




Location	Mercy Centre, 15 Guildford Terrace, Thorndon, Wellington
Attendees	<p>Authorisation Board Catherine Isaac – Chair John Shewan Dame Iritana Tawhiwhirangi Dr Margaret Southwick John Morris John Taylor Terry Bates Sir Toby Curtis</p> <p>Board Only time between 9.00am and 9.30am.</p>
Apologies	Nil
In Attendance	<p>Ministry of Education (MoE) Dr Graham Stoop - Deputy Secretary s 9(2)(a) OIA [redacted] - Project Manager Jim Greening – Group Manager, Schools and Student Support - (2.45pm to 3.15pm) [redacted] - Authorisation Board Secretariat [redacted] – Policy Adviser</p> <p>Office of the Minister of Education, Hon Hekia Parata David Seymour – Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Minister of Education s 9(2)(a) OIA [redacted] - Private Secretary, Office of the Minister of Education [redacted] - Advisor to the Parliamentary Under-Secretary</p>

Summary Actions arising from the meeting			
	Action	Owner	Due Date
10/11:01	Ministry to note the Board's requirement for clarity around its role, its expectations of a secretariat and a relationship with the Ministry that enables it to carry out its role and meet its accountabilities. GS to report back to the Board on how these matters can be addressed.	Ministry (GS)	4/12/14
10/11:02	A copy of the MartinJenkins Report to go to David Seymour.	Ministry	4/12/14
10/11:03	The Board recommended that the MartinJenkins review be put on hold. GS noted the Board's feedback and will report back on this at the next AB meeting.	Ministry s 9(2)(a) OIA [redacted]	4/12/14
10/11:04	Ministry to confirm lease arrangements for	Ministry [redacted]	4/12/14

	Pacific Peoples Advancement Trust. Ministry to note the Board's requirement to be advised of any material variations to contracts.		
10/11:05	CI to contact [redacted] re enrolment progress and details of principal appointments, and MUMA re changes in governance/sponsor group. s 9(2)(a) OIA	Board (CI)	4/12/14
10/11:06	[redacted] requested to be added to the distribution list for the weekly/fortnightly communication to sponsors. s 9(2)(a) OIA	Ministry [redacted]	4/12/14
10/11:07	Any further comments from Board members on reporting on sponsor establishment should go to [redacted] via the Chair. s 9(2)(a) OIA [redacted] asked for Board comments on the report summarising qualitative performance in Q3.	Board Members	4/12/14
10/11:08	[redacted]	Chair s 9(2)(f)(iv) OIA	4/12/14
10/11:09	Recommend to the Minister that a Performance Notice be issued to Te Kura Hourua Whangaruru re enrolment/attendance and educational performance	Ministry (GS)	4/12/14
10/11:10	Ministry to draft a Performance Notice for AB review Ministry to provide school property portfolio information to Board	Ministry [redacted] Ministry (GS)	
Actions from previous meetings			
	No actions from previous minutes		

Agenda #	Topic		
Meeting opening			
1.	Welcome and apologies	Catherine Isaac	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI welcomed everyone to the meeting. There were no apologies recorded. 		
2.	Under-Secretary for Education perspective	David Seymour	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DS welcomed the opportunity to be involved in the implementation of Partnership Schools and noted that a critical feature of the policy is an independent Authorisation Board. He also noted 		

	that, regardless of disadvantage, all New Zealand children are entitled to an education that enables them to achieve their potential.		
3.	Ministry of Education perspective on PSKH		Dr Graham Stoop
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS provided an overview of the Board's relationship with the Ministry. This was followed by a discussion. Members noted that the model put forward did not reflect the Board's requirements in respect of its expectations of a secretariat, or its relationships with the Ministry, the Minister and the schools. The Board needs to be able to carry out its role and meet its accountabilities as set out in its Terms of Reference in a thorough and timely manner, and this requires a commitment from the Ministry and better resourcing. Clarity is also required around how the Board manages risk. GS undertook to report back to the Board on how these matters can be addressed. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Action: 10/11:01 – GS</i></p>		
4.	Lessons from the US		Catherine Isaac
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI shared the main messages from her visit to a number of charter schools and support organisations in the United States. She concluded that the key features of a supportive 'ecosystem' that are needed to foster successful, high quality PSKH are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An informative Authorisation Board website, and a proactive, transparent approach to informing interested parties and the public about the schools' performance and the initiative generally A welcoming public sector environment for start-ups - not just 'open' to change, but proactively seeking to support and foster initiative Strong, mutually-supportive, well-functioning relationships between the Board & MOE, and among other agencies Readiness to face and solve problems, and continuously evolving to meet needs Rigorous assessment, authorisation and monitoring practices A high quality teacher/principal pipeline – leadership development that attracts and fosters talented and motivated educational entrepreneurs s 9(2)(f)(iv) OIA  Generous philanthropic funding and private sector/business support – recognising the potential to kick start and scale a quality movement, and 'Lateral' public/private partnerships to solve facilities challenges. 		
5.	MartinJenkins Review- evaluation		
s 9(2)(a) OIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">  provided an overview of the Review. s 9(2)(a) OIA Board members felt that the initial draft report was not useful and that the proposed approach was inefficient in terms of doubling up on the ERO's, MOE's and Board's assessment requirements, and should be fully independent, rather than managed by the Ministry. The primary focus of any assessment should be on student achievement, rather than on the policy, and a review of the policy was too early, as the implementation processes are still being refined. The Board recommended that the MartinJenkins review be put on hold. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS noted the feedback and will report back on this at the next AB meeting. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Action: 10/11:03 – Ministry GS</i></p>
6.	<p>Implementation and Operation</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) OIA [REDACTED]</p> <p>s 9(2)(a) OIA [REDACTED] presented a report on the progress of the establishing schools and a verbal update of the current issues across the established kura. He noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variations between assessed applications and executed contracts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manukau Urban Māori Authority proposed a primary school of 155 students and was contracted for a school with a maximum roll of 200. He Puna Marama proposed a primary school of 100 students and was contracted for a school with a maximum roll of 150. CI commented that any proposed variation from the original application and/or the contract should be a “red alert”. If the proposed maximum roll is being reduced this should be reflected in an amendment to the contract. It should also prompt reconsideration of the financial viability of the school. A private party is understood to have purchased the building that Pacific Peoples Advancement Trust intends to use to establish its school, and is leasing it back to the school. The Board requested Ministry to review to ensure this is an acceptable arrangement. s 9(2)(a) OIA [REDACTED] <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Action: 10/11:04 - Ministry [REDACTED]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board expressed concern about changes to the composition of sponsor groups (eg the MUMA Board) and the critical importance of ensuring high quality school principal appointments (eg PPAT), and noted they do not have the ability to vet appointments of key persons. CI to call sponsors to discuss. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Action 10/11:05 - CI</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board reiterated that it would like the weekly reports on the four establishing PSKH to focus in particular on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> variations to approved applications and/or contracts appointment of educational leaders enrolment and community engagement location and/or property issues <p style="text-align: right;">s 9(2)(a) OIA [REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further comments from Board members on reporting requirements should go to [REDACTED] via the Chair. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Action: 10/11:07 - Board Members</i></p>
7.	<p>Update on Whangaruru</p> <p>Jim Greening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ERO readiness review report identified that while the school had made a number of improvements, there are still concerns about the quality of teaching and learning at the school. The Board discussed these concerns and noted that a number of issues identified and raised with the school following a Board site visit in June this year had not yet been addressed. These included in particular educational performance and enrolment/attendance. While the school has developed a remedial plan, this was not seen as likely to be sufficient to address the issues. The Board resolved that it recommends to the Minister that a Performance Notice be issued to the Sponsor, noting that the school is in breach of its contract with respect to educational performance and enrolment.

	<i>Moved Catherine Isaac, seconded John Shewan, passed unanimously</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry agreed to prepare a draft Performance Notice for AB review. <i>Action: 10/11:09 - Ministry DP</i> The Board noted that if the contract were to be concluded on the grounds of performance then it expected the Ministry to reach agreement with the sponsor that the land must be sold and funds paid back to the Crown. 		
8.	Performance Management Framework		Dr Graham Stoop
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board noted that clear, consistent, timely, publicly-available academic data was critical in demonstrate that the Partnership Schooling model is effective in delivering high quality educational outcomes and that schools are being held accountable for this. The Board noted that the current reporting format does not provide enough information, in particular data on academic performance, for the Board to fulfil its monitoring function, nor is it timely. The Board asked that PSKH be required to use standard assessment tools eg PATs and e-asTTle for baseline testing and to test progress through the year. As a minimum, baseline testing should be done early in Term 1 and repeated in Term 4 to assess the value the school is adding for students over the course of the year. GS noted that an appointment is being made to provide assistance on the PSKH academic framework and support the Board to effectively fulfil its functions. s 9(2)(a) OIA [redacted] asked for Board comments on the report distributed summarising qualitative performance in Q3. The Board noted that in addition to qualitative material it is important to have access to quantitative achievement data. GS noted that the new appointment referred to above will be able to assist in this area. s 9(2)(a) OIA <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Action: Board to provide feedback to [redacted] on Q3 report</i></p>		
9.	Funding Formula		Ministry
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board Chair noted the perception that Partnership Schools are too expensive. Funding appears generous for Secondary Schools compared to the Primary Schools, particularly for small schools. The Board Chair described some of the arrangements in place in the US, where state departments of education are often responsible for providing accommodation for charter schools. Charter schools are often co-located with regular state schools (in some cases with declining rolls), or allocated the premises of a former school, or in some instances are given the opportunity to 'take over' a failing school. She suggested some of these options could be considered in the New Zealand context to potentially achieve better value from the Ministry's existing school property portfolio. She asked if the Ministry could provide the Board with information about the school property portfolio and any properties currently vacant or under-utilised. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Action: Ministry to provide information about property portfolio</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed that the funding formula should be reviewed. JS recommended that the Board and existing sponsors be invited to provide input into the funding review. 		
	Next round of applications		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board discussed the matter of the timing of the next round of applications and noted that a 		

	number of good quality applicants had expressed interest in applying.			
	Meeting closed at 4.10pm			