

MR KIM JOOHO:

Thank you, Richard. Good evening. To begin with, timing wise it's very creative to have the session at this time of the day and I find it's a very creative arrangement on the stage.

It is my great pleasure to share with you today the Korean stance on creativity. It seems that every country around the globe looks at creativity as a source of national competitiveness. This says it is a concept of creativity but it's not entirely my version of creativity; it's not in general terms. Nobody can visualise a concept such as creativity like this but this is exactly the way the Korean policy makers took on creativity when they set up their new policies.

Well, South Korea is no exception to this rule and the need for new education integrating creativity was raised in Korea about 10 years ago by the private sector. There was a wide gap between the learning goals of the public education system and attributes that companies looked for in their employees.

The public education system largely failed to fill this gap and this is the reason why some regard public schooling as a tomb of creativity. Sorry, it's a very harsh word but it's true. However, now both cultural and educational policies attempt to find solutions for creativity. As universities are considered the culmination of learning in Korea's educational system, the country's educational policy heavily focused on the preparation of students for college entrance examinations. Under the circumstances, creative education was not an easy sell on students, parents, teachers and the schools accustomed to pursuing the more immediate goal of increasing universities' involvement. Therefore, the issue of creativity was first tackled not in the hand of educational policy but in the hand of cultural policy.

Now let me show you how cultural policy embraces creativity. During the 1980s and 1990s the progress of

political democratisation brought gradual changes in the concept of culture. The idea of cultural democracy has expedited the arts education to make culture more accessible to the public. The focus of the policy has shifted from promoting excellence to increasing accessibility to the arts. In 2003 the Korean Government launched its new cultural policy vision named "Creative Career" which may be summed up in the following two topics.

First, cultural rights are among the basic rights of citizens enabling conditions for their pursuit of happiness. Second, culture is indispensable for developing creativity and creativity is a major source of national competitiveness.

The first point addresses culture as a basic right that enhances the quality of life and wellbeing of citizens. It is not a revolutionary thesis, however it is the first governmental recognition of its duty to guarantee the right to enjoy culture.

The second point represents creativity is closely linked to education and human resource development and cultural and art education eventually becomes an instrument for personal growth.

There is more than one way to define "creativity" and to define creativity is a creative process itself. The basic questions that frame all discussion of creativity can be listed as follows.

First, what is creativity and how do we measure creativity? Secondly, what are the developmental characteristics of creativity? Lastly, how do we develop creativity? Finding answers to these questions is very important but the problem is that there are no quick answers to these questions. Creativity is a highly abstract idea which can be widely and variably interpreted. Its hypothetical nature makes quantifying and measuring creativity also extremely challenging. The point I would like to stress here is that in South Korea cultural policies are

designed and implemented based on the general understanding of creativity and, as a matter of fact, quite removed from these academic enquiries. In other words, the policies towards developing creativity remain paradoxically divorced from creative thinking or academic findings and scrambled together with a popular understanding of creativity.

My next argument is how we handle it in the realm of cultural policy. Efforts toward creativity development in Korea have been pursued actively by culture and art education policy. Although culture and art education is a hybrid policy straddled between education and culture, it has been chiefly implemented in the context of cultural policy, particularly on the basis of the following notions.

First, culture and art are efficient tools for nurturing creativity. Second, creativity is one of the ultimate goals of education. Third, creativity is a driving force behind a thriving creative industry, one of the sectors producing the highest value added products.

I can stress for sure that the main characteristic of Korean creative developing policy is its speed and its broadness and after only three years culture and art education programs are already in use in schools and communities across the country.

Let me give you some examples of creative development programs in Korea. The Korea Arts Cultural and Education Services, KACES, is a government agency designed and developed to implement various cultural and art education programs to enhance Korean creativity. My first example of the work we do at KACES are artists in school and artists in community programs. These programs bring professional artists to classrooms to inspire young students with their experience in artistic creation. Inviting artists to schools is not a brand new idea, in fact. It has been done in many countries.

However, it is not an easy task to coordinate a nationwide system for artist participation in schools across

the whole country. In this regard we have some challenging issues. First is qualification. Artists tend to think highly of their creative potential and artistic capabilities. Their self-perception concerning their qualification as educators tends to be positive as well.

Hence, we need to set a sound criteria to meet the proper qualification for classroom instructions. Every year in South Korea some 3,000-odd graduates apply for educational activities in art and about half of them work for schools and in community art programs.

Secondly, training for trainers. When it comes to the qualification of teachers, schools' expectations are quite high. They refuse to consider any artists without educated credentials that meet their standards. Meanwhile, they feel no duty to share the cost of hiring resident artists. This makes it necessary to put artists through pre-service training programs as well as in-service training.

Furthermore, we need institutions to take charge of hiring these artists for schools. The Korea Arts Culture and Education Services is doing precisely this job. Currently it has a roster of 2,000 artist instructors and supports artists in residences of approximately 1,500 nationwide schools.

Another example of our work in KACES is creative partnership program. This program links art organisation and schools into a module for a joint project. By sharing human physical resources this joint project benefits from synergy. About 200 projects are now launched every year in schools and communities through our creative partnership.

Lastly, I would like to touch on the legal preparation for the drive of creativity education. Korean culture and art education policy is legally supported by law. New law was passed in 2005 for the sake of strong drive of culture and art education policies and securing an appropriate budget for that. The Art Education Supporting Act outlines as follows. I don't want to reiterate these lines, they are on the screen.

To cut a long story short, terms like "Act now, think later" will turn out to be the main features of Korean art educational policy, but in my opinion, the most urgent task ahead of Korea's culture and art education policy is developing specialised manpower. Human resources are crucial for this young policy and may help to reduce the cost of trial and error.

Since the legal and regulatory ground work has provided crucial support for cultural policies to gain maximum and momentum, human capital will now decisively develop it further, this time contributing not to the speed and broadness but to the quality of the education.

So finally, as much as we cherish the value of creativity we should acknowledge the role of creative educators. No doubt creative human resources are the most critical means in order to make up this less creative policy and I strongly believe that that's the way exactly we will get more creativity in the future. Thank you.