997: 3).

It is detailed in the acquittal that the project was an overall success. More excerpts from the acquittal explain the most significant successes of SAY IT OUT LOUD!

- The project created the opportunity for the community to hear and experience the telling of stories of the women involved...The histori[es] of these women’s lives are an integral part of the history of the towns in the coalfields.
- Through the workshops the women gained a sense of belonging to the group and community, and a self confidence in the importance of their stories and lives.
• SAY IT OUT LOUD! offers one example of best practice in achieving an oral and social history of an area.
• In an area of great isolation whether due to geography, transport, or lack of confidence, the new found friendships established throughout the project are a great success.
• That the Cessnock and Kurri Kurri women are continuing each of their groups.
• These community organisations now have the example of a successful community cultural development project in their experience and can now plan something similar for the broader community if they wish (Appendix I, 1997: 4, 5).

The project also contained some critical weaknesses that are detailed in the following excerpts from the acquittal:

• The time frame of the project, both in timing of the project and the time within the project to achieve the set outcomes, for both the participants and artists involved.
• …the time frame was set too close to Christmas
• The outcome expected far out weighed the time set to achieve it.
• The lack of office space in Cessnock and Kurri Kurri and the added pressure to travel to and from the towns at least twice a week for all the artists.
• This time problem was also felt in the workshops with the Year Nine girls from Kurri Kurri High School (Appendix I, 1997: 5).

It is noted in retrospect that the critical weaknesses of the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project resulted from the management and co-ordination of the project and the decision made to achieve the same results with half the funding. These issues will be further discussed in Chapter Five.

Conclusion

SAY IT OUT LOUD! was a successful CCD project. It attempted to bring together artworkers, local women, community centres and local government. It aimed to tell a different history of Cessnock
and Kurri Kurri, a history that would be recorded and kept by the town library. It aimed to create new networks for the women involved by linking them with service providers and local government. The feedback suggests that this was achieved. It succeeded in engaging a group of women in a meaningful way, allowing them to grow and get to know each other very personally. It aimed to skill local women in writing and performance skills.

While all these aims were fulfilled as a result of this somewhat simple project, has it had a lasting impact in the long-term? These are the questions to be investigated in Chapter Six. In order to establish the legitimacy of the long-term outcomes chosen to measure this Case Study against, Chapter Five will investigate the management, evaluation and measurement of CCD work – what is the process, how is it achieved and how do we know if we have achieved success?

In analysing the data from the primary research I will be looking for three main indicators of long term outcomes from community cultural development projects, specifically SAY IT OUT LOUD! The three main indicators, expressed in the hypothesis, are:

1. The creation of community networks through CCD projects
2. The creation of new communities through CCD projects
3. The importance of continued cultural development perpetuated through CCD projects.

The interviews will reveal that these three indicators, as tangible evidence of the long-term impact of CCD projects, have occurred as a result of their participation in SAY IT OUT LOUD! and that a whole other range of intangible, personal long term outcomes like empowerment, raised self esteem, and increased tolerance have been influenced by the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project. These tangible and intangible outcomes are evidence of the building blocks of social capital and social change.

The data will be examined to reveal these outcomes and feelings that CCD projects have on participants, artworkers, and stakeholders. I look forward to discovering a whole range of other evidence not pointed to in the hypothesis to point towards the overall direction of this thesis that CCD projects, if planned and consulted properly, can achieve long term impacts on communities promoting social capital and social change.

The aim of this research is to discover the achievement of the outcomes of CCD projects in the long term. The questions raised will be what are long term outcomes? Whose outcomes are they? Whom do they serve? How do you measure these long-term outcomes? Whose responsibility is it to ensure the durability of the long-term outcomes? The premise of this research comes from the
lack of research, policy and practice being spent on the long-term social and cultural outcomes of CCD projects. CCD, as discussed before, is based on the concepts of social change, artistic development and the creation of social capital. Yet one could argue that CCD today focuses on the battle for funding, artistic innovation, and the marketing of cultural development. The means don’t necessarily produce the ends automatically. It seems that current CCD ‘practice’ contributes little time to evaluation of CCD projects and work, let alone long term evaluation and planning.

Theoretically, I argue that CCD practice, which is extensively developed in consultation with community, and at the will of the community is CCD practice that is ensured a long term outcome of community participation and control. More to the point CCD practice which is embedded in community and is planned with evaluative processes that are a part of the CCD process itself has a better chance of documenting and ensuring long term outcomes. The guarantee of long term outcomes for CCD practice is excellent planning, embedded in community, flexible CCD processes with continuing evaluation processes that are measured against criteria set out by community. This research arises through consideration of this theory and will go part of the way to proving this theory. It will point to a range of recommendations at the end of the thesis. The recommendations will centre on the need to develop a culture of evaluation in the practice of CCD.
CHAPTER SIX A

Introduction

Isolating the key long-term outcomes of CCD is primary to the hypothesis of this thesis. Creation of communities, creation of networks and continued cultural development are the three key community level outcomes this Chapter seeks to test. Did the case study, SAY IT OUT LOUD! achieve a long-term impact on these three key long-term outcomes? This Chapter has been divided into two sections. Six A will examine the personal level outcomes for each of the women involved in the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project. Through analysis of the primary research, this Chapter will offer evidence to demonstrate the long-term personal level outcomes achieved by the project. Six B will consider the long-term community level outcomes, as stated above, drawing conclusions on the potential long-term nature of the CCD process. This Chapter aims to assess the personal impacts the project had on the participant's lives and the link these impacts have had on the community level long-term outcomes.

Key Long term outcomes

Drew, Kasat & Sonn, the Australia Council and Hawkes provide a theoretical framework for the hypothesis through their assertions that the long-term importance of individual-level impacts, community development, capacity building and cultural development outcomes, as highlighted by this research, emphasise the success of the long-term outcomes of CCD. Drew, Kasat & Sonn define CCD as a methodology which sets out to achieve participation, capacity building and engender a sense of community (2002: 6). The Australia Council Community Cultural Development Board (CCDB) highlights the following outcomes, "...creation of outstanding art, new community relationships…social isolation diminished" (Australia Council, 02: 3). Zuidervaat states that true democracy is conceptualised through three significant ideas – participation, recognition, and freedom (2000: 24). Hawkes asserts that participatory arts, like CCD, establish access and meaning in individuals’ creativity through valuing their contribution to expressing and creating their own culture (2002: 3).
Community Cultural Development has numerous outcomes ranging from personal to communal and social – potentially leading to social change. The three key long-term outcomes that have been reiterated throughout the literature and case studies of CCD have been that CCD can have the power to:

- Create new communities;
- Create new networks; and
- Inspire continued cultural development.

I propose that the process and artform of CCD impacts personally on the participants, stakeholders and audiences, creating long-term outcomes, and potentially social change. Ultimately, through the agency of the individuals, these personal impacts create community outcomes, which signify increased social participation and social change. Community level outcomes, which detail the success of the CCD process in the broader society are dependent on the personal outcomes and impacts the CCD process has on the participants and their personal journeys. The outcomes of CCD, from individual, to project/organisation and community stress that the impact of the CCD process has a multi layered effect. As asserted by Drew, Kasat & Sonn the personal experience and outcomes felt by individual participants become “…barometers of change in their community” (2002: 21).

**How CCD effects personal change**

CCD cannot be said to offer a guaranteed process of positive life interventions. CCD should be a rigorous process that must be managed and planned with skill and foresight. There are issues of ownership, flexibility, and community approval, which require intensive, dynamic negotiative skills. The CCD practitioners that were interviewed for this research agreed that the job required high level skills in communication, negotiation, collaboration, flexibility, stress management, counselling skills, and, most importantly, art form expertise. Fiona Winning said, “You are constantly in this negotiation which is exciting” (Appendix D, 1999: 135).

Community ownership and understanding of the CCD process, its pitfalls and successes, is one of the most important negotiations of the CCD worker. The creation of a sense of ownership by a community, of an idea that has been brought to that community, is a delicate dance of partnership and flexibility. It has to be understood that knowing intrinsically what to do cannot be the only guide.
for CCD workers. This role is a mixture of politician, community worker, artist (read expert), social worker and friend.

The capacity of each citizen to participate in our society – their freedom to achieve active citizenship – relies in good part on the way in which they are received and treated by other citizens (Latham, 1998: 260).

Latham repeats Zuidervaat’s point about the keys to democracy. Democracy starts at the individual level through participation, recognition and freedom. These three building blocks for assembling the foundations of civil, creative and democratic communities start in our hands. CCD, as a process and artform, utilises art and culture as a vehicle for the development of these actions within participants. The effects of isolation, lack of education, socio-economic circumstances, and/or health can create a sense of disengagement for individuals. CCD acts as a bridge to link individuals with their communities through cultural development. Drew, Kasat & Sonn discovered that the individual-level outcomes, resulting from the CAN WA Cultural Planning Project, included “…the development of personal social networks, an increased feeling of being a part of a growing community, and opportunities to meet new people and get to know them better” (2002: 20).

By far the most significant long-term outcomes achieved in the case study are the personal impacts SAY IT OUT LOUD! had on all the participants and the stakeholders. This result is echoed by comparison, with Catherine Murphy’s CCD project ‘See Saw’ located in Ceduna South Australia. ‘See Saw’ aimed to ‘explore cross-cultural communication and reconciliation’ (Murphy, 1998: 24). The success of the ‘See Saw’ project was in the demonstration of such skills and values as social justice, reconciliation, negotiation, co-operation and co-existence (1998: 7). The success of the art making (creation of many See Saws symbolising the balance between black and white Australia) in portraying the importance of these values was instrumental in imparting a sense of community and ownership to the participants. The result was that participants were able to reflect upon the project in such a way that it facilitated the embedding of these values in the community.

SAY IT OUT LOUD! strove to highlight the importance of the social justice issue of equality, through giving voice to women in towns like Cessnock and Kurri Kurri. Evelyn, one of the Cessnock women, states that “…part of the problem is that women don’t think their stories are important, it’s their life, they think it’s an ordinary life” (Appendix K, 1999: 239). The aim of this CCD project was to ‘unearth’ Hunter Valley women’s stories which are key to the herstory of the Hunter Valley. That was certainly achieved, as discussed in Chapter Four. Attached to that successful outcome was a life-changing personal outcome for the women who participated – the importance of their stories and the interest
generated in their stories. It is easy to underestimate the power of listening to a person and really hearing that person’s life stories and memories.

**SAY IT OUT LOUD! Personal impacts**

Grouped by theme, this section aims to unfold the personal impacts the project had on the participants in the long-term. The themes explored include Participation, Recognition, and Change. Each theme will consist of a number of sub-headings that examine the personal level impacts the project had on each participant. Participants are referred to by first name only. The structure for this section will be as follows:

**Participation**
- Self esteem through participation – Lobna’s and Beryl's journey
- Developing new networks through participation – Janice’s and Jill's story
- Developing new skills through participation - The tale of Doris
- Confronting oneself through participation - Evelyn's challenge

**Recognition**
- Recognition of common humanity - Dorothy’s epiphany
- Recognition of a unique language - Kay's story
- Recognition of self within community – Audrey’s and Maude's discovery

**Change**
- Change of perspective - Eileen's journey through grief
- Change of perspective - Maree finds a common history
- Change of life - Daphne's story

**Participation**

Participation in SAY IT OUT LOUD! created the long-term personal impacts of heightened self esteem, building of confidence, enriching one’s networks through participation, developing new skills and rising to the challenge of confronting oneself. The women involved in the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project gained on a personal level from the project.
Self esteem through participation – Lobna’s and Beryl’s journey

Building self-esteem is primary to guiding individual members of communities towards acknowledging their unique self and expressing that, with confidence to their community. The old cliché rings true, that if you cannot embrace your own self, how can you embrace another? Lobna and Beryl both lacked confidence in expressing themselves to others in a larger forum. SAY IT OUT LOUD! presented an opportunity (albeit a frightening one) to present one’s life stories to an audience composed of their own community. The project issued a challenge to participants, one for which they all stood up to and gained community recognition.

The CCD process engages participants at those three levels – artistic, personal and communal – and this is the key to the power of this process. Lobna was engaged in the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project at these three levels and experienced a strengthening of her own identity as an Egyptian woman in Cessnock. Lobna shared her life stories, which she discovered were of great interest to the group. She also shared her stories with her family, she challenged herself to write and perform. “I really enjoyed it so much. And it give me confidence in myself to speak. (Evelyn: But also to do the Tech course and get your license.) That too, yes, all in one year” (Appendix K, 1999:238).

These three opportunities the process created for participants to grow enabled Lobna to view herself differently. The project impacted on the way Lobna’s family viewed her. “SAY IT OUT LOUD! made [a] positive effect in my life because it give me confidence in my speech and reading” (Appendix K, 1999:252). It created an access point for the community to listen to Lobna’s stories and learn from the diverse experiences the community, as a whole, has within its own boundaries.

In the Kurri Kurri group, Beryl acted as a gatekeeper of knowledge on the history, the people, the church and community of Kurri Kurri. Beryl has an excellent memory for details and an enormous love for her hometown that gave the group much heart throughout the project. As a life long resident of Pelaw Main (a small village just outside Kurri Kurri), Beryl added a great feeling of family. Her stories spoke of the generations of her family in the Hunter moving lyrically from her grandparents to grandchildren.

Beryl enjoyed the project as a way of experiencing her friends’ stories and getting to know her friends on a different level. In her written evaluation she said, “SAY IT OUT LOUD! had a positive impact on my life because it improved my self esteem in as much as performing to an audience and noticing and appreciating the writing of fellow members” (Appendix H, 1999: 206). Beryl’s contribution and journey were touching, a soft expression of the wonderful person that she is. The
Developing new networks through participation – Janice’s and Jill’s story

Janice was a late starter in the Kurri Kurri group. Janice arrived towards the end of the writing phase of the project, though what she brought was enough to excite the group and the artists. Janice is an Aboriginal woman who works as a geriatric nurse. SAY IT OUT LOUD! proved successful for Janice as she found use of the Kurri Kurri women’s stories at work, "I don’t know very much about a stable upbringing, that was really good to hear the old stories. And I use them for my work with dementia folk…" (Appendix H, 1999: 194).

She created a mothering feeling in the group, although she was half the age of some of the women already participating and had a radically different life history. "Well I was the last one to come and join the group, so it was only two weeks till the performance or something and the acceptance, immediate acceptance that I got from all of you was wonderful" (Appendix H, 1999: 169). The other women in the Kurri Kurri group shared a common history. Mostly, they all grew up in and lived their lives in Kurri Kurri. Janice provided a new perspective and a challenge for the group to learn about her herstory as an Aboriginal woman.

Janice brought with her a beautiful piece of writing – “Norwood Lane”

It was and always will be to me a place of incredible peace and tranquillity, where life is unhurried and the wild strawberries, blackberries and raspberries grow undisturbed.

Maiden hair fern also runs riot, cascading over fallen logs and in gullies that I know so well. It was here that I lived for three years with my mother and father. I was allowed to wander around outside the little two-roomed shack I shared with them, my father allowed me five piglets to comfort me and keep me quiet as my mother was seldom well. I adored them, I named them, they stayed close to me and even slept with me in my cot.
My piglets and I would spend hours playing under the walnut tree and they would accompany me whilst I picked the wildflowers from the fields. It was here in Norwood Lane I learnt quite young that to be alone with just myself and my thoughts in nature was beautiful and thoroughly enjoyable, a habit that has followed me into my adult life.

I was a child of the fields and the mountains, valleys and river of Norwood Lane. I have one memory of my mother, that silhouette against an open window at dusk, her long dark hair flowing to her waist and the bulge in her stomach that I did not know was a pregnancy, one that would take her life but provide me with a sister I was not to meet until my twenty ninth year of life, but that is another chapter. All that is left now of the two-roomed shack in Norwood Lane is a piece of bricked chimney, the walnut tree is gone also but the stream and the wild berries and wildflowers, they remain.

My thoughts are never far from this place and at least once a year I make the journey back to Norwood Lane and picnic by the stream, amongst the quietness and the wild things growing.

I do not speak whilst I am there because the spoken word I feel, might intrude upon the hush that settles over my soul. It is a sacred place to me, one that is imbued with my mother’s presence. My ashes will be scattered there one day and finally again I will become part of the fields, mountains and the valleys of Norwood Lane (SAY IT OUT LOUD!, 1996: 63 - 64).

This piece of prose profoundly altered the mood and direction of the Kurri group. The beautiful sense of lament and wonder that Janice brought to the group of women still sits with me today when I read that poem again. Janice also benefited from the experience. She wrote “SAY IT OUT LOUD! is an important part of my life because: It was the first time I actually shared my stories with an audience and I feel that I have made lifetime friends with the other ladies and the acceptance I felt upon my coming was for me wonderful” (Appendix H, 1999: 206).

Jill was a writer who participated in a creative writing group in Cessnock. SAY IT OUT LOUD! expanded Jill’s experience of Cessnock. Jill, in her written evaluation of the project, stated that “SAY IT OUT LOUD! had an impact on my life in as much as I joined a group of people who were all
new to me and had all come from diverse backgrounds” (Appendix K, 1999: 252). Jill had relocated to Cessnock after living all over the world. SAY IT OUT LOUD! challenged her idea that all people in Cessnock have had the same backgrounds. She said “You sometimes get to place, especially like this, and everybody’s backgrounds are exactly the same, but it wasn't...I really enjoyed having the meetings” (Appendix K, 1999: 235).

The value of the creation of new networks at a personal level became an important outcome for the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project. As explained in the case study, Cessnock and Kurri Kurri are closed communities – tight knit, full of gossip and secrets and very hard to break into if you are a newcomer. As Audrey recounts about her arrival in Kurri Kurri, “…they got very clicky” (Appendix H, 1999: 198). Both Janice and Jill were newcomers to the towns, relocated due to their husbands work situations. SAY IT OUT LOUD! created opportunities for these participants to connect, in a meaningful way, despite social barriers.

**Developing new skills through participation – The tale of Doris**

Doris is a remarkable woman who has lived an extraordinary life. Doris kept the Cessnock group enthralled with her stories of giving birth inside a Prisoner of War camp in Hankow, China; her time in India; her childhood in Bristol and her many children and their amazing lives. Doris was truly unique, a newcomer to Cessnock in 1959, and she was the doctor’s wife. Doris started the project with a specific task in mind – how can this project help me write my memoirs better. “That helped me enormously, that bubble business [writing technique applied by Alison Lyssa, SAY IT OUT LOUD! artsworker]. I wish the Dickens I had known about that before I started my book, so I would have written it in chapters...I think I learned a lot” (Appendix K, 1999: 238).

Doris, the oldest member of the Cessnock group, offered an international perspective to the, often insular, Cessnock mind set. Doris also was responsible for letting go two bombshells in the evaluation process of SAY IT OUT LOUD! The first was her revelation that she had suffered a mini stroke after the storytelling nights. “…I was scared out of my wits, in Kurri I was really scared out of my wits. What I didn’t [know] was that three days after we had that do in Cessnock, I had a mini stroke. That was probably why I got so upset that day, I don’t know” (Appendix K, 1999: 237). The second bombshell will be examined later under ‘Change’. Doris achieved her personal aim of developing new skills in writing which have helped her compose the remainder of her memoirs. Interestingly, Doris also added a degree of humanity to the CCD process. As a seasoned public
speaker, Doris found the presentation nights as scary as everyone else did. This humbled her, the women, and me.

**Confronting oneself through participation – Evelyn’s challenge**

The SAY IT OUT LOUD! project had a personal interventionist outcome in the case of Evelyn. Evelyn is an obese woman who presented as organised, dedicated and talented. The CCD process created many tensions within Evelyn due to the fact that she needed to confront her own body in the physical aspects of the project. “Because I have spent my life not being in touch with my body and not being a physical person…So some of the exercises that we had to do were, for me, particularly personally confronting, confronting of myself…” (Appendix K, 1999: 236). She found this difficult to deal with. Her response was to create tension within the process between herself and the artist on the project. “…I actually got quite angry about it, being put in that position. And it was a while before I realised that I was putting my anger out there when it was really, it should have been at myself” (Appendix K, 1999:236). The project did not suffer from the tension that Evelyn created within the process. The other women in the Cessnock group were determined to enjoy the project. But there was a potential threat if Evelyn stopped coming to the workshops – and that was that at least three women in the core Cessnock group would not be able to attend due to lack of transport. The outcome however, of Evelyn’s cultural development included two beautiful songs, which were performed at the ‘Night of Storytelling’.

Evelyn maintains that the project did not have any long-term outcomes on her and her life, yet I beg to differ. Evelyn’s life has carried on at great pace since SAY IT OUT LOUD! Maybe the fact that the CCD process was interventionist created such fear and self-censorship that it attributed negatively to the self-image of this participant. The challenge presented to Evelyn, and all the other participants, was the opportunity to embrace oneself both intellectually and physically through the expression of emotions and stories. Unfortunately, this challenge presented too much of a hurdle, emotionally, to Evelyn. Her responses created outward tension, which really represent her inner turmoil.

To be fair to Evelyn, it must be said that her contribution to the establishment of SAY IT OUT LOUD! was invaluable. Evelyn, through her friendly and capable demeanour, enticed most of the Cessnock participants to take part. Evelyn contributed through offering to put up artists at her own
home, driving participants to the meetings, and binding the book of writing. Evelyn was an important cornerstone to SAY IT OUT LOUD! and was delighted by the impacts the project had on her friends.

**Recognition**

The CCD process and artform can lead participants towards a new awareness, awareness within themselves, about their community, their family, their friends and the world. Recognition through participation in SAY IT OUT LOUD! is one of the important long-term personal impacts for the following participants. The project created opportunities for these participants to create a new awareness of others, themselves and broader social issues. The personal outcomes of these moments of recognition are the true point of change for the participants. A sense of self, and one’s self within the broader scheme of community and the world, establishes the foundation of a democratic active citizen.

**Recognition of common humanity – Dorothy’s epiphany**

Dorothy from the Kurri Kurri group was one of my favorite storytellers. Dorothy is a gentle and thoughtful woman who came up with comments that really articulated my feelings on the change that needs to happen in people through the intervention of the CCD process. Dorothy said “…we are so much the same under the skin” (Appendix H, 1999: 168). This simple statement epitomises the sense of common humanity that we all share. Dorothy moved beyond the divisions that unfortunately shape Australia – class, race, religion, and economics, geography – simply stating that we are all the same.

This epiphany that Dorothy experienced and then articulated correlates with a feeling I have about the CCD process and hoped to communicate to the participants in this project. It is of utmost importance that if we wish to change the attitude and feeling of communities that are renowned for their gossiping and malice, the tools of tolerance, forgiveness and love need to pave the way for a new community.

Dorothy wrote, “SAY IT OUT LOUD! means to me an acceptance of my faults and an ability to feel that I can accept something that I have achieved even if it is small. I also appreciate the knowledge I gained that we are so much alike inside, even when coming from quite different backgrounds. It
was a moving introspective look which is still benefiting me” (Appendix H, 1999: 207). Dorothy is a woman who, over the life of the project, lost her sight. This major setback didn’t alter Dorothy’s passion to write her stories and tell the stories of her life. She authored ten stories.

**Recognition of a unique language – Kay’s story**

Kay is a creative woman. She taught me a lot about myself and expanded my memory about growing up in Cessnock. Kay has an unusual story – her mother was born in Cessnock, ran away from Cessnock, gave birth to Kay, placed Kay in an orphanage and Kay was adopted back into a Cessnock family. Kay laughs at her life, “And do you think I buy lottery tickets? No!” (Appendix K, 1999: 250). Kay has severe dyslexia, at times causing her to black out from seeing black type on white pages. Kay learnt from an early age to fake her way through school and life, never letting any one know that she couldn’t read or write. She was a renowned copycat. “I was dyslexic, and didn’t learn to read and write. When my husband left, and I learned to read and write, I got my money from my half of the house, I researched dyslexia and went around the world” (SAY IT OUT LOUD!, 1996: 70). Kay’s language is the language of art- drawing, design, and painting. She has had excellent success locally and internationally with her work, and has completed a fine arts degree at the University of Newcastle.

I realised that pictures are my language and I have to be content with that because a written language is beyond the amount of years I feel I’ve got left… (Appendix K, 1999: 241).

Kay saw SAY IT OUT LOUD! as a great challenge to her as it presented another confrontation with words and paper. The project created an experience for Kay to watch people turn memories into written stories,

…it was interesting to watch other people who have always had that skill be able to put it down on paper. And be envious, I suppose, because I don’t have that, I mean I think wonderful stories in me head but to put it down into written language is a totally different medium to thinking it or drawing it. So for me it was sort of a combination of all those things. And I haven’t really been able to write since then but at least I know how, how it, because I’ve never really seen it before, how you can convert it from a thought down to a beautiful written thing (Appendix K, 1999: 236).
The power that the project SAY IT OUT LOUD! had in Kay’s life was through establishing a connection with her inner being.

…the exercises that we did for the very first time in my life I felt that I have an inner feeling because we did that, humming, the sounds, and I could actually feel the inner part of my body vibrating. I had never, never experienced that I had one because I’m not a person that feels even on the exterior that much. So you know, I would have been quite content to have done that all day, cause I really thought that that was wonderful (Appendix K, 1999: 237).

All of the Cessnock participants marvelled at Kay’s expression. Doris commented, “I’d never met a person like you before [Kay], who drew in dots. I was absolutely fascinated, you’re exceedingly clever, and I would never have met you if [it] hadn’t been for SAY IT OUT LOUD!” (Appendix K, 1999: 240). Here was a woman who found it hard to express in writing her history and feelings. Kay recognised that the skill of writing does not have to compare or even equal her skill of drawing and painting her life, ideas and stories. Kay’s participation in the project added an unplanned dimension, a challenge to the supremacy of writing to portray stories. This coupled with Kay’s recognition of feeling within her body through humming exercises demonstrates the power of this project in the long-term. For Kay, SAY IT OUT LOUD! not only brings back fond memories, but also continues to encourage her artistic body of work.

Recognition of self within community – Audrey’s and Maude’s discovery

Audrey is an extroverted ‘outsider’ meaning that she only settled in Kurri Kurri in 1960. Audrey has created a space for herself and her family in the community of Kurri Kurri and now experiences a certain respect for her place in the town. Audrey is a natural performer and loved reciting her poems and stories each week. The experience of the storytelling nights in Cessnock and Kurri Kurri created an open stage for Audrey to shine with her hilarious stories and escapades of youth. Audrey wrote “SAY IT OUT LOUD! had a positive impact on my life because it got me to unfold my life…By letting myself go and exchanging with others was most beneficial. A better person I have become” (Appendix H, 1999: 206). It is heartening to know that the project also had a cathartic personal effect on Audrey’s life. Audrey confided in the group that, “…I got a lot of things off my chest that had been bugging me for years…” (Appendix H, 1999: 175).
As mentioned above in the section on Participation, SAY IT OUT LOUD! was a special experience for Beryl and her older sister Maude. The sisters were able to spend time listening to each other’s very different lives. Maude, the older sister, had to leave Kurri Kurri to work in Newcastle as a maid at the early age of fourteen. Maude didn’t really return to the family home from that time on. On the other hand, younger sister Beryl was able to gain work in Maitland [only a short distance from Kurri Kurri], allowing her to remain near home and a part of her community.

Maude passed away not long after the project finished. There was truly a sense that SAY IT OUT LOUD! was something that was meant to be a part of Maude’s life. Beryl recalled this feeling at the group interview in saying, “From the word go she didn’t know whether she would handle coming, yet she wanted to come. And everything she did I know she had that wonder, you know ‘Would that be alright?’ I know she felt like the rest of us, especially that night that it was on, you know ‘Do you fancy us doing this?’…” (Appendix H, 1999: 173) Beryl went on further to add, “I do feel that that was meant to be part of her life, yeah I do feel that. Because Maude wasn’t one to be in a lot of things, but well she had, they weren’t always good memories of early times, that we mightn’t of remembered, maybe just skimmed on. But she remembered things, [in her life]… that maybe some of us wouldn’t have know[n] about?” (Appendix H, 1999: 174).

Audrey and Maude’s recognition of their own importance in their community and family is touching. The effects of isolation, especially in regional Australia, can have devastating impacts on a person’s ability to feel a sense of community in the place in which they live. Audrey is a popular community volunteer and an active member of the community. Her feeling of being an outsider isn’t uncommon in these towns. The closed community façade can be very intimidating to “newcomers”. SAY IT OUT LOUD! gave Audrey the space to have her feelings of being the outsider recognised, validated, and dealt with. Audrey is an intrinsic part of the community in Kurri Kurri and now she knows this to be true.

The recognition of Maude’s talent, stories and life history was most important in Maude finding her place within the group. Maude found herself to be the oldest women in the Kurri group, which comprised a lot of her younger sister Beryl’s good friends. Maude’s contribution to SAY IT OUT LOUD! was recognised and acknowledged by the artists, the groups and the audiences.
Change

SAY IT OUT LOUD! helped the process of personal change within some participants. Eileen, Daphne and Maree used the project as a way to deal with grief and, in one case, anger. The use of the project, both through the writing and storytelling stages, posed the opportunity for these participants to work through their feelings in a dynamic and supported, yet personal way.

Change of perspective - Eileen’s journey through grief

Eileen from the Kurri Kurri group and the author of ‘Saturday Afternoon’ and ‘Velvet Sash’, wrote in response to my questions “SAY IT OUT LOUD! Means something to me because, no one has ever asked to hear my story” (Appendix H, 1999: 207). She goes on further to describe this experience as a “...thaw out of our solid past...” Eileen is a remarkable woman who had recently gone through a loss in the family. This devastating life loss, coupled with bad health problems, challenged Eileen’s participation in SAY IT OUT LOUD! as it became very hard just to get to the Community Centre. Yet from Eileen’s perspective the CCD process of SAY IT OUT LOUD! “…was like counselling for me because I said to them [her family] ‘I got so much out of SAY IT OUT LOUD! I found that in thinking about what I was going to write, I didn’t get round to writing it all out, but, and I think I said to Beryl, ‘Now I’ve changed my mind.’ Now when I think back I think of happy times. And even just that one day that we said, Saturday afternoon...just a natural afternoon we had. And I started to think, if not in words, got the feeling, my life wasn’t so bad after all (Appendix H, 1999: 178).

Change of perspective - Maree finds a common history

Maree, a Kurri Kurri participant, is, in fact, a Cessnock girl. Throughout the implementation of the project Maree alluded to feeling as though she didn’t belong in this group because she was a Cessnock person. This exemplifies the deep cultural imprint the towns have on the people and families that live within their boundaries. Maree is a Master of Ceremonies, a Dapper Tapper (Older Women Tap Dancing Group), a well known singer and comedian. Maree very much participated at a different level. She is an extroverted person and found the democratic process of listening and
sharing equally very different from what she was used to. She said in the evaluation I conducted in 1999 that “…I’ve been listening here all afternoon and I feel like I’m the co-ordinator (LAUGHTER) because I haven’t got as much to say as you people…I was just sitting back here thinking well, I’m in a different role because I compare all about the place and I guest speak and I… I didn’t not have the confidence” (Appendix H, 1999: 191).

The personal change for Maree came from confronting her deep-seated feeling about her parents. “I mean I disliked Mum and Dad, I said oh, they did this and they did that, and they did da, da, da. No I still have inhibitions about it, but I realised it seemed to be a coalfields attitude, towards children… I know the day that I did it here, and I can see us sitting over there, and it helped me tremendously to write it cause I think I had a good howl and it did help. But then I, I must have been showing off and vividly remember showing someone and I remember they said well that happened to me too!” (Appendix H, 1999: 177). Maree confronted her hurt, and her sense of being alone and unloved. The capacity to uncover and confront these powerful emotional scars is a key part of this CCD process. It can help and move people, though it can also harden and harm.

**Change of life - Daphne's story**

Daphne is a dear soul who has an incredible sense of kinship with her beloved Kurri Kurri. Like Audrey, Daphne didn’t grow up in Kurri Kurri. She settled here with her family – husband Carl and two sons. Daphne met her husband Carl when she was sixteen and married not long after that. At the time of SAY IT OUT LOUD! Daphne was experiencing the slow withdrawal from her life of her best friend and soul mate, her husband Carl. He had experienced a massive stroke eighteen months prior to the project; he now had no memory and during the project resided in a nursing home. Daphne used the project as a way to explore her own feelings of grief and to celebrate her extraordinary life. As Daphne stated in the group interview writing down stories from her life, “Well what I’m doing, I’m putting my oral history down on paper and I wouldn’t have been able to start it if it hadn’t been for this [SAY IT OUT LOUD!].” (Appendix H, 1999: 190).

Eileen and Daphne had experienced a major life change in the loss of a loved one and the gradual letting go of a life partner. Both used SAY IT OUT LOUD! to deal with their grief and embrace their life through the celebration of the project. The project acted in role as a part of the rite of passage these women were experiencing. Their life had changed and SAY IT OUT LOUD! helped them embrace that change through embracing and celebrating their past. In the case of Maree, her choice to deal with her anger about her upbringing and her parents was somewhat diffused by the
comment she received. It was an epiphany that set a new course in Maree’s life; a personal change had occurred where she could put to bed her anger and celebrate her present.
CHAPTER SIX B

Sustainability

It is well recognised that it is problematic to evaluate the impact a project may have had on participants in the long-term. The wheel of life continues on for all the participants and creates challenges, opportunities and times of doubt and joy. How can a short-term project like SAY IT OUT LOUD! claim these long-term personal impacts? This question confronts the core problem in proving the hypothesis of this thesis. It also raises the questions that Doris articulated in the Cessnock Group Interview. The second bombshell that Doris let go was in her response to the evaluation. “SAY IT OUT LOUD! was an enjoyable and instructive event – but was a disappointment to me because there was no follow up of any description. What was the point of the exercise? I do not mean to criticise because I enjoyed what I did – but I had a let down feeling” (Appendix K, 1999: 253).

This revelation severely shocked me. Had SAY IT OUT LOUD! created a sense of newness to the community, which was quickly withdrawn, leaving no cultural infrastructure for continued cultural development? Was SAY IT OUT LOUD! the kind of project that I, as a CCD practitioner and a researcher, was arguing against? Was SAY IT OUT LOUD! for all its long-term positive personal impact, unsuccessful because it left one participant with a ‘let down feeling’? These questions raise the primary concern for long-term implementation and long-term outcomes of CCD. It is proven, as demonstrated by the personal impacts on the participants, that a short term CCD project can have a long-term impact on participants. So, in the long run, how responsible is it for CCD practitioners and funders to implement short-term CCD projects in community, which do not host the cultural infrastructure to continue the cultural development? These questions will be examined further in Chapter Seven.

Creation of new communities

Community grows as its members participate in, and shape, its growth; and it grows because of its members participation (Kelly, 1984, 50).
A community is a hub of networks, vitally alive and striving to support each other. A community can be open or closed, an enclave that asserts its boundaries. We belong to many communities throughout life; they grow and change as we do. The need for a sense of place, a sense of belonging is what draws humans into creating communities. They act as support structures, extended families, perpetuators of certain values, ideas and ways of working. Communities create solace for people.

Community is a flexible term used to describe a group of people coming together through a shared interest – whether it is a local geographical community like a town, or an Indigenous cultural community. Raymond Williams defines ‘community’ in his book Keywords, as being a “…warmly persuasive word to describe an alternative set of relationships. What is most important, perhaps, is that unlike all other terms of social organisation (state, nation, society, etc.) it seems never to be used unfavourably…” (1976: 76).

David Watt describes the term as being “…used like Polyfilla, patching the cracks of contradiction to create the impression of monolithic social grouping” (Watt, 1991: 58). This acknowledges that the perceptions and boundaries imposed on communities and by communities can be quite limiting. Indeed the word community has become a panacea for policy makers searching for new ways to communicate to the masses. Specialist and highly defined community groupings pose difficulties when introducing the processes of CCD.

CCD is a process that aims to engage already established communities and sometimes creates new communities. The CCD process values the networks established communities bring, but does not rely on these connections to create new experiences for the participants. The power of CCD is in the ability of the process to create a sense of excitement and ever encompassing points of connection within and between communities, services, government, education, art and business. “The original definition of community was ‘to serve together’” (Jarman & Land, 1995: 32). The creation of new communities creates new opportunities for relating in new ways and serving each other within the existing social organisation.

“Dynamic notions of communities…allow the creation of purposive communities of interest which, by the process of self-definition, resist being thus subsumed and can retain an oppositional integrity” (Watt, 1991: 64). The CCD process is at heart, a way of managing the creation of new communities. To create a new community, the CCD process establishes an interest that becomes the heart of the new community. In SAY IT OUT LOUD! the new interest was writing. The interest in writing was what attracted participants to the project. The participants’ interest in writing is what
established the new community of women who assembled around this project. Hawkes concur;
“The arts practice can be usefully applied to initiate community building. That is in the originating,
articulation and expression of community values and goals” (2002: 6).

Even though a majority of the women who participated in SAY IT OUT LOUD! knew of each other
prior to the CCD project (and sometimes knew each other extremely well), the power of the CCD
process encouraged the women to reveal more of themselves to each other. This process brought
about much insight for all involved. It created a beautiful, safe environment in which the women
could push themselves, through remembering their lives and sharing themselves with each other.
For Doris, “I think it entered me into a different group of people that I very much enjoyed…”
(Appendix K, 1999: 241) and Dorothy realised that her ‘community’ didn’t extend past family, church
and school; I didn’t have very much to do with other things in the community or know what others
did…” (Appendix H, 1999: 201).

Eva Cox talks about the significance of trust “Trust is a pre-requisite for healthy risk-taking. This is
not bungy jumping or drunk driving, but the confidence to suggest new ideas, to offer proposals
outside the current loops” (Cox, 1995:11). The respect, support, caring and sharing that
characterised each of the groups in SAY IT OUT LOUD! is also that which defines a community.
Evelyn agrees; “It was a nurturing environment, you felt safe. We could open up to people around
the group” (Appendix K, 1999: 235). The project created a new community of women who saw
within each other their own strengths and weaknesses as well as their frustrations and joys of living
within towns which harbour gossip but also produces great Australians. Edgar furthers Cox’s
definition of trust; “Without trust, cooperation is impossible; without cooperation, society-building
cannot happen…” (Edgar, 2001: 101). The role of trust in building new communities is crucial.

In many towns and suburbs throughout Australia, the growing disengagement of communities,
neighbourhoods, and families is promoting the increased importance of the individual in society.
Eva Cox, renowned social analyst and author refers to the “Homo non sapien”, a non-social being
that has become more prevalent in society as economic rationalism and capitalism increasingly
inform public policy. “If he [Homo non sapien] takes over, he will destroy society because social
connections have no place in a world full of self interested, competing individuals” (Cox, 1995:2).

Part of the hypothesis of this thesis maintains that through engagement with the CCD process, the
long-term outcome of ‘creation of communities’ is possible. The bringing together of individuals and
groups that may or may not know each other opens the possibility that, post-project, the group will
remain linked through the common connection of the project. The CCD project acts as a social
intervention; it creates new opportunities for engagement for participants in communities. It also
creates new areas of interest for the creation of a new community. Building capacity for individuals
to connect locally creates new opportunities for development of culture, development of
participation in civic life and ultimately effecting social change.

In their text Beyond Breakpoint: Possibilities for New Community, Jarman & Land explain that “The
new community is built around self-responsibility, where building strength in the individual is seen
as valuable. Self-responsibility does not imply a me-only perspective but it requires a commitment
to personal development and to the good of the whole” (1995: 31). Their perspective of personal
development for the good of the entire community sits nicely with the concept of CCD. The
participants’ development of new personal communication and cultural skills is essential to good
CCD practice.

The importance of strengthening the personal identity of community members is paramount in a
CCD process. Strong identity and shared identity gives people a sense of belonging and shared
history. Gillian Rose in her insightful article “Spatialities of ‘community’, power and change: the
imagined geographies of community arts projects”, defines community as “…a group of people with
shared values…” (Rose, 1997: 3). Identity places your life in a context – geographical, cultural,
racial, and economic – that is shared by those around you, those within your community. The
strength of identity correlates to the strength of self.

**Creation of new networks**

Creating new networks within community is a long-term outcome of the CCD process. Drew, Kasat
& Sonn simply state that participants gained awareness of both personal and community networks
through “…bringing people into conversation with each other” (2002: 23). The creation of new
networks is inspired by the multitude of partners and supporters directly related to the project. It
seems that even though community organisations, local government and community groups might
exist near each other and interact somewhat with each other, the intervention of a Community
Cultural Development process creates new points of contact, new opportunities and new kinds of
collaboration.

These new points of contact often occur when community workers, local government workers and
volunteers, who have established relationships of power and communication, have to fundamentally
alter those relationships within the process of CCD. The process of CCD on CCD workers and workers involved in the steering of projects is profound and influential. Workers can access the workshops, artistically or from a management perspective and relate the experience to their organisation, department or group. The importance of the project, and therefore the power of the CCD process, becomes a point of social change. Ruby Red, a recipient of the Community Cultural Development Board’s Ros Bower award in recognition of a lifetime of achievement in CCD speaks on behalf of practitioners when she states; “The attraction of community cultural development work for me is its propensity for social change” (in Moon, 2000: 39). It changes the way workers involved see the participants, and their role in their organisation. Ultimately it may validate the importance of the community experience through the development of cultural skills.

The links established prior to the CCD process inevitably change. In the case of SAY IT OUT LOUD! many of the participants knew each other as best friends, co-workers, colleagues and sometimes arch-enemies! This familiarity created a sense of familiarity to start from. However, the traditional power structures set up within those established links were slowly altered to encompass the new relationships formed. Eileen emphasised the Kurri Kurri women’s feelings about their relationship with the KKCC after SAY IT OUT LOUD!, “We feel as if we are part of it and it belongs to us, don’t we!” (Appendix H, 1999: 203).

The links established throughout the CCD process promote further change and movement. It is recognised, though, that the propensity for change is not always of benefit, or always a possibility, in the CCD process. In the case of the Cessnock women, there was an opposite outcome in terms of the creation of new networks, “…you guys [the artworkers and myself] were the one[s] who were our connection to those areas and really, once you were gone those connections [were gone as well]…” (Appendix K, 1999: 251). Pushing participants and communities too far may have disastrous results, though at the other extreme, change in an individual, community or group, can be seen as an end in itself. In the long term CCD promotes new networks based upon participation, democracy, celebration and collaboration.

Participants indicate that through involvement in a CCD process they develop new or enhanced relationships with community organisations, government, as well as local groups and businesses. The simple process of gaining access to and interacting with organisations and governments at a personal level through meeting employees and representatives creates a new improved access point to those key community services. The strengthening of community involvement through building community linkages aids local communities by encouraging increased citizenship.
Increasing citizenship entails individuals seeing that they themselves have a role to play in the development and enhancement of a better community. This ultimately political objective sees individuals reverse their perspective from being passive members of society to an active participant in society. Rick Flowers describes this type of development or learning as emancipatory. He details “What is actually happening is that you are asserting yourself as an active, political citizen, you’re a subject, a maker and shaker. Emancipatory means to be free” (Appendix B, 1999: 122-3).

Creating new networks through CCD is about encouraging participants to become active citizens of their community. Building a new community of active citizens will lead to increased social capital within that community. Social capital is a term that is used by the community development and CCD field as a way of measuring, in a quasi-economic sense, the social worth of a project. Eva Cox explains further that “Social capital refers [to] the processes between people which establish networks, norms and social trust and facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefits” (1995:15).

This definition describes the CCD process. CCD is effectively a process by which communities can develop social capital and active citizens. Cox continues to explain how communities can develop social capital. “How do we increase our social capital? There have been no programs specifically designed to encourage community action over the past decades. In the 1960s and 1970s there were debates on community development but those lost out to advancing economic frameworks. There are vestiges in community arts movements, in some areas of adult education and in local government” (Cox, 1995: 72). So the point has been made that CCD is a vehicle for creating social capital which includes the creation of new communities and the creation of new networks.

**Continued cultural development**

Cultural development is a process that explores and opens up the opportunity within participants to their own natural abilities, stories and dreams. Cultural development is a term that describes the skills development that participants gain through community arts-based projects and programs. One precursor to this cultural skills development is the establishment of a ‘safe’ environment in which participants can learn and share without discrimination. Participants can use the excitement and anticipation they feel about participating in a CCD process and artform, to replace fear and self-censorship if they are not fully immersed in a ‘safe’ environment.
One role of the CCD worker or artist is to create a trusting relationship with the group from within. This process of creating a ‘safe’ environment is a gradual process that asks participants to give more of themselves the further along the process they go. The gradual nature of the CCD process is a comforting way to gain access to those creative selves that participants sometimes keep locked away from their families, partners and even themselves for a lifetime. Finding the key to the inner self, the dreams, aspirations, the hidden talents and the spirit to learn and achieve is the key role of the CCD practitioner and the sign of a successful CCD process.

CCD is an interventionist process. It takes participants who are at one point in their lives, introduces them to a process of cultural development in a community (familiar) setting, and gradually taps the authentic self of those participants through the cultural tools developed and used throughout the process. At the end of the project, participants have developed a renewed confidence in their ability to contribute - to their own life, that of the community and their family and friends - resulting in an increased sense of well being, self-esteem and confidence. However the longer-term personal results of CCD processes – projects or programs – seem to be obvious and understated. This could be attributed to the process or it could be attributed to life interventions post-project that the participant has been positively influenced by.

The CCD process can work on strengthening identity by engaging participants in their context through cultural tools. By engaging participants through cultural tools like storytelling, visual arts, dance, artists engage participants at a meaningful level. The process stimulates the imagination, the brain, the body and the history of each participant in the creation of new art. Celia Moon from Create Australia explains the excellent outcomes CCD process can have on participants “…if they have one experience in their life, they cherish it, this one time they performed something, or this one time that they did something artistic, it becomes very significant for people” (Appendix C, 1999:127). This powerful process embraces the individual identity of each participant, celebrates them and supports them to go further in the pursuit of artistic, personal and community goals than they have before.

Culture is key to the development of a democratic community and the development of citizens with democratic dispositions. Zuidervaat states that to gain a democratic disposition, individuals, “…require a cultural environment in which dialogue, independence, mutual respect, critique, creativity and public discourse prevail” (2000: 26). Drew, Kasat & Sonn concur that, “It is…essential that people are encouraged to recognise the importance of culture in providing a sense of identity and community” (2002: 21). The role of cultural development as an agent of social change acts in the creation of a new type of community that is essential to the formation of a democratic society.
**Conclusion**

SAY IT OUT LOUD! successfully achieved many outcomes in the long term. The individual level outcomes of the SAY IT OUT LOUD! project are: Self esteem through participation, development of new networks through participation, developing new skills through participation, confronting oneself through participation, recognition of common humanity, recognition of a unique language, recognition of self within community, change of perspective, and change of life. All of these outcomes, at a personal level, have had a profound effect on the participants’ life trajectory. This project intervened in their life and spoke to each participant in a different way. The project signifies a change of perception for the participants about the community in which they live, their role in that community and their self worth.

As suggested by Drew, Kasat & Sonn, these personal outcomes do lead to community level outcomes; they affect the way in which the participants perceive and, therefore, are perceived by their community. At a communal level SAY IT OUT LOUD! did achieve in the long term a creation of two new communities of people, however small. These two groups have created new or renewed strong bonds through their participation in this project. The creation of new networks within those communities was somewhat successful in the long term. This particular long outcome is extremely important to plan and manage correctly. In Cessnock, there was a feeling that the networking happened on a level above the participants; that is a lesson to be learnt. Some of the participants have personally continued in their own cultural development, others have not. These long-term outcomes and that of the creation of new networks are linked to the level of cultural infrastructure within communities. The infrastructure will provide a place for participants to practice their skills and networking and though in the absence of this infrastructure, participants have the right to feel ‘let down’.

The final Chapter will examine the position the CCD sector finds itself in today. As one half of a mutually dependant relationship, the CCD sector must now take the initiative and lead the Australia Council towards the core issues that need addressing for the future. Those issues are the need to establish a regional cultural infrastructure and a ‘culture of evaluation’.
CHAPTER SEVEN

This Chapter will argue the need for the development of a framework for CCD comprising the praxis that supports both useful policy development and a holistic methodology of practice. The current policy and funding climate, encompassing CCD in Australia is a long way away from the desired praxis. There is a certain paradox that limits the pro-activity of the sector, that is the dependant funding relationship CCD has with the government. So how does the CCD sector, as a potentially unified group of workers, transform the current environment into the framework for praxis in CCD? Can development in the area of regional infrastructure and evaluation enable practitioners the capacity to implement their vision for the future of CCD?

The shortfalls of desiring long-term outcomes

Indeed we have no doubt that isolated short-term projects frequently default on the full social change potential of artistic participation (Thiele, 2001: 2).

CCD is a process and an artform that demands careful articulation and strategic direction to achieve its desired outcomes of social change through building social capital. Short-term projects and short-term funding enable seeding but do not facilitate long-term development. Indeed, the funding of such a dynamic and interventionist process and artform should contain only a limited amount for short-term projects and programs, reserving the bulk of funds for facilitating the infrastructure to sustain long-term development. Rachel Fensham cautions, “…the extensive financially dependant community arts infrastructure would be anxious about such a move…”(1994: 2). However, this somewhat cautious attitude could inhibit the need for growth in the sector. If CCD is to achieve true social outcomes for communities, the sector’s argument should be for a long-term policy and practice framework. The questions that must be asked are, who should be funding CCD? How should CCD be funded? How should CCD be evaluated? Who should monitor development and outcomes? Perhaps we should even dare to ask whether all this focus on social outcomes is what the work is about?
To answer the last question first, CCD is undoubtedly focused on its core drive of creating social change. As argued and substantiated in previous Chapters, the sector’s political framework has always been radical and unashamedly socialist. This core vision of CCD is echoed around the world. There is a global CCD movement that contributes to this agenda, as demonstrated by the Rockefeller Foundation’s commitment when they assembled the world’s CCD artists and activists at their Bellagio Study and Conference Centre on Lake Como in northern Italy in May 2001. This gathering of artists and activists from North America, Asia and Australia contributed to an anthology on CCD as a global movement. Entitled Community, Culture and Globalisation editors Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard uphold that:

…community cultural development activities are demonstrably the best available tools to teach the skills and values of true citizenship: critical thinking, interrogating one’s own assumptions, exercising social imagination and creative problem solving, simultaneously holding in mind one’s immediate interests and larger interests and the larger interests of the community as a whole (2002: 17).

**Funding & Policy**

Federal, State and Local government arts and cultural departments currently operate as the primary financiers of the CCD sector - granting projects and program funds to individuals, communities, organisations and sometimes businesses. The projects and programs that the government funds are those that can demonstrate the criteria and directions determined by government policy. The greatest potential to challenging and changing arts policy in the area of CCD is in the hands of the CCD sector. Fensham upholds this argument; “...the community arts field have shaped Australia Council policy in general as well as state and local government discussions of culture, to which I would add their impact upon current federal cultural policy” (1994: 4).

The role of the CCD sector, within the policy development milieu, is to continue to act consistently by presenting sector wide research and proposals, pilot projects and evaluative frameworks. This interface with policy makers within the government continues the long-standing relationship the sector has in leading the government practice and theory of CCD. The job of policy makers is to respond in part to community experts, community directions and demands. This may not necessarily be the attitude of some conservative government departments and policy makers, but
certainly it is the attitude of the Australia Council. Practitioners from the sector shape the Australia Council, as its peer assessors and policy advocates. This government structure supports sector involvement and is in return supported by the field.

It is generally agreed that governments, elected for three to four year terms, rarely support long-term initiatives. The Victorian State Labor Government pointed out in their arts policy platform from 1999/2000 that the Coalition government, who had been in power for seven years, had abolished peer assessment and replaced it with ministerial discretion (Australia Labor Party, 2000: 3). Peer assessment has become more visible, though still ‘advisory’, under the Steve Bracks Labor government. Peer assessment seems to be a cornerstone for the arts in Australia due to its profile role in the Australia Council. If something as seemingly fundamental as peer assessment can be finetuned by political parties as they assume government, what are the chances of having a long-term policy for cultural development?

Can the CCD sector convince government of the value of putting in place a framework for long-term practice and evaluation? The task of altering the current short-term thinking requires its own CCD process. The process requires long-term planning for long-term objectives, outcomes and impacts; it requires consultations across the sector, across government and across the country; it will require general support for a specific type of long-term approach which needs to be presented to and ratified by arts policy makers. There needs to be a charter of cultural rights that asserts the basic principles of a long-term approach to social change through the practice of CCD. Jon Hawkes, in his address to the ‘Groundswell’ Conference in 2002, put forward a generic statement of cultural rights. “Three cultural rights would do it: The right of our citizens to engage with the human cultural heritage; The right of our citizens to engage with new intellectual and artistic production; [and] The right of our citizens to engage in their own forms of intellectual and art production” (2002: 1).

I am not advocating that long-term CCD is the only type of CCD work that needs to be and should be done in Australia. I am advocating for a new direction and financial consideration for this area to facilitate social change through the building of social capital. So should the arts and cultural departments of government be funding this type of long-term CCD work? The answer is not alone. There are agencies that historically fund this sort of approach like Vic Health – the Victorian Health Promotion Department, NSW Housing Department, and other social service government departments as well as parts of the education sector, trade unions, philanthropic bodies and businesses. The task for the CCD sector is to plan a coordinated approach to a long-term social change agenda, which is attractive to governments from both sides of politics and the funding bodies.
CCD has the ability to change and adapt to many areas, as exemplified in the case study and the See Saw project profiled earlier in Chapter six. CCD has been used to develop literacy skills, maths skills, to promote health, and develop local cultural heritage in line with new housing developments. It is also a powerful practice with “…tremendous potential to respond successfully to the negative effects of globalisation…” (Adams & Goldbard, 2002: 23). CCD is a dynamic process that has broad appeal. We know this as a sector, yet find it difficult and problematic to work together as a sector. This could be due to the lack of funding or the tyranny of distance or the preference in some states and territories to network informally. Whatever the reason, the sector needs to unite somehow on a national level.

The case study of SAY IT OUT LOUD! epitomises the type of project that could have done with a long term funding and planning approach. The area of the Lower Hunter Valley was new to this sort of community based participatory arts project. The communities that experienced the interventions of the CCD process were somewhat shy, fragile and untapped as a cultural and historical well of potential and knowledge. The project aimed to bring together a range of community and cultural organisations along with the local council, and engage women, who were largely “homemakers”, in an exploration of their lives. The aims and objectives of the project demonstrate the artistic and social outcomes the project hoped to achieve. However, the project itself, through lack of funding, only touched the surface.

SAY IT OUT LOUD! does fit the model of a successful CCD project in some criteria and not in others. In the positive sense SAY IT OUT LOUD! created new communities, new networks and inspired continued cultural development for some participants within the project. The long-term impacts on the community are around the fact that the project was a watershed in the creation or discovery of new woman-centred cultural heritage in Cessnock and Kurri Kurri. The project acted as a model for stakeholders to use for future cultural development endeavours. SAY IT OUT LOUD! had a lasting and unique impact on the participants, in different and meaningful ways. On another positive note, three years post-project the Cessnock City Council ratified Cultural Development Principles and Actions, a plan that had been two years in the making. The Council acknowledges the importance of CCD in their principles.

On the negative side, SAY IT OUT LOUD! failed to establish, or inspire the establishment of, a cultural infrastructure, or set of structures to support continued cultural development within the communities of Cessnock and Kurri Kurri. This failure, aptly articulated by Doris’s comment of ‘having a let down feeling’, is a case in point as to why communities newly touched by CCD, like the
Hunter Valley, need extra support, time and continued engagement. The evidence gathered through the case study, group interviews and stakeholder interviews suggest that the project did have long-term outcomes and impacts on the community and participants. Nevertheless, one question this longitudinal study raises is, did the project, due to the short-term nature of the engagement, do more harm than good? This question is mirrored by CAN WA, which asks, “…how do the communities maintain initiatives and in what capacity can agencies continue to be involved?” (Drew, Kasat & Sonn, 2002: 24).

**Regional Cultural Infrastructure**

Establishing regional cultural infrastructure to support continued cultural development is essential to a healthy CCD process. It is essential that short-term funded CCD projects are implemented in an environment supported by infrastructure, or core services, which support access points for communities to continue their engagement with community, based participatory arts practice. The negative effects that short-term funding and short-term CCD projects could have on the communities in which they are set begin when arts/CCD expertise is withdrawn from the area. Ideally the enhancement of local government’s role in CCD or the further development of key CCD agencies throughout Australia which act as support and advocacy agencies for a regional cultural infrastructure development will create a safety net for short-term CCD projects.

A change towards funding long-term CCD process and further development of regional cultural infrastructures starts with new policy development. This policy development should also look at the funding cycles of CCD, the professional development of regions and the increased role peak CCD bodies or key CCD organisations have on localised CCD projects. The enhancement of the role state and territory cultural networks have in consultation with practitioners and promoting the long-term agenda to the sector could be invaluable. CAN WA recognises its role in promoting awareness of the potential for CCD to build social capital and promote social change. Its response to Drew, Kasat & Sonn’s report *Conceptualising Community Cultural Development* was “How can CAN WA’s role be transformed to ensure ongoing involvement with a limited resource impact?” (2002: 24). The financial factor will always be considerable in this sector, and cannot be overlooked or downplayed.

However, this renewed approach to the sector could have profound effects on creating social change. Developing the role local government bodies have in CCD processes would also support long-term development of CCD as a social change agent. This developmental approach to the use
of the CCD process across sectors must start with holistic practice at a local level, with a national policy development approach. Many local government councils, especially in regional and rural areas, do not have the tools, time and training to approach CCD in this manner. The role of creating access points for local government and local arts bodies rests with a national policy and funding approach, across the whole of government. This means that governments (federal, state/territory and local) should take into consideration each other's policy developments with the goal of developing an across government stance on the implementation of CCD (Hawkes, 2001: 47).

The CCDB of the Australia Council has a long-standing partnership with the ALGA, having worked together on co-funding and implementing the placement of Community Arts Officers in local government throughout the late eighties and early nineties. They have also worked together on the agenda to have a national movement of cultural planning. These sorts of partnerships signal the type of advance that a 'whole of government' agreement on cultural development could provide. Monynihan & Horton also agree on the pro-active role the CCDB has played in developing relevant new directions in partnership with the CCD sector and other key stakeholders. "In the longer term, the CCDB is working toward the full integration of community cultural development into Australia’s environmental, economic and social sectors" (2002: 205).

The question remains, how do we ensure that this inherently political process and social change agenda is developed towards a long-term approach to CCD? Do CCD practitioners see our sector as primarily being about creating social change and developing pro-active communities? These broad questions must be answered by the CCD sector as a whole, articulated with a vision for the future. The CCD sector must genuinely embrace the community development premise of the work. This demands a change from allowing our evaluation of social outcomes to remain anecdotal and funding driven to establishing long-term evaluation frameworks for practice. The Australia Council has outsourced a research project on establishing an evaluation framework for CCD in Australia. Headed by Rick Flowers of the UTS Centre for Popular Education, this project aims to produce a framework that practitioners can utilise for evaluating short and long-term impacts and outcomes.

Our core pursuit is art, the people and community. These core values must demonstrate, endorse and support the future growth and well-being of the sector and the participants and communities engaged by the sector. They also need to address the potential problem of 'rapidly changing' communities through CCD (Drew, Kasat & Sonn, 2002: 26). Evaluation is key to constructing the burden of proof of the value of CCD for the future funding and policy development of the sector.


Evaluation

Governments are looking to refocus economies around knowledge, research and information technologies. The community sector (or non-governmental, civil sector) is being heralded as the new lifeblood of experimentation and innovation. Think tanks on both the right and left of politics are promoting the community sector as the core of new approaches to governance and service delivery. These new models aim to use the expertise of non-government community agencies in the vital middle ground between government and corporate sectors. They advocate a move away from centralised services toward locally determined models. This situation represents an opportunity for the community cultural development. But how prepared is the sector to take advantage? (Moynihan & Horton in Adams & Goldbard, 2002: 206).

An integrated management approach to CCD is needed if the sector is to advance its social change agenda. An integrated management approach is constructed through attention to the theoretical side of managing projects, which aim to achieve the vision we have for our work (Simpson, 1994: 3). There is a tradition of sidelining theory in the community arts that has been commented on by many theorists including, quite early on in the movement, Owen Kelly who states that;

>[f]rom the beginning, the community arts movement was reluctant to engage in serious theoretical debate of the sort needed to establish a political framework and a resulting practical strategy through which the work of individual community arts groups might achieve a cumulative strength. This reluctance played into the hands of the pragmatists in the movement who regarded such questions as ‘academic’. They were quick to dismiss any such debate as a utopian soft option; a retreat from the ‘real battle’, which was perceived in terms of short-term fights to obtain money and resources, to pay decent wages and to ‘achieve recognition’ for community arts (1984: 26).
This practical and somewhat activist approach to CCD works against the long-term survival and impact that CCD could have on communities, and potentially the society and world at large. What is required is for artists and activists to comment, debate and theorise on the dilemmas, points of argument and new approaches of the CCD sector. In real situations of project management and organisational life, the systematic achievement of performance indicators and the priority of planning may be seen to rob the innovation, spontaneity and holistic practice of CCD. Drew, Kasat & Sonn argue,

...that there is a phase of sustainability that requires much greater attention, to ensure the longevity of cultural planning initiatives and community empowerment (2002: 25).

Achieving long-term outcomes in CCD and sustaining those outcomes within community is by far the most important challenge facing the CCD sector. The most extensive investigation into this area was Deidre Williams’ 1995 study Creating Social Capital referred to previously in Chapter four and six, which was supported by the CCDB and CAN SA. On page three of the executive summary Williams writes there is an "...urgent need for an economic impact study and [she] recommends that one be carried out which looks at all the relevant aspects of the impact of funding community-based arts work" (1995: 3). That recommendation was written eight years ago and the impact study has not yet been commissioned. The sector must push and advocate for more research, more debates, or it remains the report of one of only a few voices in a relatively thin academic field.

In the interest of building social capital and contributing to social change CCD practitioners must engage in the theoretical and sometimes academic debates. It requires coordination and cooperation across the sector and with our funding partners. This is what the CCD sector is in desperate need of. As Hawkes says, "Rhetoric is an essential beginning for any program for change." (2002: 4) The debate should engage the sector in a ‘dialogue’ between practitioners, communities, with our work and with ourselves (Freire, 1972a). From this point of praxis a genuine long-term vision is not only viable but within reach!

**Conclusion**

The research discussed in this thesis supports the following assertions, that CCD’s core aim is to achieve positive social change; that government funding of CCD needs to embrace a long-term strategic approach; that the CCD sector needs to embrace a ‘culture of evaluation’; that the
Australia Council initiates a regional cultural infrastructure network that links with short-term CCD projects and programs to offer support; and that CCD can successfully achieve long-term community level outcomes that impact positively on communities, benefiting social change.

There is an urgent need for further discussion with the Australia Council’s CCDB to encourage policy development that would support these outcomes.
CONCLUSION

Having matured from within, the ‘parochial’ community arts has grown into CCD - a professional, rigorous and esteemed practice. Founded upon social upheaval, CCD embraces the tenets of community development and cultural democracy, which it imparts to participants via cultural tools. CCD is an artform and a process. It is a dynamic practice that struggles with its internal and external politics. CCD is at a point that begs critical and theoretical debate. In the 1980s Kelly suggested a revolutionary plan for the future of CCD.

The role of community artists within this wider struggle is threefold. Firstly, we must engage in projects that explore alternative models of cultural production, distribution and reception. Secondly, we must maintain a clear analysis of what we have done and what we are doing, and the ways it fits into a revolutionary programme aimed at the establishment of cultural democracy. Thirdly, we must persuade others to join with us in a series of widening alliances which can encompass capitalism and its systematic oppressions (1984, 137).

Within the process of CCD is a spirit of revolution, a spirit of tolerance and egalitarianism. Through the tool of CCD we could build a new type of community structure, within Australian towns and suburbs, which places value in the people that make up that community. The vision for the future of CCD, as Kelly refers to his utopian dream for revolution, is a holistic reconstruction of society and culture in Australia. Bit by bit practitioners, artists and educators will work with individuals and communities to create a new citizenship. Eva Cox states, “Putman claims that the interactions which create social capital are most likely to occur in egalitarian communities where people voluntarily contribute time and effort and receive positive reinforcement” (Cox, 1995: 17).

As a new field of endeavour CCD has developed substantially throughout Australia and the world over the past ten years. The Rockefeller Foundation’s published anthology (2002) of practice by CCD practitioners from all over the globe, demonstrates the global attraction of this potentially powerful process. CCD unashamedly has a social change agenda that seeks to forge pro-active citizens within our communities. Emancipatory learning is the key linking the dynamic CCD process and the social change agenda for the future. It is inherently political, radical and revolutionary. A socialist economic approach would subvert the role of capitalism.
Within this sector the teachers, artists and practitioners of CCD must articulate the power relationships that the process invokes in the role we play within communities in which we work. The revolutionary nature of CCD must come from a theoretical and practical understanding of the power of the process, the power of our role within the process and the legacy we leave behind within the community. A long term, infrastructure enhanced approach to CCD is what is needed, as recommended in Chapter seven.

This thesis places CCD within a broad Australian cultural policy framework. All three tiers of government support CCD as a process and an artform. The development of CCD over the past thirty years has been the dual responsibility of the sector and of government, most particularly the Australia Council. It has been established that political changes to government do impact on the policy directions that govern the funding of CCD and that it will continue to. It was also stated that politicians rarely support long-term funding approaches to the arts, let alone CCD.

This, therefore, presents a challenge to the sector and the Australia Council. How can we collectively devise a long-term approach to funding and developing CCD that is politically aware and practically effective? This will require not only a joint policy development approach, but also the further expansion of evaluation in the sector.

The imperative for the CCD sector is to envisage a long-term approach to the work to implement this planned approach. As Alan Petersen says “There is doubt, however, that without the development of theoretically informed practice, one can never be sure that one is ‘on the right track’ towards effecting any change” (1991: 7).

SAY IT OUT LOUD! as an example of a short-term, under-funded CCD project emphasises that the CCD process can effect change. Here is a project that has achieved the short-term objectives it set as well as some longer-term outcomes and impacts on participants. This is a success story. Imagine if the project, the first CCD funded project in the Lower Hunter Valley, would have been a part of a long-term cultural development plan for the area – some sort of cultural partnership between the Cessnock City Council and the Australia Council for the Arts? What impact might that sort of project have had in the development of the communities in Cessnock and Kurri Kurri?

While the long-term visionary requirements of pitching projects remain the responsibility of artworkers who spend a lot of the time voluntarily searching for future work opportunities, how can this long-term plan be implemented? Whose responsibility should it be? Can a local, regional, state
or national agenda for the development of a cultural democracy be formed without the responsible involvement of all parties?

This thesis has upheld the success of the three long-term outcomes highlighted in the hypothesis. Through the analysis of the case study and supporting primary and secondary material, it seems apparent that CCD does successfully implement beneficial long-term outcomes that can lead to social change. These outcomes, however, must be effectively planned for and evaluated in a holistic management approach to CCD. Moreover, the management of CCD must include linking projects with CCD regional cultural infrastructure. This approach will ensure a greater success for long-term engagement by participants in the CCD process.

This presents another challenge to the sector and Australia Council. How can we establish a national cultural infrastructure that actively supports CCD in the long term? What will the infrastructure look like? How will it work? Is there a skeleton of one that we can expand on? This will require joint policy development, consultation and perhaps, as suggested, its own CCD process.

The path to active citizenship within this country’s communities can be built through CCD because it inspires expression and articulates inner knowledge. Developing cultural tools within participants is only the first step. This first step, if left at that, only fosters disappointment and inaction. If short-term CCD projects can be supported by a regional cultural infrastructure, participants can continue to engage actively through other projects, programs and ultimately the society in which they live. They can then develop the tools for social change – democracy, social justice, advocacy and social participation.

The role for long-term evaluation of continued and sustained involvement in CCD is vitally important. This culture of evaluation will track the progress of the newly established approach to the establishment of a cultural democracy. “...the fact that this work can only be properly evaluated in the long-term should be firmly argued, and the criterion of value for money should be applied only in conjunction with other stated goals when adequate resources have been invested to sustain arts development programmes to maturity” (Clinton, 1993: 17).

Feral Arts hosted a symposium regarding CCD. It engaged leading practitioners, academics, artists, and community representatives. It was acknowledged at this ‘debate’ that, “The ‘essence’ of the CCD sector lies in its flexibility and its volatility – its responsiveness to diversity, its commitment to pluralism, and its shared and sustained political focus” (Feral Arts, 1999: 57). It is not enough, after the twentieth century, to claim CCD as left wing centre of arts practice. We must be committed to
our vision of making change – social, environmental, and political – through our chosen field of work, cultural development. I challenge all CCD practitioners to open up this discussion – to challenge and debate these recommendations I have outlined. This research is only the beginning of what could be an exciting new theoretical debate in CCD.

1 The project engaged with children, who were involved in a program being run through the University of Newcastle, entitled Homelink. Homelink matched children from low socio-economic backgrounds, who were between the ages of six and twelve, who were termed ‘problem’ children as identified by schools, with role model adults. This program aimed to do two things – give the children an adult friend with which they could spend time, and give the family some supported time apart from this child. The WCAC’s project engaged these ‘problem’ children in art making – photography, physical theatre, music, and sculptural workshops. This culminated in an interactive installation and exhibition of work by the children in a Vincent St, Cessnock shopfront (Main Street of Cessnock). The exhibition was called “bigger than me”.

2 Donald Horne, is one of Australia’s leading social commentators having written many influential books on society and culture in Australia. His biography from the Groundswell Conference (Oct 2002) describes him as “…[the] former Chair of the Australia Council and the Ideas for Australia Program. Editor of The Bulletin, The Observer and contributing Editor to Newsweek International, Mr Horne has written for journals both nationally and internationally. He is an Officer of the Order of Australia and has been chosen by the National Trust as a ‘Living National Treasure’” (Groundswell: Regional Arts Australia National Conference, October 2002, Albury.)

3 The word Councils in this thesis refers to Local Government Councils, Shires, and Boroughs.
Big ‘A’ arts and little ‘a’ arts are phrases that play on the terminology referred to by Adams and Goldbard (2001: 22) when they discuss the elite arts or ‘High’ arts and the ‘popular entertainment’ of the ‘low’ arts.

On all Australian Labor Party Yearly Tickets is a pledge that members will comply with the rules of the Party and support “the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange, to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in these fields...” (ALP Member’s Yearly Ticket 1997).

Professor Andrea Hull was the Director of the Community Arts Board of the Australia Council from 1979 – 1982.

This information was accessed from the Australian Bureau of Statistics website – www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs%40.nsf/94713ad445ff1425ca25682000192af2/7dc26fec0ae7ed9ca256b35001bacf3

There has been a range of forums including one hosted by the Australian Library Association, the University of Technology Sydney, ccd.net as well as conferences like Community arts and Health held in Melbourne in 2001, the Art of Dissent conference held in Adelaide and Melbourne in 2002. Research projects like the ones commissioned by the Australia Council, CAN SA and CAN WA into CCD have created a strong research-based interest in the practice.

RMC Research Corporation is a research consultancy based in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. They specialise in research on arts and culture, media, education, families and children, technology and health. Their web site is www.rmcres.com

Street Arts was founded in inner-Brisbane in 1982 and began a three-year association with women in outer-suburban Inala in 1984. The first Street Arts project at Inala was Once Upon Inala. After 1986, Street Arts ended its association there, leaving the newly formed Icy Tea (from the initials of Inala Community Theatre) to continue work with its own infrastructure. In a story typical of Street Arts’ career, Icy Tea outlived its parent.

The workshops were well attended, though there was a ‘core’ group of women in each town who attended all or most of the workshops. These women are highlighted in the performance night, in the publication of stories and in the evaluation for this thesis.

Create Australia is the National Training Authority for the formation, development and certification for all types of cultural training. Create Australia includes a CCD section, headed by Celia Moon.

This term can be interpreted in two ways, the straight dictionary definition - which means ‘accepted practice or custom or the practising of an art or skill’ - or the Marxist definition in which praxis describes the inevitable link between thought and practice. This thesis is informed by the second definition.
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