

SUMMARY REPORT

August 2010

Evaluation of

Te Kotahitanga: 2004-2008

*by Luanna H. Meyer, Wally Penetito, Anne Hynds, Catherine Savage,
Rawiri Hindle and Christine Sleeter*

This work was supported in part by Contracts 387-2904 and E1627 awarded to Victoria University's Jessie Hetherington Centre for Educational Research from the Ministry of Education. The opinions expressed herein, however, are those of the researchers and do not necessarily reflect those of the Ministry of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

See <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/78910> for a copy of the full report from which this summary report is derived.

Published by:
Ministry of Education
Schooling/Professional Learning
© Crown Copyright
August 2010
All rights reserved

Enquiries should be made to the publisher

ISBN 978-0-478-36719-5
ISBN 978-0-478-36720-1 (web)

Contents

01	Overview	2
	Background.....	2
	Key Findings.....	2
	1 Quality of overall design.....	2
	2 Outcomes for teachers.....	3
	3 Outcomes for Māori students.....	3
	4 Outcomes for whānau.....	4
	5 Effects of Te Kotahitanga on school culture.....	4
	6 Enablers and barriers for success.....	5
	7 Sustainability of programme design.....	5
	8 Factors for improving teacher efficacy.....	6
02	The Te Kotahitanga Model	7
	Te Kotahitanga as professional development.....	7
	The facilitation team.....	8
	Individualised teacher observations, co-construction meetings and shadow coaching.....	8
	GPILSEO.....	9
	Selection of schools.....	9
03	Evaluation Research Method	10
	Observations.....	10
	Interviews.....	11
	Student Outcomes.....	11
04	Impact on Teachers' Classroom Practice	12
	Classroom Observations.....	12
	Interviews.....	13
05	Impact on Students	14
	Learning and belonging as Māori.....	14
	High expectations for achievement.....	16
	Impact on attendance, engagement and retention.....	16
	Evidence on achievement-related factors.....	17
	Evidence of achievement outcomes.....	18
06	Impact on Schools	21
	Goal: Improving outcomes for Māori students.....	21
	Pedagogy: Cultural responsive pedagogies of relations.....	21
	Institutions: Structures to support reform.....	22
	Leadership: Proactive and power-sharing.....	23
	Spread: Inclusion of staff, parents and community in the reform.....	23
	Evidence: Use of data for formative and summative purposes.....	24
	Ownership: Whole school including Board of Trustees ownership of the reform.....	24
	Sustainability of Te Kotahitanga.....	25
07	Recommendations	26
	For teacher professional development and classroom instruction.....	26
	For students.....	27
	For schools.....	27
	References.....	28

Overview

From 2004 to 2007, Te Kotahitanga was introduced in 33 New Zealand secondary schools. Its aim: to develop culturally responsive pedagogies designed to enhance Māori student achievement based on the Effective Teaching Profile concept.

This independent evaluation of Te Kotahitanga addresses the research question: How well and in what ways does Te Kotahitanga work towards the goal of improving Māori student achievement?

01

Background

This Summary Report focuses on major findings from the evaluation of Te Kotahitanga as implemented at 12 Phase 3 and 21 Phase 4 schools. During these phases, the Te Kotahitanga model was focused on teacher professional development to enhance teacher practice as described in Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, and Teddy (2009).

The evaluation team of Māori and non-Māori researchers visited 22 of these schools in 2008 to observe classrooms and interview school leaders, teachers, project facilitators, whānau, students, and boards of trustees chairs. Project reports were reviewed, and student achievement data analysed.

🌸 *Evaluation findings have been used formatively throughout 2009 by the University of Waikato Te Kotahitanga team and the Ministry of Education to modify the design of Te Kotahitanga.*

In 2010, Phase 5 of the programme was introduced to 17 new secondary schools. Informed by the evaluation, the Phase 5 model is focused not only on teacher professional development, but also on school leadership to achieve whole-school change and the use of evidence of student outcomes to improve and inform practice.

NB. For details of Te Kotahitanga please see the full evaluation report.

Key Findings

This section summarises key findings for each of the sub-questions that were designed to assess the overarching question:

🌸 *How well and in what ways does Te Kotahitanga work towards the goal of improving Māori student achievement?*

1 What is the quality of the overall design, content and implementation of Te Kotahitanga?

With few exceptions, teachers, principals, boards of trustees chairs, and facilitators were overwhelmingly positive about the Te Kotahitanga professional development model as a sound and effective process for improving classroom teaching and learning for Māori students. Teachers were enthusiastic about facilitator classroom observations and the feedback they received towards improving their teaching and reflective practice. Co-construction meetings across the team were working well, while use of shadow coaching was limited. Teachers, principals and other school leaders affirmed enhanced relationships with and expectations for Māori students, and attributed these to Te Kotahitanga. Teachers knew less about Māori cultural identity as an educational outcome for students.

The Te Kotahitanga professional development model is associated with improved classroom teaching. The majority of teachers (approximately 75%) in Te Kotahitanga schools evidenced moderate or high implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile (ETP) in Year 9-10 classrooms. More than one in five demonstrated high levels although there was variability across subjects and schools. On average, mastery of the Effective Teaching Profile was not evident in 25% of classrooms, where professional development needs appeared to extend beyond those which Te Kotahitanga was designed to address.



2 How valuable are the outcomes for the teachers who participate – what new knowledge, understandings and skills do they develop, and how valuable are these learnings?

Teachers reported valuing relationship-based pedagogies, affirming that Te Kotahitanga professional development had an impact on classroom instruction, which led in turn to enhanced outcomes for Māori students as well as for all students. Across schools and across subjects, Te Kotahitanga has communicated effectively to teachers that relationships in the classroom are important.

Most teachers were able to highlight subject strategies introduced by Te Kotahitanga with a relational focus that improved practice and outcomes for Māori students. Teachers spoke of changes in factors including their beliefs, expectations and understandings; improved teacher agency; and increased job satisfaction, motivation and empowerment. They reported increased valuing of Māori students' language and cultural knowledge, a shift to student-focused classrooms, improved assessment practices, and more use of group work and cooperative learning.

3 How valuable are the outcomes for Māori students, and what is the impact on other classmates/peers?

Māori students were proud of Māori culture and identity. On the whole and in most schools, they felt that they were able to 'be Māori' as learners rather than leaving their culture outside school, in order to succeed academically. Students reported enhanced valuing of their identity as Māori learners and increases in culturally responsive practices. Students gave examples of how schools either did or did not demonstrate valuing of Māori culture and language. They were able to define places and people – the Te Kotahitanga room, the marae, and Māori teachers – that helped them to 'feel Māori' at school in a positive way.

Students articulated how teachers showed they valued them as learners and as Māori, and they discussed how teachers had established positive relationships with them as learners, which they saw as essential for their learning. They commented on how difficult it was for them to be motivated and work hard in class if teachers did not care and had low expectations for them. In a few schools, there were still perceptions among Māori students that a 'double standard' existed whereby Māori students were singled out and disciplined for behaviour that was typically ignored for students from other cultural groups.

Whānau reported that their children felt appreciated as Māori in school and were more positive about school than they themselves had been. Parents, teachers, facilitators, principals and other school leaders reported improvements in student attendance, participation, motivation, and engagement in school and classroom learning activities. There is evidence of enhanced student retention leading to increases in Māori student enrolment in the senior school. In terms of real numbers, there is an average increase in the Y11 Māori student enrolment of approximately 250% from 2005 to 2008 at Te Kotahitanga schools.

Given the Te Kotahitanga implementation timeframes, these are early days for analysing its impact on NCEA outcomes. At the Phase 3 schools, 2008 Year 11 NCEA results were analysed for the first student cohort exposed to full implementation of Te Kotahitanga across Years 9 and 10. Year 11 NCEA results, compared with those at demographically similar schools from 2004-2008, revealed enhanced performance for Māori students at Te Kotahitanga schools on several achievement indicators. Te Kotahitanga schools also had a higher mean percentage of the total school population gaining University Entrance in Year 13.

No comparisons of NCEA results were done at Phase 4 schools as the first student cohort exposed to Te Kotahitanga in Years 9 and 10 will not reach Year 11 at these schools until 2010 – beyond the timeframe for the evaluation.



4 How valuable are the outcomes for whānau?

Whānau associated Te Kotahitanga with major changes in how their children viewed school. Most stressed that their children were enthusiastic about attending and motivated to achieve. Whānau valued achievement and expected young people to do better in school than they had. They perceived that their children were 'able to be Māori' while learning, unlike the previous generation of Māori. At a few schools, whānau expressed that Māori culture and te reo were not adequately supported, and they felt that in these schools, their children still struggled to be both Māori and high achievers.

Findings suggest less than optimal levels of involvement and communication between many schools and the Māori community. Ongoing communication and partnership work were generally not happening to support commitment of Māori whānau and the school community to Māori student achievement in these schools. Information sharing with communities and effective strategies for engaging with Māori whānau were limited.

5 How beneficial (or detrimental) are the effects of Te Kotahitanga on school culture?

(covering any changes in formal systems and policies; informal practices, or 'the way we do things around here'; and underlying beliefs, values, assumptions and attitudes)

Principals generally articulated student achievement targets and outcomes, but these were not widely known to others in the school community. Chairs of boards of trustees and whānau wanted more information about Te Kotahitanga and closer connections between the school and its community. There is potential for improving the use of the marae in enhancing these relationships.

Schools leaders, teachers and students attributed positive change in relationships within the school to Te Kotahitanga. New professional leadership opportunities in schools included facilitation, mentoring, and leadership development for teachers with the creation of new roles. There was less evidence of leadership distributed across the school with

respect to responsibility for Te Kotahitanga's GPILSEO framework. The support of deans, heads of departments and deputy principals tended to be philosophical rather than structural. In a few schools, leadership opportunities have been extended for Māori students with the creation of mentoring roles, prefect and head boy/girl positions.

Schools struggle over the dilemma of voluntary or required participation by staff. Shared problem-solving and decision-making by co-construction teacher groups worked best when all members of the group were participating in Te Kotahitanga. Such groups were challenged when some team members were not involved. Programme implementation was sometimes associated with division amongst staff, although this appeared to dissipate after time. At some schools, there was a risk that targeting Māori student achievement was being misconstrued as deficit theorising about students and families, by attributing to students predetermined outcomes based on socio-economic and family influences, rather than emphasising the focus of Te Kotahitanga on actions by school leaders and teachers as agents of change to enhance student outcomes.

Principals generally indicated that Te Kotahitanga had not had significant impact on other school practices and/or school policy. They emphasised teacher change towards development of the Effective Teaching Profile rather than whole-school change, and use of the GPILSEO framework (see Chapter 6 of this report) was limited. School leaders did not generally see Te Kotahitanga as school reform, but rather as focused on teacher professional development. It is important to emphasise that at this time, Te Kotahitanga was focused on teacher professional development.



6 What are the enablers and barriers for getting Te Kotahitanga to work most effectively?

The Te Kotahitanga professional development model works best with active support from school leaders, particularly the principal and other senior managers, who see it as essential for improving academic achievement of Māori students. Communications between the school leadership and the lead facilitator varied and were largely dependent on personal factors rather than a systematic feedback loop to the senior management.

Trained facilitators were seen as critical to the success of the model. Facilitators and teachers affirmed that the facilitation role required:

- ▲ expertise in Māori culture and culturally responsive classroom pedagogy
- ▲ subject matter expertise related to culturally responsive pedagogy
- ▲ effective strategies for working with teachers and colleagues.

There were some substantial challenges for facilitators in providing effective professional development. These included:

- ▲ uneven availability of curriculum expertise across different subject areas related to the effective teaching profile
- ▲ timely access to student outcome data for use by teachers
- ▲ lack of differentiated professional development activities to accommodate teachers at different stages of implementation, expertise and cultural knowledge.

It is suggested that teachers demonstrating high levels of implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile in different subject areas could play a greater role in mentoring other teachers.

The Te Kotahitanga professional development model appears to function best with:

- ▲ a stable facilitation team
- ▲ facilitators who are part of the school community and who have a sufficiently flexible schedule for project responsibilities
- ▲ facilitators who have expertise related to culture, pedagogy and subject knowledge.

Physical space for the project and the employment status of the facilitators appeared to signal the importance and permanence of the programme to staff and students.

Successful implementation requires willingness from leaders to change systems and structures. Principals felt that networking and/or mentoring relationships with colleagues who had prior experience with the model would assist in this process and they expressed an interest in playing this role for schools new to Te Kotahitanga.

7 How sustainable is the initiative likely to be when investment of resources is scaled back?

Principals emphasised that the effectiveness and sustainability of Te Kotahitanga was dependent on the resources and expertise associated with the facilitator role. The model appeared to be dependent on provision of the expertise associated with a facilitator position. This position supported the professional development of teachers across the school. Some principals explored ideas for embedding the culture of Te Kotahitanga in school relationships and related school processes, including staff appraisal and peer support networks. The boards of trustees chairs who were interviewed also emphasised that Te Kotahitanga depended upon both people and financial resources. They expressed concern about funding being reduced or withdrawn and how they would maintain facilitator staffing. Boards of trustees chairs also emphasised budget limitations and wondered whether there would be support for re-directing funds from other initiatives in order to continue funding Te Kotahitanga when additional funding ended.

In addition to the role of facilitators, sustainability of Te Kotahitanga has also been dependent upon delivery of professional workshops and hui from the Waikato Te Kotahitanga team to develop school leader and facilitator skills. Additional opportunities for professional development of cultural expertise, such as development of a qualification to provide ongoing availability of specialist facilitators, would further enhance sustainability.

Student achievement-related outcome data were not generally available on a regular basis to teacher teams. Sustainability of Te Kotahitanga will require more efficient and relevant data on student outcomes at the school level for teacher use throughout the year.

8 What are the most critical factors in improving teacher efficacy?

School personnel agreed that the role of lead facilitator is central to Te Kotahitanga as teacher professional development towards enhancing Māori student outcomes. There were concerns that integrating the role with other duties could have a negative impact on programme effectiveness if the emphasis shifted from Māori student achievement. There was strong support for a permanent senior teacher leadership role held by someone with the necessary cultural and instructional expertise.

The percentage of high implementers was high. Approximately two in five at the Phase 4 schools and one in five at the Phase 3 schools were evidencing high implementation of the Effective Teacher Profile (for more information refer to page 10). The percentage of high implementers was highest at Phase 4 schools, and this could reflect improvements to the Te Kotahitanga programme model towards enhanced effectiveness at Phase 4 compared to Phase 3 schools. Alternatively, benefits for teaching practice may reach their peak within two-three years, after which momentum for demonstrating high implementation declines without additional activities. There were some teachers and facilitators who felt the cycle became repetitive once mastery of the Effective Teaching Profile was evidenced. The model could be better differentiated for high implementers, perhaps through moving onto senior secondary subjects. Or, high implementers, along with heads of departments could become more active in mentoring others or as facilitators. Such approaches could also enable the Effective Teaching Profile to be better integrated into the different subject areas and across the senior secondary school.

Better access to student outcome data on a regular basis is needed to inform co-construction planning meetings. Without this, teacher

participation in the professional development activities may wane once teachers feel they have mastered the critical components of the Effective Teaching Profile.

A remaining challenge is the lack of change in some classrooms where there is low implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile. Difficulties evidenced by some teachers indicated professional needs beyond those that Te Kotahitanga is designed to address. Some may be performance appraisal issues, and a minority of teachers do require more support and advice.

In relation to Te Kotahitanga, some teachers may require additional work and subject-specific exemplars to assist them in constructing lessons that use culturally responsive pedagogies. Shadow-coaching was either missing or not operating effectively within the professional development model in many schools. More emphasis on shadow-coaching could assist the professional development process.

Factors associated with low implementers were the absence of stated learning outcomes and achievement criteria, low expectations for students, and classroom management challenges. These classrooms did not evidence culturally responsive pedagogies of relations, and students did not appear to be active participants by bringing their own knowledge, cultural identity and experiences to learning.

The Te Kotahitanga Model

For the Phase 3 and Phase 4 schools, Te Kotahitanga operated as a professional development programme for Year 9-10 secondary school teachers to improve achievement of Māori students through developing cultural pedagogies of relations. This was accomplished through implementation of strategies and processes that recognise the importance of culture as found in every classroom. These include the ways in which participants relate to one another, the context within which the participants interact, the content of what is taught and learned, and the actual pedagogical act itself.

02

The Te Kotahitanga model reflects research on the most effective forms of professional development for teachers. Researchers have found that professional development that is most likely to have an impact on teaching is sustained over time, focuses on specific instructional strategies or content areas, involves teachers collectively rather than individually, is coherent, and uses active learning (Garet et al., 2001; Snow-Runner, 2005). Peer coaching in the classroom is emerging as an important facet of teacher professional development that is linked with improved student learning (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Neufield & Roper, 2003). The Te Kotahitanga programme takes on particular significance given the growing international interest in effective professional development approaches for teachers of indigenous and other minoritised student populations in mainstream schools (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). The Te Kotahitanga professional model incorporates evidence-based components of effective professional development and is perhaps unique in addressing culturally responsive pedagogies on a large scale. The results of this independent evaluation add further to information about the effectiveness of different approaches to enhance student achievement through culturally responsive pedagogies.

Te Kotahitanga as professional development

During Phases 3 and 4, Te Kotahitanga was implemented primarily as a professional development model designed to enhance teaching and learning, and with a goal of enhancing Māori student achievement in mainstream secondary schools.

✿ *The Te Kotahitanga professional development model is grounded in the voices of Māori students who articulated what does and does not work for them in school.*

These students identified that their relationship with the teacher was at the centre of their success. They identified that teacher deficit theorising and transmission approaches to teaching were ineffective. The Effective Teaching Profile of Te Kotahitanga came directly from the Māori student narratives; as Bishop, Berryman, Cavanaugh and Teddy (2009) explain, “the narratives [of the students] were used in the professional development part of the project to provide teachers with a vicarious means of understanding how students experience schooling in ways that they might not otherwise have access to” (p. 736).

The Effective Teaching Profile comprises two major understandings for teachers:

- ▲ Rejection of deficit theorising to explain Māori students' educational achievement levels
- ▲ Knowledge of and professional agency regarding how to bring about change in Māori students' educational achievement.



These two major understandings are demonstrated through six major dimensions of teaching and learning:

Manaakitanga

caring for students as culturally located individuals

Mana motuhake

high expectations for learning

Whakapiringatanga

managing the classroom for learning

Wānanga

discursive teaching practices and student-student learning interactions

Ako

range of strategies to facilitate learning

Kotahitanga

promote, monitor and reflect on learning outcomes for students

The Te Kotahitanga professional development model links culturally relevant, relationship-based classroom pedagogy with a site-based process for working with teachers in the classroom. Implementing the Effective Teaching Profile operationalises the project's 'culturally responsive pedagogy of relations' to establish

“ *a learning context that is responsive to the culture of the child and means that learners can bring who they are to the classroom in complete safety and where their knowledge is acceptable and legitimate* ”

(Bishop et al., 2009, p. 741).

Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, and Teddy (2007) describe components of the programme for teachers:

- ▲ The initial induction workshop (hui) introducing Te Kotahitanga and the model of a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations
- ▲ Structured classroom observations followed by feedback sessions with teachers
- ▲ Co-construction meetings where teacher teams problem-solve collaboratively based on observational and student outcome data
- ▲ Specific shadow-coaching sessions for individualised teacher professional development.

The facilitation team

At each school, Te Kotahitanga activities are coordinated by a lead facilitator supported by one or more additional facilitators based on student and teacher numbers. Typically, the lead facilitator position is full-time and supported by part-time facilitators also working in other roles (e.g., advisory, Resource Teachers: Learning Behaviour (RLTB), teaching). Lead facilitators are expected to have cultural expertise and be master teachers – many are Māori .

Individualised teacher observations, co-construction meetings and shadow coaching

Once per term, each teacher is observed by a facilitator and participates in a feedback session focused on goals related to development of the Effective Teaching Profile. Shadow coaching may also be carried out with the facilitator working alongside the teacher in the classroom to develop particular skills *in vivo*.

Co-construction meetings are an important component of the professional development, whereby teachers who teach the same students but in different subject areas meet once every month or two to address challenges and strategies for improving Māori student achievement. The meeting is led by a facilitator who has observed the teachers in the classroom. The intended focus of co-construction groups is the analysis of a teaching-learning problem shared by the teaching team, using evidence of student learning outcomes and then developing a group goal. At a subsequent meeting, progress towards meeting goals is analysed.

Table 1: Implementation timeframes at Phase 3 and Phase 4 Schools

Project Year	Phase 3 Schools (N = 12)	Phase 4 Schools (N = 21)
1st Year	2004 <i>Training Year</i>	2007 <i>Training Year</i>
2nd Year	2005 <i>Training Year</i>	2008 <i>Training Year</i>
3rd Year	2006 <i>Full Implementation*</i>	2009 <i>Training Year</i>
4th Year	2007 <i>Full Implementation*</i>	2010 <i>Full Implementation*</i>

* *Full implementation years signify that all participating teachers across Years 9-10 have been trained in Te Kotahitanga. When these students reach Year 11, the impact of Te Kotahitanga on NCEA can be evaluated.*

Secondary school students in Years 9-10 are enrolled in different subjects across the curriculum, and on any given school day a particular Māori student will be exposed to 5-6 different teachers. In 'training years', some teachers were participating in Te Kotahitanga and others were not. Even in 'full implementation' years, students will be exposed to subjects where teachers are new to the project or not participating.

GPILSEO

Te Kotahitanga has developed GPILSEO "as a mnemonic device to aid in referencing" (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2007, p. 195) to support the sustainability of reforms flowing from the project. The GPILSEO model is articulated as a school-wide **Goal**; new **Pedagogy**; new **Institutions** and Structures for support: **Leadership** that is responsive, transformative, pro-active and distributed; strategies for **Spreading** reform; **Evidence** to evaluate progress; and establishing school **Ownership** of the reform.

In Phases 3 and 4, commitments made at the school level through the principal and the board of trustees were expected to have an overall impact. The results of the evaluation of Te Kotahitanga as implemented in the Phase 3 and Phase 4 schools supported the need for greater emphasis upon the school-wide aspects of the model in Phase 5, using GPILSEO as a framework for working with school leaders (Bishop, O'Sullivan, & Berryman, 2010).

Selection of schools

The 12 original Phase 3 schools were selected by the Ministry of Education from 330 secondary schools based on participation in existing school improvement providing funding for the project. Selection of the 21 Phase 4 schools was done collaboratively by the Waikato Te Kotahitanga team and the Ministry of Education based on factors such as the proportion of Māori students and geographic region.

As shown by Table 1 (above), project participation began late 2003 for Phase 3 and 2006 for Phase 4 schools.

Evaluation Research Method

The evaluation project was mixed-methods, involving both quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2009). Comprehensive data were gathered from the 22 schools during school visits and other sources. This included participant perspectives, as well as the review of individual school reports, student outcome data and National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) achievement results. Observations, interviews and focus groups were conducted individually or in pairs by the research team. The team comprised of experienced Māori and non-Māori researchers using protocols approved by the Victoria University of Wellington ethics committee. More information regarding these processes is available in the full report.

03

The Evaluation Report involves data collected from all 12 of the Phase 3 schools and 10 of the 21 Phase 4 schools which were selected as representative of the larger group but also to include schools in regions that had not been part of Phase 3 of the project. Phase 3 schools are located in Northland, Auckland and rural regions of the North Island. Phase 4 schools were from three geographic regions – Auckland, Bay of Plenty and the Waikato.

There were both co-ed and single-sex schools in the sample, and schools were identified across the range of deciles, size and proportion of Māori students represented in the project itself. For comparison purposes, 10 of the Phase 5 schools were identified according to similar demographic variables. Baseline data were gathered in 2009 from these schools prior to initiation of Te Kotahitanga.

Schools were approached from a bicultural perspective, and the research team encompassed Māori cultural expertise in addition to evaluation research expertise. Details about the research process are available in the full evaluation report.

Observations

To investigate aspects of the teacher professional development model and its impact on classroom teaching and learning interactions, 336 classroom lessons were observed in the 22 Phase 3 and 4 schools. In addition, 102 classroom observations were conducted in 10 of the Phase 5 schools prior to the start of Te Kotahitanga, as baseline observations for comparison purposes. A detailed, four-page observation protocol was used by each research observer for subsequent analysis across the 438 classroom observations.

Classroom observations were analysed to investigate the extent to which teaching and learning reflected implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile. Three categories were defined: High, Moderate and Low. For an explanation of the criteria for each level, please refer to the full evaluation report.

Two observers independently coded each observation, and where there was disagreement regarding coding, a team of three or four researchers discussed the observation and reached consensus regarding coding. Results were summarised by subjects across schools and by schools across subjects, and exemplars of different levels of implementation are reported across the curriculum in the full report.



Interviews

Interviews were held to investigate key perspectives on how well and in what ways Te Kotahitanga works towards the goal of improving student achievement.

Individual and small group interviews were conducted with:

- 150 teachers
- 20 principals
- 19 deputy principals
- 22 deans
- 19 heads of departments
- 22 lead facilitators
- 32 additional facilitators
- 15 boards of trustees chairs
- 19 whānau focus groups were also held at 17 of the 22 schools
- 214 Māori students in 39 focus groups at all schools.

Interview protocols were based on the evaluation questions and informed by input from the national advisory group and key Ministry of Education personnel associated with the project. Individual interviews were digitally recorded and detailed notes taken by a person other than the facilitator for focus groups, with notes read back to participants for member checking after each section of the interview. Interviews were transcribed, reviewed by team members to identify possible themes and codes, and coded formally using NVivo for analysis.

Student Outcomes

To investigate student outcomes associated with Te Kotahitanga implementation, multiple data sources were utilised encompassing three broad categories: student achievement, student behaviour and student attitudes about their learning. Evidence included NCEA achievement data sourced from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and the Ministry of Education Benchmark Indicators databases.

Year 11-13 student outcomes at Phase 3 schools were compared with student achievement at 12 comparison schools matched using key criteria including location (North Island); character (state co-ed or single-sex); decile range (within one decile level); percentage of Māori students leaving school with at least a Year 12 qualification in 2004 (mean average difference of 1.5%); specific geographical region (rural, small town, urban) and school size.

Achievement data analyses from NCEA Achievement results include the percentage of Year 9 students who attained NCEA Level 1 two years later when they were in Year 11 from 2004-2008; literacy and numeracy attainment; credits attained in Year 11 in different subject areas; and the percentage of students attaining University Entrance. Frequency statistics were generated using SPSS software and tested for significant differences, with Z-test analyses using differences of proportions where appropriate.

Additional information on student attitudes about their learning was gathered through interviews with school personnel, whānau/family and the students themselves.

Impact on Teachers' Classroom Practice

A major purpose of Te Kotahitanga is to ensure that teacher views about Māori students' learning and classroom practices shift from a base of deficit theorising towards culturally responsive pedagogies of relations. Results support the effectiveness of the professional development approach for the majority of teachers, though a minority of teachers did not demonstrate mastery of the project's Effective Teaching Profile.

Classroom Observations

Observations carried out in 336 classrooms in the Phase 3 and 4 schools were gathered across the curriculum, including core subjects such as English as well as elective subjects such as te reo Māori and Technology.

Results from the observation ratings indicated that the majority of teachers evidenced either moderate or high implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile. Implementation levels in four subjects – English, Maths, Science and Social Studies – were compared to the implementation levels that existed in Phase 5 schools prior to implementation of Te Kotahitanga.

✿ *Table 2 (below) shows the dramatic differences in ratings. Phases 3 and 4 teachers demonstrated higher levels of implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile compared to teachers in schools that had not yet begun participation in the project.*

Table 2: Effective Teaching Profile evidence at schools* in English, mathematics, science and social studies: Percentages and numbers of observations rated at different levels of implementation

Level of Implementation	Phase 3, 4 Years of Te Kotahitanga (N = 129)	Phase 4, 1 Year of Te Kotahitanga (N = 66)	Phase 5 Baseline (N = 98**)
Low	24% (31)	23% (15)	47% (46)
Moderate	57% (74)	36% (24)	36% (24)
High	19% (24)	41% (27)	5% (5)

* Numbers reflect observations conducted in only the four named subjects at these schools.

** Of the total of 102 observations at Phase 5 schools, four were invalid and could not be scored (e.g., test administration).

✿ *In the baseline or comparison schools, nearly half of the observations were scored as Low Implementers and only 5% as High Implementers. This is in stark contrast with Te Kotahitanga schools, in both phases, who have much higher rates of implementing the Effective Teacher Profile.*



Interviews

Te Kotahitanga is designed to challenge teacher beliefs and expectations for Māori students and to shift classroom instruction from a transmission approach to a more discursive, interactive model. Interview data affirmed that teachers valued relationship-based pedagogies. They were also able to highlight particular teaching strategies with a relational/interaction focus that had been introduced by Te Kotahitanga that were particularly helpful in improving their practice and outcomes for Māori students.

Three key themes emerged from the interviews:

- 1 change in teacher beliefs, expectations and understandings
- 2 change in teacher agency
- 3 increased job satisfaction, motivation and empowerment.

Teachers reported that the professional development had raised their awareness of Māori students and their learning needs in the classroom:

“Before Te Kotahitanga, I did develop this view just not to expect as much from them as I would from other students, and that has changed. I do now have the same expectations of them as of the other ones.”

A deputy principal emphasised that teachers were now more likely to actively involve students in the teaching and learning process:

“I was a traditional classroom teacher, forever, from way back. My job was to provide knowledge for the students. Their job was to use that knowledge in a wise way, but the whole exposure to Te Kotahitanga makes you question what you’re doing in the classroom. That shift to the discursive rather than traditional has actually opened a whole lot of doors. I started to question the whole foundation on which you built your concept of teaching. And that in itself has been valuable experience in light of the new curriculum coming in, which actually supports much of the fundamentals of Te Kotahitanga.”

Improved teacher agency was an important outcome of engagement in the professional development programme. Participants identified specific changes in teacher efforts to take on responsibility for improved practice and outcomes for Māori students. Another key change was teachers working to get to know their Māori students as individuals, including knowledge of student interests and experiences outside the classroom:

“I think the big key thing that I’ve noticed is that I really make an effort, trying to make a relationship with the Māori students in class, to show that you’re interested in them and you care about them, not just in your subject but other things.... make them know that we care about their learning.”



Whānau also reported changes they had noticed in the school and the teachers. Many commented on the importance of strong teacher-student relationships and teacher encouragement of Māori students and their achievement. They appreciated the effort that teachers made to improve practice and outcomes for rangatahi:

“Some of the teachers have clearly changed and they’ve really come on board, I’m not sure about all of them, but that’s a start, at least that’s a start. I also feel that the teachers that are involved in this programme, they actually exert themselves more by taking an interest in the Māori students and they’re not just a number... They sort of have a more personal interest in the students and their ability, and they try to get them to excel to their highest.”

Teachers were starting in different places in their knowledge of elements included in the Effective Teaching Profile. For some, a major shift was knowing who the Māori students were and being able to pronounce their names correctly – asking for help if needed. Māori students appreciated teacher efforts, and they commented that many teachers were now making an effort to use te reo in the classroom and enjoyed helping teachers learn te reo Māori. Other teachers incorporated cultural knowledge and understandings into classroom activities, and students were able to describe cultural components teachers had included in the curriculum such as knowledge from Te Ao Māori and youth culture.

Challenges remain for teaching and learning in those classrooms where low implementation of the Effective Teaching Profile was observed. These classrooms lacked culturally responsive pedagogies but also evidenced additional limitations to effective teaching and learning, suggesting ongoing professional development needs beyond those for which Te Kotahitanga was intended.

Impact on Students

To evaluate the impact of Te Kotahitanga professional development for teachers on students, three categories of student outcomes were investigated: student attitudes about their learning as Māori, student learning behaviour and student achievement. Sources of information included interviews with students, whānau and school personnel as well as data on student achievement from schools and official student records of learning.

05

Te Kotahitanga challenges schools to become culturally responsive for Māori and thus assume agency for Māori student achievement.

Learning and belonging as Māori

The structures and practices within English-medium schools reflect the cultural identities of many of their non-Māori students. They do not, however, reflect the cultural identity of Māori, despite their status as tangata whenua.

Teachers acknowledged the importance of Māori identity as integral to promoting Māori student achievement:

“That’s the beginning of promoting Māori achievement: knowing them as Māori and respect them for that, and also that it’s an honour to be Māori and be proud of your culture.”

Students discussed what it meant to be Māori at school:

“To me, it means expressing the culture of being a Māori and not being afraid or shy to show it.”

“I’m tangata whenua, I can carry my Māori culture to the next generation.”

Whānau were pleased that, in their view, Te Kotahitanga supported students culturally and instilled pride in being Māori, commenting on how many New Zealand secondary schools are 'mainstream' and disempower Māori students:

“I agree the principal is supportive, but in the mainstream curriculum how much is directly about Māori history, entrepreneurs... Māori role models; that, to me, is directly linked to the value of Māori in the school.”

“My dream for my child, my children, is something that I’ve not been able to give them because I didn’t learn te reo Māori, tikanga Māori all those things. I’d be so proud to see my son standing on the paepae, doing the whaikorero, that sort of thing. Our Māori culture is not something that is easy to learn somewhere else, and if they can do it now, it’s going to go with them for the rest of his life. That’s my dream for him.”

“It’s a new programme, but the problem is that we’re still in the colonial system. It’s not just the teachers, the system needs to change. There is work that needs to be done, because we (the whānau) can see problems.”



High expectations for achievement

Most teachers discussed high expectations for achievement in terms of student attainment of NCEA qualifications, sometimes tied to university preparation:

“For the average Māori girl coming in here, she should be capable of leaving with her Level 3 [certificate], and I’d hope that she’d at least have the choice to go to university. If university wasn’t for her, at least she’d have that choice.”

Principals affirmed that discussions among teachers had changed regarding expectations for Māori students, and teachers were more focused on their agency for promoting learning rather than attributing underachievement to the students themselves:

“It’s “Let’s talk about achievement. Let’s talk about learning. And let’s talk about needs of students.” As opposed to, “They can’t, they shouldn’t, they won’t be able to” type of deficit stuff. You move away from that and start talking about learning, and it’s encouraging.”

The one thing that’s changed [is] this whole deficit theorising. You know, teachers have always been very good about, “Well, if Wally would only put his shoes on to come to school” or whatever it is that is good to make him learn better, “What can you expect when he comes from that family?” and so on. A lot of that talk has gone away, and I suppose that has been the training, making them aware that they had been deficit theorising in the past.”

Impact on attendance, engagement and retention

Teachers discussed the impact of Te Kotahitanga on achievement-related behaviours such as attendance and engagement as active learners rather than only the specifics of achievement test scores or NCEA results:

“At the beginning of the year, there were quite a few that were truant, and not bringing their gear, but now they all participate [because] I got to know them better. We just got a relationship where they know I care that they are not participating or not in my class, and they know I’ll find them around the school or when I see them I’ll ask them where they were.”

“The valuable outcome for students would be higher achievement, less truancy [so] that those students who avoid school will attend regularly. That as teachers, we don’t focus on things that we can’t control, like what’s going on at home, or whatever, that we just focus on what’s going on in our classroom. So at the end of the day, better results and higher retention rates.”

“We’re after achievement which can be interpreted in many ways, but step one is them wanting to be here, and being in a classroom environment where they feel comfortable and they will come more days than they would otherwise.”

“I would say the engagement levels and the participation levels are much higher. For myself, within the project, my expectations now are of a 100% participation and 100% engagement.”



Principals emphasised that achievement began with enhanced attendance and engagement, and they overwhelmingly perceived that Te Kotahitanga had led to changes in Māori student engagement, attendance, and behaviour:

- “*Te Kotahitanga also looks at actual engagement within the classroom – the type of interaction with the teacher, the attendance, those sorts of things, the ability to compare attendance in different classes.*”
- “*What I’d like to hope will happen is that the Māori kids in particular – I was just about to say engage a bit – but instead that they are comfortable in the learning environment that we have, that it’s not something that’s foreign to them.*”
- “*One of the things we’ve seen over the last few years is a change in the retention of Māori kids in school, and coming back for Year 12 and Year 13. We used to have a lot of those that would come back because they had nothing, and then they’d only need to survive a short period of time in Year 12 and then disappear. These students [now] tend to be staying right through.*”

Whānau were convinced that Te Kotahitanga was responsible for their children’s improved educational outcomes compared to previous practices:

- “*I can see [my son] moving on to stay to Year 13, just purely because of that support and that work that’s here. And the role models, the people that they put in front of them – this is what you can achieve.*”

Evidence on achievement-related factors

Although achievement-related factors such as attendance, retention, streaming patterns, and disciplinary statistics were mentioned by school personnel, the inability of most schools to provide summaries of evidence for these student outcomes was attributed to difficulties with their student management systems. Factors such as these are referenced in the GPILSEO model but had not yet been incorporated systematically into Phases 3 and 4 training.

In addition to the possible impact of Te Kotahitanga, other school initiatives – such as the implementation of restorative justice processes – can also have an impact on such factors. Quantifying the relative impact of different factors would require precise information regarding what and when initiatives were introduced and implemented, and, given various factors to be tested, there is unlikely to be sufficient statistical power to assess these influences meaningfully.

Data on achievement-related student outcomes should be gathered and reported systematically as part of support for Te Kotahitanga (or other initiatives designed to have impact on students) and the evaluation team has made this recommendation to the Ministry of Education and the project.

NCEA data revealed large increases in the numbers of students enrolled in Year 11 and those attaining NCEA Level 1 in Year 11 from 2005-2008 at Te Kotahitanga schools. Data also revealed increased retention at secondary level for other students in comparison to those at 12 comparison schools. **In terms of real numbers, there is an average increase in the Year 11 Māori student enrolment of approximately 250% across this 4 year period.**



Evidence of achievement outcomes

During Years 9-10, schools were not consistently assessing students using an agreed standardised achievement measure, such as Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning (asTTle). Data for some of the Phase 3 schools were reported by the Waikato Te Kotahitanga team (Bishop et al., 2009) and assessments are now being done systematically at the Phase 4 schools, which were not available to the evaluation team within the required timeframe.

Of interest, however, is the longer term impact of Te Kotahitanga on NCEA student achievement in Years 11-13. A caveat for reviewing the results is that there is no evidence available regarding whether teaching in the senior secondary school also reflected the Effective Teaching Profile. It may be that these practices have not been extended to NCEA Level instruction in Years 11-13, hence affecting student achievement accordingly.

Nevertheless, comparisons of NCEA results for the 12 Phase 3 and the 12 comparison schools revealed meaningful differences on several indicators (more details and further analyses are included in the full report):

The qualitative data clearly indicates that Te Kotahitanga is having a positive impact on Māori student achievement. The quantitative data reported for 2008 also shows evidence that Te Kotahitanga is associated with enhanced Māori achievement, although not in all areas. It is interesting to note that there was an average increase in the Year 11 Māori student enrolment of approximately 250% across this four year period. It has been suggested that larger gains in achievement are not evident because Te Kotahitanga schools have been more successful than other schools in retaining students who would otherwise have left the senior secondary school.

Percentage of all Year 9 entrants who attained NCEA Level 1 in Year 11:

This percentage was slightly lower from Year 9 in 2002 to Year 11 in 2004 but showed a greater gain in the percentage increase for Te Kotahitanga schools with nearly identical results by 2008 (see Table 3). Further, the percentage gain for students at Te Kotahitanga schools was twice that of the percentage national average gain for all secondary schools over this time period.

Table 3: Year 11 students' attainment of NCEA Certificates at Level 1 as a percentage of Year 9 entrants two years earlier

	12 Te Kotahitanga schools				12 Comparison schools			
	Mean	Median	SD	SE mean	Mean	Median	SD	SE mean
Year 11 in 2004 as % of Year 9 entrants in 2002	38.1	35.2	15.4	4.5	43.0	42.5	15.2	4.6
Year 11 in 2005 as % of Year 9 entrants in 2003	42.5	40.8	12.7	3.7	43.3	39.8	16.0	4.8
Year 11 in 2006 as % of Year 9 entrants in 2004	51.4	52.9	12.3	3.5	51.7	49.5	14.1	4.1
Year 11 in 2007 as % of Year 9 entrants in 2005	51.8	52.5	12.3	3.5	57.5	54.1	15.7	4.5
Year 11 in 2008 as % of Year 9 entrants in 2006	51.6	53.7	15.6	4.5	52.6	47.8	15.2	4.4

NCEA credits attained in selected subjects: NCEA

There were no differences between Te Kotahitanga and the comparison schools in history and English credit attainment by Māori students in 2008, with a small decline occurring for English from 2005 to 2008 for all students.


 *Māori students at Te Kotahitanga schools out-performed their peers in the comparison schools in Maths, Science and Physics (Table 4).*

Table 4: Mean total credits in selected subjects attained by Year 11 Māori and NZ European students in 2005 and 2008

Subject	Year	Group	NZ European students					Māori students				
			N	M	SD	t-value	p-value	N	M	SD	t-value	p-value
English	2005	Te Kotahitanga	582	19.97	7.13	3.32	< .01	360	15.29	7.54	-1.48	n.s.
		Comparison	42.5	40.8	12.7			314	15.56	7.01		
	2008	Te Kotahitanga	1,081	17.63	7.03	-.76	n.s.	863	13.10	6.84	-1.80	n.s.
		Comparison	978	17.87	7.03			700	13.73	6.97		
Mathematics	2005	Te Kotahitanga	585	23.23	7.95	-.76	n.s.	373	19.54	9.11	3.42	< .01
		Comparison	586	21.66	7.53			331	17.36	7.87		
	2008	Te Kotahitanga	1,118	23.93	10.61	8.37	< .001	953	17.26	10.50	4.20	< .01
		Comparison	1,015	20.37	9.03			759	15.37	8.10		
Science	2005	Te Kotahitanga	429	12.66	7.56	-.89	n.s.	228	8.84	6.49	-2.70	< .01
		Comparison	491	13.09	6.84			224	10.54	6.89		
	2008	Te Kotahitanga	822	13.09	7.89	3.16	< .01	639	9.92	6.44	2.64	< .01
		Comparison	820	13.80	8.22			516	8.96	5.87		
History	2005	Te Kotahitanga	117	18.74	6.80	3.32	< .01	40	14.60	7.11	1.62	n.s.
		Comparison	139	16.12	5.84			52	12.38	5.67		
	2008	Te Kotahitanga	169	19.29	9.64	4.83	< .001	93	12.26	7.97	-.00	n.s.
		Comparison	194	14.99	6.84			107	12.26	7.17		
Physics	2005	Te Kotahitanga	201	6.17	4.22	4.22	< .001	97	5.23	3.64	3.32	< .01
		Comparison	172	4.65	2.71			81	3.70	2.44		
	2008	Te Kotahitanga	202	8.09	4.79	9.00	< .001	65	6.18	3.88	2.69	< .01
		Comparison	252	4.63	2.93			86	4.60	3.32		

Attainment of University Entrance (UE) in Year 13:

The percentage of students attaining UE increased from 2004-2008 at all schools. This percentage was significantly higher at the Te Kotahitanga schools compared with the matched school sample (Table 4).

Further, the national percentage gain during this time period across all New Zealand secondary schools was from 36.9% in 2004 to 43.6% in 2008, a gain of 6.7% which was comparable to the gain achieved in Te Kotahitanga schools of 6% during this same time period.

Table 5: The mean percentage of Year 13 students gaining University Entrance in 2004-2008

	12 Te Kotahitanga schools				12 Comparison schools			
	Mean	Median	SD	SE mean	Mean	Median	SD	SE mean
Year 13 in 2004	37.1	38.8	10.9	3.15	28.9	28.2	18.5	5.4
Year 13 in 2005	33.9	32.4	12.7	3.67	27.4	25.3	16.2	4.7
Year 13 in 2006	38.9	47.5	15.8	4.55	35.0	32.1	20.1	5.8
Year 13 in 2007	41.4	44.9	15.0	4.34	37.8	33.6	16.1	4.6
Year 13 in 2008	43.1	46.1	12.7	3.68	35.3	35.9	19.4	5.6

* At one of the comparison schools, no student attained University Entrance; hence the overall mean was 0%, thus increasing the standard deviation accordingly.

It is too early to assess the direct impact of Te Kotahitanga on Year 13 students in attaining UE as the first cohort fully exposed to the model from Year 9 had not yet reached this level in either the Phase 3 or the Phase 4 schools. Nevertheless, these data are included here as evidence regarding whether or not the presence of Te Kotahitanga in schools is associated with either enhanced or depressed performance at graduation, for all students.

As one principal explains, gaining University Entrance is a valued outcome for Māori as for other students:

“*The thing is, Māori students are just like any other group of students. They are perfectly capable of getting Level 3 and going to university. So I would like to see a lot more of University Entrance happening.*”

This issue speaks directly to any concerns that focusing on one particular group of students, such as Māori, would have a negative impact on achievement for all students. Thus, the results for attainment of University Entrance are included here as an overall indicator of school performance in promoting student achievement. Many principals saw this as a key achievement outcome.

Impact on Schools

The overarching goal of Te Kotahitanga is to enhance Māori student achievement in the mainstream, thus the evaluation investigated both intentional and incidental impact on the schools. There was considerable variability in the cultural responsiveness of schools from being highly responsive to things Māori to minimal evidence of awareness of Māori students' cultural backgrounds and experiences at the school level. Across all schools, however, there was expressed commitment to Te Kotahitanga as a valued professional development model that was seen as highly effective for teachers.

06

Bishop and Berryman (2006) discuss the importance of schools being culturally responsive in recognising Māori students' culture and taking cognisance of Māori cultural aspirations and notions of belonging. These in turn require schools to build appropriate and responsive pedagogies into curricula and programmes (p. 201).

The GPILSEO model, updated in Bishop et al. (2010), is designed to guide school leaders towards establishing culturally responsive policy and practices school-wide.



Goal

Improving outcomes for Māori students

Across all schools, principals articulated goals for Māori student outcomes anticipated through participation in Te Kotahitanga. There was less evidence that these goals had been widely communicated to whānau, and the students themselves.

Pedagogy

Culturally responsive pedagogies of relations

Teachers and other school personnel clearly articulated a primary focus on improving learning relationships in the classroom that was seen as having a school-wide impact, as described by teachers:

“I think I've seen a change in the school, a change for the better. One of the big changes would be that it's looking at good engagement, good achievement of Māori students and others, that is the measure where initially there was a lot of emphasis on collaborative work and students would be working collaboratively.”

“I feel personally as a teacher here that this is a very, very comfortable and supportive and safe school to work in... the students are comfortable in this environment, they feel that it is an environment where it actually matches up with their culture and they are culturally at home in this school. They can relate to teachers very positively in most circumstances.”

“There's no way that this is only helping Māori. This has huge positive impacts on all students, and that's part of that school tone thing. It was never just the Māori kids who were naughty, it was never just them who were being excluded and suspended. It has had a big impact on kids in general.”

Despite reports of changes in attitudes towards Māori students and Māori culture, some students described incidences of racism as something they still faced at school. These comments largely occurred at two schools that appeared to be low implementers of Te Kotahitanga across our data. They involved a few teachers and, in some cases, school rules were considered by the students as culturally disrespectful (e.g., confiscation of a tāonga).



At other schools, a student summed up the consensus of the focus group:

“I think that there is no racism here... There are other schools round here that you can get quite a negative racist thing like that, and I feel like at this school, I don't think you do.”

Institutions

Structures to support reform

School leaders and facilitators affirmed that physical resources and supports such as space and time, to accommodate the project needs, signalled commitment to the purpose of the Te Kotahitanga programme. In one school, the introduction of Te Kotahitanga led to the creation of a department and position attracting management units that normalised things Māori and acknowledged that the school valued Māori culture:

“By the school setting up a faculty [of] Māori and by creating a position such as director of Māori achievement was like putting Māori things out there, normalising Māori things instead of making it a 'too scary to go there' zone... It has also helped moving the whare into the middle of the school, where everyone can see it.”

Principals described the need to better accommodate the timetable in project planning, particularly given that teachers receive training across a period of two to three years; thus not all teachers in a particular planning group will have been trained in the first years of the project:

“For us, [at the time] we were accepted into Te Kotahitanga, our timetable for the following year had been pretty much strung. So there wasn't that opportunity... to spend time constructing your timetables so that your cohorts can be together. We didn't have that luxury. And it's better this year; it'll be fine next year.”

Principals were asked how Te Kotahitanga fits alongside other school initiatives, and most indicated it was the driving force enabling them to re-focus how different projects operating at their school fit together:

“How does this fit with what we are trying to do? I think it fits very well with whanaungatanga, because it's modeling that. Te Kotahitanga is certainly becoming the umbrella along with two other key things: the New Zealand curriculum and the regional achievement initiative happening in this district.”

Principals were most likely to discuss the impact of Te Kotahitanga on how other professional development initiatives were affected, such that Te Kotahitanga was in the process of becoming “the pillar, the backbone of which the other PD will hang off”. One teacher described the relationship between Te Kotahitanga and numeracy professional development:



“When TK came along, I was interested to hear from school support services that many of the aims and the objectives overlapped [with numeracy professional development]... One of the reasons that we in maths were a little bit slow to engage in TK initially was because we were still in the pilot [numeracy] project. [But] the aims were similar because we wanted to do good teaching practice and we saw that overlap.”

In general, the evidence suggested that school principals and other school leaders viewed Te Kotahitanga as primarily a teacher professional development initiative, with some relevance to other school initiatives but having less impact on overall school policies and practices. Most principals were not able to describe how school policy had been affected by Te Kotahitanga. In most schools, even school-wide activities and events we observed were largely reflective of traditional mono-cultural ‘European’ practices rather than incorporating biculturalism and specifically Māori cultural aspects.

Leadership

Proactive and power-sharing

Principals commented on the increase of leadership capability resulting from Te Kotahitanga professional development:

“[The facilitator] has blossomed into a great leader on the staff. This will be a channel for her moving into senior leadership I’m sure. She’s really developed.”

School leaders described other indicators of leadership reflecting Māori cultural skills and understandings:

“Five years ago, would you have expected a white middle class deputy principal to be talking Kaupapa and talking things like that to you? It’s just that there are all these subtle changes that go on. And we are bicultural.”

“This year, we’ve got a head boy who is tangata whenua, and a head girl. Five years ago that would not have happened.”

However, there were gaps in the extent to which leadership was shared across the school, with principals continuing to set the overall agenda and not necessarily involving others in establishing targets for staff and students. The 19 heads of departments we interviewed generally did not highlight or elaborate their own role in the leadership and improvement process across the whole school, but rather discussed Te Kotahitanga in terms of teacher professional development at the classroom level.

Spread

Inclusion of staff, parents and community in the reform

Some principals felt that including all staff in the reform was a developmental process, not achievable in the short term for many schools:



“I did want to say that I don’t feel it’s good to have a programme that starts in a school and that there is coercion at the beginning. There is a lot of resentment underneath the surface of a lot of staff about this because of it. I believe that forcing people into something that they don’t really... well, that they feel resentful. And yes there are undercurrents... So I think it has to be truly voluntary, and if the whole school doesn’t go into it, then so be it, without any penalties being applied to people.”

Schools varied in their approach to participation, and some did require all staff to commit to participation at some stage:

“I honestly think that a programme will not work well in a school if the whole school’s not involved, because these kids change classes all the time. If they’re getting something good in one class and then they move to the next class and it’s not there, they lose that.”

“I think it’s a bit sad that not all teachers are actually participating. I think it makes it a little bit more difficult when you’ve got some that are, some that aren’t. I think really that if we are going to buy into it, we should all be buying into it.”

Bishop et al. (2010) contend that culturally responsive schools extend inclusion in the reform to parents and the community. This was not occurring in the Phase 3 and Phase 4 schools, though whānau expressed to the interviewers that they would welcome more opportunity for involvement.

Evidence

Use of data for formative and summative purposes

Schools varied widely in their collection and distribution of relevant student data towards attainment of outcome goals. For example, there were assertions that the percentage of Māori students in low versus high streams had shifted over time as a function of higher expectations and achievement related to implementation of Te Kotahitanga. However, few records of streaming practices were available to verify such patterns.

Where steps were underway to analyse and share data with teachers and the co-construction teams, this was viewed positively:

“As a result of being in Te Kotahitanga, the data we are going to collect and analyse now for our junior kids is going to be better data, rather than broad brush stuff.”

At the end of last year, start of this year, a team of us which included facilitators and some other teachers sat down and created a data collection and analysis plan for the school. That included stuff about serious misbehaviour incidents, attendance and achievement. And I’d actually say we wouldn’t have done that in such a coherent way if Te Kotahitanga didn’t have the demands of attendance and assessment data being collected for these targeting classes.”

Ownership

Whole school including board of trustees ownership of the reform

School personnel were pleased that their schools were part of Te Kotahitanga, could articulate the benefits, and appeared highly motivated to continue with the programme. Overwhelmingly, boards



of trustees chairs expressed commitment and enthusiasm for Te Kotahitanga, indicating their hopes that the programme would continue beyond the current additional funding initiative.

Sustainability of Te Kotahitanga

Virtually all school principals indicated that sustainability depended upon three factors:

- 1 the lead facilitator role;
- 2 individualised expert cultural advice to teachers and support for co-construction teams; and
- 3 availability of ongoing training and support as have been provided by the University of Waikato research team.

Some explored ideas for embedding the culture of Te Kotahitanga in school relationships and related school processes (e.g., staff appraisal, peer support networks):

“I feel it has to come from the staff themselves wanting to keep the model going, rather than being able to provide a huge amount of release time and resources.”

“I think the observations should become self-reflections at some stage. There are other ways to make TK sustainable, so that observations still happen. There is some sort of trade-off that says “This is no longer formative for you, this is now summative checking that you are somewhat still on track”. ”

Yet, Phase 3 schools that were nearing their final year of project funding did not report systematic planning for sustainability, while some Phase 4 schools indicated this was something they were already exploring in their second year in the project:

“Through the milestone reporting or whatever, you could require schools to make sure it’s in their strategic plan, or their charter. Because then you’ve got that, and then it filters down to all the areas to where it should be. Then it becomes a self-sustaining model.”

“I’ve been thinking throughout the year “How do I embed it?” How does it become sustainable in the school?” Because you do so many professional development initiatives and projects and then you stop doing them, and they go away.”

Boards of trustees chairs at both Phase 3 and Phase 4 schools expressed their commitment to Te Kotahitanga, but again, it was the Phase 4 chairs who most often mentioned strategies and resources needed to sustain the model:

“If the funding for the facilitator position dried up, [we] would have to look at funding it within the Board’s own budget, and we could seriously do that.”

“There has got to be some sort of strategic intent to make sure that it is firmly integrated into the fabric of the school. Our Board of Trustees would have to seriously consider looking at other options. We get fantastic support from our corporate: I’d go and talk to someone to see if they’d help us with that.”



07

Recommendations

The following recommendations are supported by the evaluation findings:

For teacher professional development and classroom instruction

- 1** Continued support should be available for the Te Kotahitanga professional development model for improving classroom teaching and learning for Māori students.
- 2** University-based programmes along the lines of the Resource Teacher: Learning and Behaviour (RTLB) professional postgraduate programme, leading to a formal qualification, should be encouraged given the key role and importance of trained facilitators. Heads of departments and teachers who are high implementers of the Effective Teaching Profile should have more opportunities to provide culturally responsive teacher leadership, particularly to meet the need for more subject-specific advice and support.
- 3** At present the professional development programme does not differentiate between teachers who are working as 'High' 'Moderate' or 'Low' implementers. More specific and targeted professional development is needed to better cater for teachers' needs, with more targeted professional development goals for improvement.
- 4** Systematic planning for extending supports and professional development is needed if achievement impact is expected in Years 11-13. This extension could comprise selected facilitator observations and feedback sessions focused on NCEA subjects in the senior secondary school for teachers once they have demonstrated mastery in the junior school.



For the Ministry of Education

- 1** Whenever initiatives are intended to have an impact on student outcomes, systematic measures of those outcomes should be reported on an annual basis by the school to the Ministry of Education and to the school's board of trustees, students, and families. For Te Kotahitanga, these data should minimally include an agreed measure of student achievement as well as achievement-related motivation and/or engagement, with results reported for all students and also disaggregated for Māori students.
- 2** Schools receiving special initiative funding should be provided a template and technical support for reporting required student outcome data annually in a format consistent across schools for Māori and all students, including: average percentage daily attendance; retention as a percentage of students returning to school in the year following their 16th birthday; the total number of suspensions, stand-downs and expulsions; and numbers and levels of streamed groups including percentage composition by ethnicity.
- 3** The Ministry of Education should provide technical support to all schools to ensure establishment of reliable data management systems, with designated school personnel responsible for these data.

For schools

- 1** All schools, and particularly English-medium schools with significant Māori populations, should establish staffing patterns, policy and procedures, and cultural advice to teachers to support student achievement in culturally responsive ways. Accountability for these systemic processes should be with the principal and the senior management team.
- 2** Focus on high achievement is needed for all Māori students, alongside evidence of high expectations including access to enhanced learning opportunities, gifted and talented programmes, and appropriate educational supports for students with special educational needs.
- 3** Summary data on student outcomes should be available to teachers and other school personnel for use in programme planning and to improve instruction. Summaries of student outcome data should also be shared on a regular basis with whānau and the students themselves.
- 4** Whānau and students should have opportunities to participate in the visioning and goal setting for the school as set out in the New Zealand Curriculum. This includes creating opportunities for whānau to participate in school change initiatives: some schools may need to address relationships with whānau and local iwi where there is evidence that historical disputes and/or past schooling experiences for whānau at the school are seen as barriers to participation.
- 5** An expectation of overall school change associated with Te Kotahitanga is needed, driven by school principals and other school leaders accountable for that change. This should include consideration of the implications for systems such as support for provisionally registered teachers, professional mentoring, performance management, professional development activities, curricular reform, and relationships with the community and families.



08

References

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning*. Wellington: Huia Press.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kotahitanga: Phase 3 whānaungatanga: Establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in mainstream secondary school classrooms: Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Te Kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 734-742.

Bishop, R., O'Sullivan, D., & Berryman, M. (2010). *Scaling up education reform: Addressing the politics of disparity*. Wellington: NZCER Press.

Castagno, A.E., & Brayboy, B.M.J. (2008). Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 941-993.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Garet, M.S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L., Birman, B.F., & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 915-945.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Neufield, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity*. The Aspen Institute Program on Education, the Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

Snow-Runner, R., & Lauer, P.A. (2005). *Professional development analysis*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

