

Minutes	
Partnership Schools/Kura Hourua Authorisation Board Meeting	
Date	11 September 2013
Time	10.00 am – 3.15 pm
Location	Room 11.05, St Pauls Square

Present
<p>Members: Catherine Isaac (Chair) John Shewan (Deputy Chair) Dr. Margaret Southwick Terry Bates</p> <p>In Attendance: Rowena Phair, Deputy Secretary (10.30am – 11.00am) Ben O'Meara, Group Manager, Schooling Policy (10.30am – 1:00pm) [REDACTED] Senior Policy Manager (10.30am – 2.30pm) [REDACTED] Project Officer (10.30am – 2.30pm)</p> <p>ERO: Di Anderson (Acting Chief Review Officer) (11.00am-12.00am) Di Moffitt (Review Services Manager) (11.00am-12.00am)</p> <p>Apologies: John Morris s 9(2)(a) OIA Tahu Potiki Dame Iritana Tawhiwhirangi</p>

Item	Topic	Responsibility
	<p>1. Update</p> <p>The meeting commenced with an update from the Chair. The Board agreed that it is important that the successful schools be announced as soon as possible to enable implementation to commence.</p> <p>Preferably, announcements concerning future application rounds should be made at the same time.</p>	
	<p>2. Disclosure of Board Members interests:</p> <p>Board members advised that they had no new matters to disclose.</p>	
	<p>3. Update from the MoE:</p> <p>RP offered her congratulations to the Board on the successful completion of the application process.</p>	

RP advised that the contracts with the successful applicants are due to be signed soon. The Ministers' offices are responsible for the organisation of the announcement, supported by MoE. She outlined plans for the announcement, which is likely to take place in Wellington, on or around 17 September. It is unlikely that details of any future application rounds will be able to be released as part of the announcement.

The AB's role in the contract negotiation process was discussed. The AB agreed that it was appropriate for the MoE to be responsible for negotiations, but that this was not consistent with the wording in their Terms of Reference, which states that the AB will oversee contract negotiations. The AB will recommend the ToR be revised in keeping with the Board's role in the current round. This was limited to assisting in resolving issues where appropriate and providing background information to the Ministry where this is relevant to negotiations. However, it is important that the AB be kept informed on progress on negotiations.

Arrangements for the release of information under the OIA were discussed. The AB recommended that the announcement of successful applicants and the proactive release of information under the OIA should be separated.

RP noted that at the 30 August application round debrief meeting between Senior Ministry Officials and the Chair, Deputy Chair and Margaret Southwick of the AB, AB representatives had requested additional support from the Ministry in future rounds. In response, the Ministry will provide increased research, process and secretariat support. RP advised that in addition she planned to have more direct contact with the AB in future rounds.

The AB asked about the media briefing for sponsors scheduled for Thursday (12th September) in Auckland. They said they were keen for all the sponsors to be well briefed.

A discussion followed about the process for announcing any future application rounds. The AB requested that MoE prepare communications material for use by the AB.

The AB requested input into the reporting template document for PSKH.

The AB also asked that the Project Manager make suggestions for improving the application materials in preparation for any future rounds, including the identification of any common issues or major recurring themes.

Action: RP to stay in regular contact with AB.

Action: MoE to discuss sponsor briefing with Communications Team.

Action: MoE to prepare communications material for the AB in the event of a future application round.

Action: AB to have input into the reporting template document.

Action: Project Manager to report to AB on common issues to improve the application process in the event of a future round.

	<p>Action: AB to receive weekly updates, possibly via teleconference, during any future contract negotiation processes.</p>	
	<p>4. Readiness Review by ERO:</p> <p>ERO introduced their readiness review process, emphasising that their approach will be tailored to each individual school to help the school start from a strong base. The schools’ contractual obligations will be taken into account. ERO plan to work individually with the sponsors as required until such time as they can provide MoE with a report (this will not always coincide with the opening of the school). A full education review would follow between 18 and 24 months after the schools’ opening and will be flexible and tailored to each school.</p> <p>A discussion followed about the readiness report, and who is responsible for picking up the issues that may arise. It was agreed that the schools should be autonomous. ERO would not be imposing policies and practices on the schools, but would be able to make best-practice examples available where required and to help schools avoid having to reinvent the wheel. ERO would act as a “critical friend” who can help sponsors who may require such support to engage in self-reflective, formative review processes.</p> <p>The AB recommended that ERO undertake the readiness reviews with a strong focus on outcomes, data, student progress, and recognition of the schools’ voluntary acceptance of high levels of accountability.</p> <p>Ben O’Meara responded that it will not be mandatory for schools to take up the recommendations contained in the ERO readiness review. They will be expressed as options which the reviewed school may wish to adopt.</p> <p>There was a discussion about submission and circulation of the review reports. MoE will receive the ERO reports as the purchaser, but they will also go to the AB as part of the its statutory role to monitor the performance of the schools. The reports will also go to the sponsors.</p> <p>The AB agreed that the readiness reviews should be provided for all sponsors. In terms of the schools’ regular ERO reviews, ERO will develop a bespoke process after the schools are established. The AB requested a discussion with ERO at its 5 February 2014 meeting, to discuss the readiness reviews.</p> <p>Action: MoE to copy readiness review reports to the AB.</p> <p>Action: MoE to invite ERO to the AB’s meeting on 5 Feb 2014.</p>	

5. AB's monitoring role:

The AB noted that international experience shows that authorising and monitoring should be tied together; the Board can evaluate against what it anticipated when it recommended a school for approval.

The Board agreed that its monitoring process would have the following elements:

- review of contract reporting material from MoE (quarterly)
- two AB representatives to visit each school annually (around mid-year)
- ERO reports to be reviewed
- annual report to Minister (4th quarter)

The AB requested a reporting template with dashboards on each school, combining the contract reporting with critical evaluative questions such as:

1. Impact on student learning
2. Are students/parents being served?
3. Are the students engaged? Well taught?
4. Is there good leadership/management?
5. Is there a good return on public investment?
6. Is there a common agreement on student outcomes?

The AB noted it would like Ed Potential to be used as a means of tracking the schools' progress in reaching student achievement targets.

Ben O'Meara responded that the Ministry's plan is to introduce Ed Potential into the schools, but there are some areas, particularly at Primary level, where existing measurements systems are as good. MOE advised that Ed Potential has been drawn to each school's attention. The Ministry is considering how the system might be funded, if it is to be used.

It was agreed that a key requirement of the AB monitoring role is the receipt of indicators that set out how children are progressing relative to a baseline. Is the school making a difference, and is that difference significant? Progress scores are likely to be more informative than achievement scores.

The Ministry advised that the reporting template needs to be finalised by 30 November. It was agreed that they will prepare a draft template for the AB to consider at its meeting on 12 November.

The AB discussed whether it should act as a mentor to schools in addition to its authorisation and monitoring roles. The possibility had been raised by the Minister in the context of correspondence with the Chair on contract negotiations.

The Board concluded that acting in a mentor role for specific schools could lead to a loss of objectivity and independence. It was agreed that the AB role

is to act as a champion and guardian of Partnership Schools policy rather than as an adviser to or advocate of individual schools.

The benefits of some form of organisation to support and help Partnership Schools were discussed. It was agreed that the schools should be encouraged to consider forming a group to share ideas.

Action: AB to review MoE contract monitoring reports quarterly; ERO reports as available; visit schools annually; and report to Minister in 4th quarter of each year.

Action: TB to circulate evaluative questions to Board.

Action: AB to inform MoE of final evaluative questions.

Action: MoE to draft a reporting template for AB to consider at next meeting (12 November).

Action: MoE to draft a letter from AB to Minister on AB's monitoring process and response to possible mentoring role.

6. MOE Support for AB:

The AB noted that the discussion on monitoring and performance evaluation underlined the need for additional support (discussed under Item 3). It was agreed that they would benefit from access to a senior official with a good understanding of education practice and policy to provide support and to undertake research on initiatives. The AB also needs to be able to access external advice from time to time.

MoE stated that a senior advisor who is not involved in Ministry PSKH business as usual work will be assigned to support the AB.

Action: MoE to assign senior advisor to support Board.

Action: MoE to confirm mechanism for AB to access external advice.

7. Terms of Reference:

As requested by the Minister, the AB discussed its Terms of Reference (TOR) with a view to updating them in the context of its experience from the first application round.

Changes were agreed in the following areas:

- The order of the TOR to be changed as follows:
 - Opening paragraph
 - Principles
 - Process.
- The principles to be rewritten to remove process oriented functions.
- The opening paragraph to include reference to the AB's role as guardians and advocates (Kaitiaki) of the Partnership Schools policy.
- Membership to be expanded to 8, to allow the addition of another educational

	<p>expert.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under resources, inclusion of a sentence noting the AB may access such external support and resources as it deems necessary to undertake its work. The Board recognised the need for an indication of cost, and considered an amount of \$25,000 (plus GST) was appropriate. • Removal of the word “directives” under the resources heading, and relocation of this sentence to the final section of the TOR. <p><i>Action: MoE to make changes to TOR and send to AB for confirmation.</i></p>	
	<p>8. Approval of AB Papers to be Released:</p> <p>AB agreed that media contact would be handled by Catherine Isaac. AB approved documents as presented for proactive release.</p> <p><i>Action: MoE to provide information about wider release to CI.</i></p>	

9.	<p>Improvement to future application processes:</p> <p>This item was deferred due to lack of time. A separate meeting of the AB (by conference call) was scheduled for Thursday 19, or Friday 20 September to discuss this item, and to review the updated TOR.</p>	
10.	<p>Board self review:</p> <p>The AB undertook a self review of its performance in the first application round. Key issues identified were the need to schedule meetings well in advance, the need for access to research skills and increased secretariat support.</p>	
11.	<p>Meeting closed at 3.15pm. Next meeting proposed for 19/20 September via teleconference:</p> <p><i>Action: MoE to organise teleconference for AB board members either 19th/20th September.</i></p>	