

Minutes

Partnership Schools/Kura Hourua Authorisation Board Meeting (by teleconference)

Date 20 September 2013

Time 8.00am – 9.15am

Present Catherine Isaac (Chair)
John Shewan (Deputy Chair)
Dr Margaret Southwick
Terry Bates
Tahu Potiki
Dame Iritana Tawhiwhirangi

Apologies John Morris (tried to dial in from overseas but dial in number not able to connect)

1. Update

The Chair noted that the announcements of the successful applicants for the first round had been made. The response was generally positive, with the exception of comments from the PPTA. The School Trustees Association has offered support to the PSKH schools.

It was noted that the Government has not yet confirmed if and when a second round of applications will be held. However review and refinement of the application and evaluation process should proceed.

2. Terms of Reference

The draft revised ToR document was discussed. It was agreed that –

- the first page requires some re-ordering to insert background prior to the principles section;
- the principles section currently contains content that goes beyond principles;
- a clear statement needs to be included setting out the purpose of the AB (ie. to provide informed, independent advice to the Minister).

Action: CI and JS to prepare and circulate a further draft.

3. Application Process

The draft application process paper was discussed in detail.

Key conclusions –

- The concept of a two step process involving an expression of interest which would be used by the AB to determine a list of sponsors to be invited to submit a full application has some initial appeal. However, based on the experience with round one the AB felt that the amount of information required to make an informed decision on which sponsors should be invited to make a full application would be quite extensive. In practical terms therefore the two stage process would place an added burden on sponsors, as well as on the Ministry and AB.

- A two stage process would also put significant pressure on the timetable. It would be necessary to complete the evaluation of the EOIs by mid December, which would require their completion and submission by mid November. As a second round is unlikely to be able to be announced by the Government before 1 November, the time available to sponsors to complete EOIs to a reasonable standard is inadequate.

- In the interests of fairness to applicants and ensuring high quality applications the Board considers that
 - a single stage application process should be used;
 - the application form should be streamlined based on experience from the first round;
 - the RFAs should be issued as soon as possible following any Government decision on round two.

A word version of the round one application form will be sent to Board members to enable them to provide feedback to the Chair on suggested changes.

The section in the draft application paper on increased transparency was discussed. The Board fully supports the PSKH selection process being totally transparent. In response to the discussion points in the draft paper –

- The Board agrees that applicants in future rounds be advised that information about their bid will be made public.

- The Board does not consider public consultation should become part of the application process. In round one applicants were required to provide details of community engagement and support. This worked well, and provided the detail needed in the evaluation of this aspect of applications.

Action: CI to arrange for a word version of the round one application form to be circulated. Board members to respond with recommended changes.

Action: CI and JS to provide feedback to MoE on the draft application paper, and on the application form.

4. Authorisation Board's monitoring role

CI advised that the AB's monitoring role needed to be finalised and a paper submitted to Cabinet by 30 November. A draft paper based on AB feedback to date is being prepared by the Ministry, and will be considered at the AB's 12 November meeting.

It was agreed that identifying and reporting on key indicators of success is central to the AB's monitoring role. The role extends beyond the five schools selected in round one, and should include observations on how the overall initiative is progressing.

The recommendations provided by TB concerning evaluative questions (and the data required to answer these questions) were noted. These include:

- how to demonstrate a school's impact on student learning;
- how reliable the measures are;
- how significant the impact is (and how it compares with contracted achievement targets);
- student engagement;
- the extent that learning outcomes positively affect students' life chances and are understood by the school community.

It was agreed that this information, and TB's associated email exchange with JS, may assist the Ministry and should be passed on to them. TB will contact John Morris on information required to enable the AB to fulfil its monitoring obligations with a view to collaborating in preparing notes on the critical data inputs required by the AB to fulfil its monitoring role.

CI suggested that consideration be given to the Delaware reporting format. CI also noted the importance of the reporting format being easily understood by the public.

Action: CI to forward to the Ministry TB's emails re data required as part of AB monitoring role.

Action: TB to contact JM re working together to provide specifics on the critical analytics required to evaluate the performance of PSKH schools.

5. Minutes of 30 August meeting with MoE and 11 September Board meeting

The minutes were held over to the next meeting pending updates to be inserted by JS.

Action: JS to update minutes.

The meeting concluded at 9.15am.

