

THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW

RESPONDING
TO THE
TOMORROW'S
SCHOOLS
TASKFORCE

THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW RESPONDING TO THE TOMORROW'S SCHOOLS TASKFORCE

We struggle to address system-wide challenges because our current schooling system has been designed for autonomous self-governing schools, not for networked and connected schools and their communities. (p11)

NZEI Te Riu Roa agrees it is time for change. There can be little argument with the overall analysis from the Tomorrow's Schools Taskforce that the competitive and highly decentralised model of Tomorrow's Schools has failed to increase success or improve equity for all learners across the system over the past three decades.

The Tomorrow's School model has also taken its toll on people working in the system. School leaders are working long hours, suffering stress and burnout at levels significantly higher than the general population. They feel largely unsupported by their boards, in part because the autonomous model of schooling we currently have does not support governance or leadership well. In too many cases, schools with the greatest challenges have the weakest governance. And the skill and expertise of both teachers and para-professionals in the system is not shared or scaffolded across schools to the benefit of all children.

There is broad agreement amongst education professionals that a more *connected and networked education ecosystem* is desirable going forward. We have one of the most atomised schooling systems in the OECD and although New Zealand has been world-leading in the area of curriculum and pedagogy, arguably we can learn and improve from other schooling systems that are better resourced, more networked and that connect across larger units than the single autonomous school.

We believe the proposals the Taskforce have put up include some workable approaches to the problems of the Tomorrow's Schools model. But their suggestions also raise a lot of questions, and feedback from NZEI members indicates there is ambivalence and some scepticism about some of these proposals, including the concept of independent regional hubs.

While there is a fair degree of agreement around the problem definition, this does not mean there is consensus in the sector around solutions, or agreement with all the specific recommendations of the Taskforce.

There are concerns that:

- The *fix* could mean a swing of the pendulum to a more powerful centralisation of the system, rather than a distributed network
- The necessary shift from a culture of competition, atomisation and autonomy could result in the loss of responsiveness to local communities
- Without a culture change to a high trust model, there could be a loss of appropriate local decision making in favour of bureaucratic paralysis
- Personal and professional autonomy could be reduced if school leaders become state servants directly employed by hubs
- Changes to governance and structure may be less important and effective than other levers to achieve the shift to a culture of connectedness and collaboration. Commitment to move from narrow accountability to high trust professionalism across the system is fundamental.

We have an historic opportunity to create positive change for education and for NZ students through careful reform of the Tomorrow's Schools model. Taking the time to get it right and ensuring educators and learners are central to the co-design of any change and its implementation is critical. Lip service to this concept will fatally undermine the Taskforce's vision of the future of education.

KEY ISSUES

1. SYSTEM CHANGE

The Tomorrow's Schools reform is one of a package of ambitious reforms being proposed by the government. The problems the reforms are trying to address are widely acknowledged. The reforms all add up to a significant, whole of education system change.

A number of workgroups are at various stages on various elements of the reform package. These have engaged the sector and the community in various ways. But there are significant problems looming. Unless urgently addressed, these problems will confound the reforms and the reform process.

There is considerable unease about –

- The overarching design and sequencing of the reforms – the reform architecture – how it practically all works together;
- Execution risk – the capacity to sequence and implement the reform package in a logical way that engages with the sector at all stages. The existence of a work group is not a proxy for organised change.

Change management looms as a major risk. Successful change management is not widely attributed to the education sector. The cross overs of politics, strongly organised sector groups and wide public interest complicate and confound system change management, the latest example being the Communities of Learning implementation.

There are far too many reforms in play at the same time with the same timetable. This leads to a significant disaggregation risk with far too many things going on at the same time with low visibility of the linkages.

This lowers understanding of how they are all meant to work together. It reduces the capacity for a significant, coherent and widely understood narrative to be developed about the reforms and the reform process.

The Task Force proposes an Establishment Group to lead the process. NZEI suggests far more is needed. Before or hand in hand with any reforms adopted by Government are introduced, the Government needs to address the problems noted above or the change process will run into significant hurdles.

The whole of sector reform architecture needs to be clear to the sector and embraced. This means an obvious linking and sequencing of the changes into that architecture. Whole of system change design supported by a coherent and embracing narrative is critical.

Change management capacity that acknowledges the special conditions of the sector needs to be developed that has the confidence of the sector. The sector needs to be convinced that there is significant change management capacity to make this all work. The change management plan needs to be developed with the sector.

The criticisms of the Ministry *the way that policies integrate and their overall likely impact on the schooling sector is not considered carefully enough, or even fully understood* are cogent in this regard. Given the low levels of confidence and trust in the Ministry, and the scale of the change required – including within the Ministry and other agencies – it is clear that developing the capacity to oversee and manage change needs to be a priority.

2. RESOURCING

The overall amount of funding for schools in Aotearoa New Zealand is not sufficient ... the disparity (between staffing entitlements for secondary and primary schools) is unwarranted and ... impacts negatively on teachers/kaiako and learners / akonga in primary schools. (p 107)

NZEI agrees with the Taskforce's conclusion that the overall amount of resourcing for schools is not sufficient, and that adequate funding will be a crucial pre-requisite to the success of any changes. While New Zealand's expenditure on education is increasing in dollar terms, on its current trajectory it is decreasing as a percentage of GDP, and its spending on primary education as a percentage of GDP (and \$ per student) in primary is below the OECD average support. We strongly believe that increased resourcing, increased supports for teachers and support education workforce must underpin successful reform. Additional investment in funding and human resources, including support to leaders, Boards, teachers and children, particularly those with additional learning needs, is a prerequisite for success, regardless of changes to the system.

NZEI is concerned that any new equity funding formula takes account of neighbourhood/community poverty, not simply individual student socio-economic status. We also believe that many failures in the current system result from persistent, chronic under-resourcing and will not be fixed simply by changes to governance and administration. Ensuring genuine parity for teachers across the system – a teacher is a teacher is a teacher – will require significant new resourcing from government, as will the development of a para-professional workforce and a sustainable system for learning support.

3. THE CENTRALITY OF TE TIRITI

NZEI welcomes the Taskforce's recommendation that we need to “focus on an explicit commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.” (p11)

Te Reo Areare, the Māori council of NZEI Te Riu Roa, supports the proposed formation of a dedicated national hub for Kaupapa Māori settings. Te Reo Areare strongly endorses the NZEI Te Riu Roa policy supporting universal access for all students to te reo Māori and the compulsory teaching of Māori history.

However, we are disappointed that this does not translate into more specific recommendations from the Taskforce about the ways this “explicit focus” could be realised particularly in kura auraki (English medium schooling). We support the suggestion that mana whenua be represented on school boards and that iwi representation be mandated on Hub governance bodies, for example. However, this is as a necessary but not sufficient shift to create a schooling system that is genuinely pluralist and power-sharing and where Māori students in every setting see their language, culture and identify as the norm.

We are not convinced that recommendations four and five (development of a schooling network planning strategy that would consult with iwi, runanga and Urban Maori Authorities and formation of a dedicated national hub for Kaupapa Māori settings) would in themselves be sufficient to drive the necessary transformation for Māori learners of what is still a largely mono-cultural schooling system. Requiring school leaders and teachers to have knowledge, understanding and confidence to lead or teach in a bicultural context without providing resourcing and capacity to support their learning and development will only perpetuate the status quo. Likewise, the Taskforce describes the pressures created by the increase in demand for Māori medium schools and te reo in kura auraki schools and the need for more diversity in the teacher workforce but fails to proffer solutions or levers to move us forward.

4. THE NEED FOR CULTURE CHANGE IN THE SYSTEM

It is time for cultural and structural transformation in our education system. (p 21)

We welcome the call for collective action to *reconceptualise schooling* with reform *prepared for and developed through partnership with people who work in the sector and understand its complexities* (p 132).

For the process of implementation to support such culture change, it would need to ensure that the hubs are not simply re-configurations of Ministry regional offices. To genuinely get collective ownership of change by the sector independent oversight of its implementation over a reasonable timeframe is essential.

There needs to be even more emphasis on the need (and further identification of the levers and resourcing required) to shift culture and mindsets, not just changes to administrative and governance arrangements, if the vision of the Taskforce is to be realised. Time will also need to be given to people working in education if they are to genuinely engage in the change process.

Implementation of the Taskforce recommendations will require intensive capacity and capability building in the sector and an injection of resourcing to ensure the transformation the Taskforce was looking for. Building trust between hubs and schools/services will be critical to the success of this approach. This also supports the need for a transition period with a strong focus on capability building (underpinned by the required resourcing).

A commitment to building capacity and capability in the public education system is critical. We can see a potential risk of the hub model increasing the use of contractors/private provision and want to see safeguards to ensure capacity and capability is recognised and grown within the sector itself instead. Overtime, limiting schools' ability to access consultants from the private sector rather than the hub would see expertise growing in the public sector rather than growing private sector businesses.

We would support members of the Taskforce forming part of the proposed independent Establishment Group, which would need to be given a strong enough mandate and be sufficiently resourced to ensure genuine co-design of implementation.

5. EDUCATION ECOSYSTEM COHESION

Schooling exists within the larger ecosystem of education, but the review recommendations perpetuate the idea of the compulsory sector being in a silo, with little attention paid to the way the new schooling hubs link to, or improve transition between ECE to schooling, and from schooling into work, training or study.

The review ignores the opportunities of alignment between Te Whaariki and the NZC in terms of curricula and, the essential foundational role of ECE in children's learning, and is silent on whether the proposed hubs play any role in the Government's 10 year ECE strategic plan to turn back the tide of privatisation in ECE. There is a critical need to piece the jigsaw together, as the atomisation and competition in schooling is currently replicated even more brutally in ECE. NZEI's views on the need to reverse the trend of competition and privatisation in ECE are outlined in a recent report, *Turning the Tide*.

Neither does the Taskforce explain in any detail how the new hubs would enhance transition to work or tertiary study or training. It is weak on the question of how the hubs would better support Learning Support specialist services. The proposal for Learning Support Coordinators in every school, for example, ignores the evidence about early intervention and the need for early childhood education services to also access these supports.

Given the previous government's significant investment in Kāhui Ako/ Communities of Learning (and previous experience with the Extending High Standards across Schools programme and the Learning and Change networks) it is surprising that the Taskforce has not reported any evidence to support any particular scale or shape to the proposed hubs.

6. PEOPLE CENTRED CHANGE

A prerequisite for changes to the system should be that the well-being, security and quality of working conditions of educators should be enhanced not diminished. National collective agreements must be maintained and strengthened through any change process and in any new employment relationships.

Hubs have the potential to provide more continuous and secure employment for educators, including para-professionals, and may facilitate stronger career pathway options and more effective professional and learning for principals, teachers and support staff.

However, we believe there are also risks to the Hub model. Principals must be permanently employed, with any time limits on appointment at a school or hub unacceptable unless agreed mutually. Employment by the hub should not undermine the ability of school leaders, teachers and school boards to be responsive to local context. All principals, not just beginning principals, need professional supervision and mentoring, not necessarily by the person appraising them, and this will require additional resourcing at hub level.

We endorse the Taskforce's concerns about the preparation and retention of teachers. We see both risks and opportunities with the employment of teachers by hubs (with delegation of teaching appointments to principals). We do not support solely school-based models of training for primary teachers because this reduces the opportunities for balancing theory and practice and most schools simply do not have the capacity to train teachers on the job.

Leaving most support staff in insecure term by term employment through schools' operations grants is a missed opportunity to move towards Labour's commitment of central funding of support staff.

MORE QUESTIONS

NZEI Te Riu Roa has canvassed the views of members and acknowledges there is a diversity of views across the sector. There are areas of the Taskforce's recommendations where we are still seeking the views of members.

For example:

- what should the governance bodies of hubs look like, to ensure that hubs have currency and credibility with their schools and their parents/whanau and are sufficiently permeable to be responsive to their communities?
- what should the future of intermediate and middle schools be - does it make sense to re-shape existing schooling or just develop and pilot new forms of middle schooling in new build situations?
- what are the pros and cons of hubs employing principals and teachers?
- what might be the benefits and downsides of principals having their salaries linked to factors other than size? (P 105)
- what are the advantages and disadvantages of a national Māori education hub?

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We have an historic opportunity to create positive change for education and for NZ students through careful reform of the Tomorrow's Schools model. However, the Government's proposal for a speedy legislative timetable in order to enable hubs to be established in 2020 is running ahead of public and teacher engagement in the consultation, let alone co-design of any change and its implementation.

We recommend the change process is elongated to ensure that there is sufficient public conversation to share more widely the analysis of the problems with Tomorrow's Schools and grow broader consensus around solutions.

2. The education sector strongly agrees with the Tomorrow's Schools Taskforce that the schooling sector is under-funded. It is rightly sceptical about whether any changes will be sufficiently resourced.

We recommend that the Government is transparent about the increased and additional resourcing that will support any transition and new structures in advance of the change process, particularly in terms of the disparity between primary and secondary school resourcing.

3. Change in the system is more likely to be embraced if it is road-tested first, and successes and opportunities for improvement are communicated transparently.

We recommend that – if hubs are to proceed – the Government consider pilot projects in a small number of areas to road-test the concept, and include both ECE services and schools in the design.

4. A well-resourced and independent agency is needed to build trust, capacity and capability across the sector and to move change forward.

We recommend that the proposed Establishment group remains independent of the Ministry but is expanded and resourced so that it has robust oversight of any change.

ANNEX 1

WHAT WE AGREE WITH ...	HOWEVER ...
<p>The problem definition: <i>We struggle to address system-wide challenges because our current schooling system has been designed for autonomous self-governing schools, not for networked and connected schools and their communities.</i> (p11).</p> <p>NZEI agrees with the overall analysis that the competitive and highly decentralised model of Tomorrow’s Schools has not improved equity or success for learners across the system.</p>	<p>The review ignores the essential foundational role of ECE and how ECE services would integrate into hubs. It does not appear to have identified any essential or specific characteristics from previous experiments with school networking (such as learning and change networks or Kahui Ako) to suggest the most successful type or scale of Hub.</p>
<p>The overall direction of the proposed response: <i>Tinkering with the current system will not work...we need a different way of thinking about our schooling system.</i> (p 11).</p> <p>NZEI agrees that bold change is necessary. We can see that the proposed establishment of independent hubs and changed roles for agencies, including the Ministry of Education, into a <i>learning ecosystem</i> looks like a workable response and could create better supports for schools and the people working in them.</p>	<p>The process of implementation would need to ensure that the hubs are not simply re-configurations of Ministry regional offices. To genuinely get collective ownership of change by the sector means independent oversight of its implementation over a reasonable timeframe is essential. We would support members of the Taskforce forming part of the proposed independent Establishment Group, which would need to be given a strong enough mandate and be sufficiently resourced to ensure genuine co-design of implementation.</p>
<p>The centrality of Te Tiriti: <i>We need to focus on an explicit commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</i> (p11).</p> <p>NZEI Te Riu Roa welcomes the recommendations for a national educational hub for kaupapa Māori settings and the inclusion of mana whenua on school boards and mandated iwi representation on Hub governance bodies.</p>	<p>There should be more focus on supporting the changes in schools needed to uphold the language, culture and identity of children, particularly tamariki Māori and Pasifika students. The role of Ka Hikitea and Tapasa in guiding changes in teaching and learning needs more emphasis.</p>
<p>The need for culture change in the system: <i>It is time for cultural and structural transformation in our education system.</i> (p 21).</p> <p>We welcome the call for collective action to <i>reconceptualise schooling</i> with reform <i>prepared for and developed through partnership with people who work in the sector and understand its complexities</i> (p 132).</p>	<p>There needs to be even more emphasis on the need (and further identification of the levers and resourcing required) to shift culture and mindsets, not just changes to administrative and governance arrangements, if the vision of the Taskforce is to be realised. Time will also need to be given to people working in education if they are to genuinely engage in the change process.</p>
<p>Inequitable and under-resourcing: <i>The overall resourcing for the compulsory schooling sector is currently inadequate to meet the needs of many learners/akonga and those who work in it.</i> (P19).</p> <p>NZEI strongly supports the recommendations to increase equity funding and review staffing and management entitlements to ensure they are fit for purpose.</p>	<p>NZEI is concerned that any new equity funding formula factors in neighbourhood/community poverty, not simply individual student socio-economic status. We also believe that many failures in the current system result from persistent, chronic under-resourcing and will not be <i>fixed</i> simply by changes to governance and administration. Ensuring genuine parity for teachers across the system – a teacher is a teacher – will require significant new resourcing from government, as will the development of a para-professional workforce and a sustainable system for learning support.</p>
<p>Better support for students, principals and teachers. More resource in the hubs to support learners with additional learning needs and to provide professional and practical support to principals and teachers is welcome.</p>	<p>This will require intensive capacity and capability building in the sector and an injection of resourcing. Building trust between hubs and schools/services will be critical to the success of this approach. This also supports the need for a transition period with a strong focus on capability building (underpinned by the required resourcing).</p> <p>We can see a potential risk of the hub model increasing the use of contractors/private provision and we want to see safeguards to ensure capacity and capability is recognised and grown within the sector itself instead. Over time, limiting schools’ ability to access consultants from the private sector rather than the hub would see expertise in the sector working from within hubs rather than setting up private sector businesses.</p>

WHAT WE AGREE WITH (CONT'D) ...	HOWEVER (CONT'D) ...
<p>The intent to ensure quicker and better access for learners with additional needs to the support they need. We welcome the proposal for LSCs in every school and employment of specialist staff by hub.</p>	<p>This will require an increased investment to meet the growing and complex needs of learners. Specialist staff would need to maintain national professional networks to ensure consistent quality provision. We are yet to be convinced that the new Learning Support delivery model is based on robust evidence and doubt the LSDAP will succeed without significant new funding and a shift away from deficit contestable funding models.</p>
<p>Ensuring support staff are valued as para professionals with clear roles, pathways and support, and with more secure hub employment for teacher aides is welcome.</p>	<p>However, leaving most support staff in insecure term-by-term employment through schools' operations grants is a missed opportunity to move towards Labour's commitment of central funding of support staff, the development of robust career pathways and the efficient delivery of pay equity for this female-dominated workforce.</p>
<p>Better planning and support for the teacher workforce: <i>... newly trained teachers are not guaranteed employment ... [fixed terms] are being used to try new teachers/kaiako out ... there is a need for customised support for Kura teachers/kaiako.... Induction and mentoring the teacher workforce supply policy lacks coherence and connectedness. The recruitment, training and retention of our teachers/kaiako should be a shared responsibility between government agencies, teacher education providers and schools. We do not believe it currently is.</i> P89</p>	<p>While we agree that the system needs to do better to prepare beginning teachers, ensure greater workforce diversity, ensure the quality of graduates and increase the retention of beginning teachers/ kaiako, the Taskforce recommendations miss the fundamental issue of ensuring teaching is sufficiently well paid and personally sustainable enough to attract the best people to the profession. Without addressing the two issues of more pay and more time, the other measures suggested will be insufficient to break the teacher drought.</p>
<p>Principal employment, support and appraisal by hubs. The proposal for hub appointment, PLD and appraisal through experienced and credible leadership advisers and the establishment of a leadership centre goes some way to creating more systemic supports to school leaders.</p>	<p>Principals must be permanently employed, with any time limits on appointment at a school or hub agreed mutually. National collective agreements must be maintained and strengthened through any change process. Employment by the hub should not undermine the ability of school leaders and school boards to be responsive to local context. All principals, not just beginning principals, need professional supervision and mentoring, not necessarily by the person appraising them.</p>
<p>Evaluation of the whole schooling system (hubs and agencies) by an independent body reporting to Parliament is broadly supported.</p>	<p>It is unclear how ECE services would be evaluated if they are not within hubs. Evaluation should be a 360 degree process where "feed up" from schools about hub performance in terms of effective relationships and support is possible.</p>
<p>The Ministry has <i>insufficient focus on teaching and learning and is overly bureaucratic, risk averse and often unresponsive, with management structures that are too heavy and opaque.</i> Because of a top down approach, insufficient resourcing and high staff turnover, regional Ministry offices <i>cannot always respond to what schools need</i> and do not have the ability to <i>build positive and trusting relationships with schools</i> (p 119-121)</p>	<p>We recognise that transformational change in the system requires a change in the culture of leadership in both schools and agencies. Previous attempts to re-position the Ministry as "stewards" rather than leaders of the system were undermined by the political positioning of Ministers and the tendency to require ever more bureaucratic accountability rather than a high trust approach. Any change in Ministry culture will also require a commitment by politicians to change their <i>short-termism</i> with regard to education policies.</p>
<p>Better transitions: NZEI supports the need for better transitions for students, particularly those with the most challenging learning needs.</p>	<p>The primary purpose of better transitions is not to produce more consistent data but to support student success through more consistent relationships and personalised learning. We believe the transition from early childhood education to school is likely to be the most critical for many children with the highest learning needs; there is inadequate attention given to this transition in the report. Structures of schooling provision may be less critical to successful transition if the culture shift from <i>my school, my kids</i> to <i>our community, our kids</i> is achieved.</p>
<p>The role of school boards: NZEI believes most BoTs would welcome re-orientation of their focus on to strategic planning and student achievement, while still retaining right of veto on principal appointment and oversight of the operations grant.</p>	<p>Clarity about where the hub delegates (or abrogates) powers from boards will be needed, for example around issues such as health and safety.</p>

ANNEX 2: IMPLEMENTING CHANGE

In response to the Taskforce's request that NZEI map out which recommendations could be implemented immediately and which would take more time, we have done a quick analysis below.

We believe that the strongest levers to transform schooling and the behaviour of the adults in it are resourcing and leadership, rather than changes to administrative and governance structures per se. We need to learn from the shambolic and patchy implementation of policies such as the IES policy establishing Kāhuihui Ako that co-design with the sector needs to be genuine, and that form should follow function, not dictate it. There is a hunger for positive change in the sector and the review of Tomorrow's Schools needs to channel that energy into areas where immediate changes can take place, while legislative and structural change can follow later.

RECOMMENDATION	NOW	LATER	COMMENT
1. Reorientation of the core role of BOTs		x	Prioritising strategic planning and student success could happen in theory without structural change to governance, but the employment, finance and property elements of the Taskforce proposals could not.
2. Local education hubs are established		x	Form should follow function: getting a cultural shift can begin immediately while legislative and structural change is co-designed with the sector over time.
3. Education hubs are regularly reviewed		x	
4. A Te Tiriti o Waitangi-led, future-focused state schooling network planning strategy be developed	x		A bold Government could already be doing this, in particular properly resourcing kura and universal access to te reo.
5. Dedicated national education hub for kaupapa Māori settings		x	Te Reo Areare supports a dedicated kaupapa Māori hub. In line with a commitment to Te Tiriti, the functions and structure of the hub should be for Kura to determine.
6. Work undertaken to ensure seamless transitions for students	x		Information and data is already being shared locally in Kāhui Ako and between ECE-Schools. Encouraging best practice without creating a <i>big data</i> system that erodes privacy could continue. The bigger picture of teachers working together across ECE and schools requires resourcing to release teachers and support professional learning together. ECE as well as schools should have entitlement to Learning Support Coordinators to support the transition of children with the most challenging learning needs.
7. Phasing in of full primaries/ middle schools/senior colleges or full primary/ and year 9-13 or composite schools ie phase out of intermediates over time		x	Growing full primaries or middle schools in areas of new build should continue to be considered. Expanding or closing current intermediate schools is unlikely to be logistically feasible in many places, without considerable upheaval to communities. Focus on soft aspects of transition rather than schooling structures is likely to produce swifter wins.
8. Schools become full service sites with extensive wraparound services		x	Some schools are already doing this but may be limited by physical sites, availability of resourcing or legal status of full service body. Education Act Update Bill proposals in 2016 contemplated mechanisms to achieve this.
9. Education hubs design community wide flexible curriculum, assessment and timetable offerings for schools		x	We are unconvinced timetable changes are a significant factor in transformative teaching and learning.

RECOMMENDATION	NOW	LATER	COMMENT
10. Te Kura specialist expertise be incorporated into Hub network provision		?	We are skeptical that Te Kura has the capacity or capability to build teacher and leadership capability at present or without a significant change in focus and resourcing.
11. Each hub has a planned network for state and state integrated schools with enrolment schemes and zoning		x	However introduction and enforcement of enrolment schemes and zoning could be encouraged more proactively by MoE immediately. Shifting community and school thinking about competition for students can also occur (as the examples in Christchurch and CoLs show) once a more collaborative culture is established.
11a. Upper limit on school donations	x		NZEI supported Labour's pre-election policy of providing an amount per student centrally if schools withdrew demands for donations altogether.
12. Transport subsidies and enrolment schemes for state integrated schools be aligned with state schools	x		NZEI believes there should be a level playing field and equity between state and state integrated schools.
13. MoE lead national strategy and policy in Disability and Learning Support	x		This represents the status quo.
14. Every school have a LSC	x		The government's pledge to introduce 600 LSC positions in 2020 needs to be expanded to an entitlement for all schools and ECE services.
15. Hubs employ specialist staff, RTLBs and a pool of teacher aides and ensure local provision of special schools, funding for students with additional learning needs and share its expertise nationally		x	LS staff have been employed both nationally and in regional groupings in the past. More resourcing is required to support either model and further consultation with the sector is required to find the optimum model of service delivery. Employment issues need to be addressed at an early stage.
16. MoE and Teaching Council ensure a workforce strategy including ITE provision is future focused and fit for purpose	x		Measures could be taken immediately to make ITE and teaching more attractive financially to recruit and keep the best and brightest in teaching. Again this requires resourcing — for example through extension of fees free or bonding or other methods to reduce cost on top of an undergraduate degree of four year course of study, more attractive pay and conditions, better support for beginning teachers and provision of training in special education, te reo etc. The relevant education unions should also be a part of the development of this workforce strategy to ensure the opportunities provided by the changes are fully embraced and the risks mitigated.
17. MoE Curriculum learning assessment and pedagogy unit works with education hubs		x	Supporting learning and pedagogy should be MoE's core function currently. It could immediately beef up its capacity to lead pedagogy and foster research in partnership with the sector instead of contracting this out to private providers.
18. More flexibility for Kāhui Ako	x		NZEI has argued for this since the inception of the IES policy. Kāhui Ako should be demand led (by what the Kāhui Ako needs) – not supply led (by what the Ministry says a Kāhui Ako can have) as is currently the case.

RECOMMENDATION	NOW	LATER	COMMENT
19. Teaching Council develop more flexible appraisal guidelines	x		
20. Education hubs coordinate PLD and advisory services		x	
21. Leadership Centre established within the Teaching Council	x		
22. Leadership Centre works with leadership advisers in hubs and provide leadership research and national guidelines		x	
23. Education hubs identify and support leaders, employ leadership advisers, connect leaders, allocate scholarships and sabbaticals and feed hub learning about leadership into Leadership Centre		x	However there is an urgent need for systemic leadership identification, development and support for all principals. This is primarily a resourcing question but given the critical role school leadership plays in student success, this should be core business for the Ministry, not a privatised function. Employment matters need to be addressed as part of this change.
24. Equity index implemented with equity resourcing increased to a minimum of 6% of total resourcing	x		We note that measures of community or neighbourhood poverty not just individual socioeconomic status are important to capture when resourcing to address inequity.
25. Allocation of staffing entitlements and management resources reviewed to ensure alignment between primary and secondary	x		This significant disparity could begin to be addressed immediately as a part of collective agreement negotiations.
26. Education hubs work with principals who receive equity funding to identify and share best practice around its use		x	However, the Ministry could be leading this work with individual schools and CoLs now.
27. Education hubs carry out school network reviews to ensure smaller schools are merged or closed		x	
28. Reconfigure the Ministry to focus on learning, curriculum assessment and pedagogy, system wide performance data, research and policy and an examinations unit		x	
29. Education Hubs created as crown agencies to replace existing MoE regional offices and with responsibility for school performance, improvement and equity		x	
30. Independent evaluation office created to review hubs and other agencies		x	
31. Teaching council expanded to host the leadership centre	x		
32. ERO and NZQA disestablished, functions distributed to MOE, Evaluation office, the TEC or Teaching Council		x	