



Minutes

Early Learning Regulatory Review Sector Advisory Group meeting

Date	Wednesday 16 June 2021, 10.00pm-3:00pm
Venue	Mātauranga House, 33 Bowen St., Wellington
Chair	John Brooker, Group Manager, Education System Policy (ESP)
Attendees (Ministry)	Chris Jamieson, Policy Analyst, ECE Policy, ESP Sam Hughes, Policy Analyst, ECE Policy, ESP Elspeth Maxwell, Manager, ECE Operation Policy & Design, SE&S Megan Hutchison, Lead Advisor, ECE Operation Policy & Design, SE&S Karen Quinn, Lead Advisor, ECE Operation Policy & Design, SE&S Siobhan Murray, ECE Senior Policy Manager, ESP
(Members)	Pauline Winter, General Manager, CEO Auckland Kindergarten Association Heather Taylor, General Manager, Barnardos Fiona Hughes, Deputy CEO, BestStart Educare Sarah Alexander, CEO, ChildForum Maree Stewart (for Calmar Ulberg) CEO, Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association Peter Reynolds, CEO, Early Childhood Council Craig Presland, COO, Evolve Education Group Cathy Wilson, Executive Officer, Montessori Aotearoa New Zealand Shelley Hughes, Education Organiser, NZEI Te Riu Roa Andrew Philipps, CEO, Provincial Education Belinda Woodman (for Arapera Royal Tangaere and Esther Tinirau, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust) Catherine Bell, Senior Policy and Engagement Advisor, Te Rito Maioha Arapera Royal Tangaere, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust
(Secretariat)	Charlotte Ryan, Project Coordinator, Office of Deputy Secretary, ESP
Apologies	Jill Bond, CEO, New Zealand Kindergartens; Thomas Tawhiri, General Manager, Playcentre Aotearoa; Emma Norrie, Area Manager, Evolve Education Group; Calmar Ulberg, CEO, Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association; Raewyn Overton-Stuart, Manager Director, PAUA; and Esther Tinirau, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust.

Note: These notes capture the themes of the discussion and key points made. They do not necessarily represent a shared view of the group and there may be differing perspectives on some points. They are not intended as comprehensive minutes of the meeting.

Welcome and Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on March minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group noted the wording on hazard checking for the section on proposal 10 should change because the service is legally responsible rather than the 'person responsible.' • Feedback on April minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was concern about the use of the phrase 'generally supportive' for different points in the April workshop minutes as silence didn't necessarily equate to support.
Regulating for 80% qualified teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members questioned why such a high number of hospital-based services find it difficult to qualify for 80-99% funding rates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Ministry noted that this is something to explore during consultation. • Another member questioned whether any teacher-led Kōhanga Reo did not qualify for 80-99 or 100% funding rates. <p><i>Factors impacting on the 80% requirement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry have considered the following factors for the 80% requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ honours Te Tiriti o Waitangi ○ maintaining or improving the quality of provision and shaping positive outcomes for children ○ ensuring services' sustainability ○ supporting diverse provision ○ clear and easily understandable ○ regulatory standards that can be easily measured. • Group stressed teacher supply (particularly the supply of quality teachers) and teacher training should be considered as a factor. • Group also questioned where the additional teachers required to reach the 80% requirement would come from. Discussion extended to noting that all kinds of services found it more difficult to reach the 80% threshold this year, not just small services. • Group identified that the pipeline of teachers from abroad has been disrupted by COVID-19, reducing the availability of diverse, culturally competent workers, impacting on teacher supply. Group discussed getting the 'right teachers,' and not just a supply of any teachers while noting the connection between tertiary training and entering the profession was important. <p><i>Group discussion on options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group identified the following alternative options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 80% in ratio across one month. There are some complexities e.g. what would it mean if you met 80% one month and not the other? ○ 50% ECE qualified teachers in ratio at all times, with services also needing to employ 80% ECE and/or primary qualified staff. This would be a change for the sector but may be achievable.

- Counting a percentage or proportion of final year students as qualified (larger services would be able to have more than one such student).
- Protection for ECE qualified teachers across all options was also discussed.
- Supports like the PRT (Provisionally Registered Teachers) grant were also floated, and pay parity was raised as a way to help meet new qualifications requirements. Extra support could also be provided on a case-by-case basis, like the Sustainability Fund.
- Many members also felt that the Ministry should do more to promote the teaching profession to prevent teacher shortages based on perceptions of the sector.

Person responsible requirement

Group discussion on options

- Many members thought there should be a person responsible. The person responsible is someone who can mitigate health and safety risks for the service and protect children, staff and parents. However, there was a competing view that the person responsible functions could be shared amongst all qualified staff – this would align better with conceptions of distributed leadership.
- Most felt there is a strong level of accountability with having a single person as person responsible, and that distributed responsibility would make it harder to have someone responsible.
- One member mentioned that given the breadth of the sector, we need to understand the situation for different services. For example, Kōhanga Reo use and rely on the person responsible role, but largely in relation to their particular philosophy and model.
- It is possible that the person responsible role isn't entirely clear, so perhaps the Ministry needs to provide more guidance to employers to fulfil this role, in terms of competences and capabilities. It is also important to understand differences in who actually holds the role for each service type.
- Members thought the role mainly centres on ensuring someone can respond to first aid/health and safety issues and can be a two-way channel between the Ministry and centre.
- It was also felt that parents won't necessarily go to the person responsible in the event of issues.

Next steps and consultation

Tranche 2 consultation discussion

- The Ministry plans to consult on different options for 80%, network planning and the person responsible requirement for teacher-led centre-based, hospital-based and home-based services in tranche 2. The detail of these proposals will be in the tranche 2 discussion document in September, which will be supplemented with an online survey.
- Other effective ways of targeting service providers?
 - Members thought Ministry communications on consultation should be channelled through the services and peak bodies represented on the Sector Advisory Group.
 - Another member added that those services that may not meet the 80% requirement (e.g. the 106 mentioned) should be contacted, perhaps by local Ministry staff.
- The Ministry asked whether there were any other ideas on how to reach parents and teachers, or how they could tailor the material, so it is accessible to parents and teachers.

- Engagement needed to be suitable for teachers, as they may not get out of services until later in the day. Teachers may be time poor, so it is important for the Ministry to engage repeatedly. Promoting the changes to parents would also be useful, perhaps through focus groups.
- One member raised the importance of an analysis of the impact of proposed changes on children.
- Decisions and implementation dates relating to tranche 1 proposals were outlined. Members requested information identifying when the tranche 1 changes come into effect to be made available, for example, through the ECE bulletin.
- This information requested above on tranche one is now available on our website:
<https://www.education.govt.nz/early-childhood/licensing-and-regulations/the-regulatory-framework-for-ece/early-learning-regulatory-review/>

Action items	Responsibility	Deadline
Send minutes to Members	Charlotte	ASAP
Group to meet after public consultation finishes to discuss key themes	Ministry TBC	November