



# Tapasā draft framework consultation feedback summary report

August 2017

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>The approach</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary of respondents</b>	<b>4</b>
Pasifika students (Years 7-13)	4
Pasifika parents and families	4
Student teachers and teachers (including principals, centre managers and senior teachers)	4
Tertiary institutions, providers, school trustees and others	4
Workshop participants and written submissions	4
<b>Summary of key themes</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Survey results and themes</b>	<b>5</b>
What Pasifika students had to say	5
What Pasifika parents had to say	5
What the teachers and student teachers had to say	5
What tertiary institutions, providers, school trustees and others had to say	6
<b>Combined feedback</b>	<b>6</b>
The timing of the consultation	6
Early childhood and learning support (special education)	6
Tapasā and other cultural terms and concepts	7
The content and framework	7
Target audience	8
Implementation support	8
Some comments on design, accuracy and technical aspects	8
<b>Next steps</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>10</b>
1. Advisory group and experts' panel	10
2. Survey demographic information	11
3. Workshops	13
4. Participating centres, schools and organisations	13

## Introduction

In 2014, the Ministry commissioned work to develop a Pasifika Competency Framework (PCF). This is a specific action in the Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017. The scope of the commissioned work covered three phases:

- a. Phase 1: Literature review
- b. Phase 2: Development of a PCF (now known as Tapasā)
- c. Phase 3: Pilot/implementation.

An advisory group was established during Phase 1 to provide governance oversight and advice to the selected provider. A Pasifika Experts Panel provided cultural and education expertise during Phase 2. Information from the literature review was synthesised and used to inform the development of a framework. A list of members for the Advisory Group and the Experts Panel is located in the appendices.

In 2016, further work was undertaken to align the draft framework with recent key pieces of work such as the *Te Whāriki* early childhood curriculum update and the *Standards for the Teaching Profession* which was led by the Education Council.

To ensure the robustness and relevance of Tapasā, a sector consultation was initiated during June and July. While the consultation was open to anyone, we were especially keen to hear from teachers, senior leaders, principals and managers as well as early learning services, schools and board members. We were also interested in feedback from Pasifika parents and Pasifika learners (Years 7 – 13), by asking them to describe some of the behaviours and characteristics of a good teacher. Initial teacher education training providers, teacher unions, education partner agencies, relevant government departments and professional bodies were also invited to provide feedback.

Tapasā is a Samoan term that can be loosely translated as a compass; Tapasā can also be referred to as a guide in a malaga or journey. The compass symbolism builds on the use of the Pasifika Success Compass in the Pasifika Education Plan.

## The approach

The consultation opened on 1 June 2017 and closed on 7 July 2017. It involved a series of three workshops in Auckland, and one workshop each in Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin. Feedback could also be given through online surveys and written submissions.

Notices including a media release announcing the consultation were posted on the Ministry of Education's website and related social media platforms. Email notices were also sent to the Ministry's print, radio and TV media outlets (Pasifika and non-Pasifika). Targeted email notices were sent to schools and principals as well as key partner agencies and groups.

The key objectives of the consultation were to determine whether:

- the framework adequately contextualised quality teaching for Pasifika learners in early learning and in schools;
- it was robust, relevant and practical for teacher use; and
- it had any gaps and how to address them.

Primary analysis of feedback involved use of the Survey Monkey data analysis functions and Excel especially for the quantitative data. A grounded thematic analysis approach was used to collate and analyse the qualitative sections of the feedback.

## Summary of respondents

### Pasifika students (Years 7-13)

In total we received 116 completed surveys in this category. The majority of respondents were:

- female (61%)
- in Years 7-9 (64%)
- Samoan - identified as full Samoan or part Samoan (43%).

### Pasifika parents and families

In total we received 71 completed surveys in this category. The majority of respondents were:

- female (76%)
- in the 31-45 year old age group (50%)
- Samoan - identified as full Samoan or part Samoan (56%).

### Student teachers and teachers (including principals, centre managers and senior teachers)

In total we received 105 completed surveys in this category. The majority of respondents were:

- female (70%)
- in the 31-45 year old age group (49%)
- Pasifika (62%), of whom 30% identified as either full Samoan or part Samoan
- teachers (51%)
- in secondary education (38%)
- teaching for over 10 years (65%).

### Tertiary institutions, providers, school trustees and others

In total we received 20 completed surveys in this category. The majority of respondents were:

- female (85%)
- in the 31-45 year old age group (40%)
- Pasifika (60%), of whom 45% identified as either full Samoan or part Samoan
- in education (30%).

### Workshop participants and written submissions

We did not collect demographic information from workshop participants however they were invited to record their organisation and role. There were a total of 128 workshop participants of which the majority represented schools and early childhood services.

We received 11 written submissions. The majority of the written submissions were group submissions from tertiary providers, organisations and community groups.

For more details about the demographic make-up of the respondents refer to the appendices section at the end of this report.

## Summary of key themes

Overall there was overwhelming support for Tapasā with all of the respondents agreeing that a cultural framework for teachers of Pasifika learners was much needed and well overdue. Many noted that while the draft framework required some further finessing it was a “big step forward in the right direction” and that the draft framework for the most part captured the key elements of what an effective tool of this kind should look like.

A number of respondents noted the unique, standard-setting and pioneering nature of Tapasā as the first of its kind (i.e. a Pasifika cultural competencies framework for teachers) and expressed a sense

of responsibility to “get it right” and excitement about the opportunity to be a part of and contribute to this work.

## Survey results and themes

### *What Pasifika students had to say*

Over 90% of Pasifika students we surveyed agreed that it was either quite important or really important that their teachers understood and acknowledged their identity, language and culture. Being able to pronounce their names properly and making the effort to learn more about their culture and incorporate it into teaching practice were some of the top suggested behaviours teachers could do to demonstrate this.

A similar proportion of Pasifika students agreed that it was either quite important or really important for teachers to involve their parents and talk to them about their progress at school. Not being afraid to ask their parents’ questions, showing interest in the culture and language, regular communication, and meetings with parents were some of the common themes and suggested actions that could help teachers engage better with parents.

Being caring and compassionate, using Pasifika greetings and words, correct pronunciation of names as well as a good sense of humour and willingness to learn were some of the characteristics of a good teacher, as described by the respondents.

### *What Pasifika parents had to say*

The majority of parents (over 90%) agreed that it was either quite important or really important for teachers to understand and acknowledge the identity, language and culture of their child. Pronouncing the names of their children correctly and making the effort to use Pasifika greetings and words was a common and strong theme from the Pasifika parents we surveyed.

Over 95% of the parents agreed that it was quite or really important for teachers to talk to them and their child about how well their children are doing at school. Ongoing and regular communication in relevant ways was described as important by the parents, as well as regular meetings. One of the top suggested actions described by parents was that teachers should engage more in activities that promote and encourage the languages, identities and cultures of their Pasifika students.

The Pasifika parents we surveyed described a good teacher as someone who is respectful, compassionate, a good communicator, shows genuine interest and effort, and challenges students.

### *What the teachers and student teachers had to say*

Over 80% of respondents in this category agreed or strongly agreed that the draft framework sufficiently described quality teaching within a Pasifika learner setting. Over 90% described their overall impression of the framework as good, very good or excellent.

The majority of respondents liked:

- the three turu or competencies which made it simple and easy to follow
- the format, structure and flow of the document (for example case studies under each turu)
- the case studies, guiding questions and suggested readings and resources.

When asked about what they would change about the framework, about 30% of respondents said they wouldn’t change anything. A small number of respondents felt that more case studies were needed as well as visual diagrams to simplify some of the concepts. Others also felt that there was too much text and it needed to be simplified further.

Strong professional learning and development training as well as sufficient online and visual resources linked with Tapasā was the overwhelming response when asked about the types of support needed to implement Tapasā.

### **What tertiary institutions, providers, school trustees and others had to say**

The majority of respondents in this category, nearly 90%, agreed or strongly agreed that the draft framework sufficiently described quality teaching within a Pasifika learner setting. A similar number of respondents described the framework as good, very good or excellent.

The three turu and table format of the framework were positively received by the majority of respondents. As with the teacher and student teacher survey results above, a small number of respondents felt that more case studies were needed. Visual diagrams and less text would help make the document more accessible and practical. One tertiary provider wrote in their submission that “identity, language and culture are not static” and that the Tapasā draft framework did not capture the “dynamism and evolving nature of Pasifika cultural paradigms and nuances” or the notions of “spaces in between” and “cross-cultural” identities.

Most, if not all, of the respondents agreed, like the teachers and student teachers, that strong professional learning and development training as well as sufficient online and visual resources including resources to help teacher training providers and school boards incorporate Tapasā in their scope of work was critical to the success of implementing Tapasā.

## **Combined feedback**

### **The timing of the consultation**

A number of respondents felt that not enough time was given for the consultation. The initial consultation period was four weeks; however, due to overwhelming feedback from the sector for more time, the consultation period was extended for another week. The original timing for the consultation was based on completing Tapasā at about the same time as the completion and launch of the Standards for the Teaching Profession on 1 July. However, it became clear from the feedback that four weeks was insufficient.

There was also concern about the short notice given for the consultation, which meant a number of teachers and principals were unable to plan and schedule time to provide feedback or attend workshops. Some of the principals and teacher at some of the workshops explained that, had sufficient notice been given, there would have been a much greater turnout and attendance at the workshops.

As well as extending the consultation period by another week, targeted email notices were sent to school principals, early learning centres as well as key sector groups to raise awareness about the consultation and increase participation. Stakeholders who could not attend workshops were encouraged to complete the online surveys or provide a written submission.

### **Early childhood and learning support (special education)**

One of the key recurring themes across the submissions and feedback received was the lack of, or limited content on, early learning and learning support. In other words, the draft framework seemed to be “compulsory schooling” centric. This was reflected in the limited number of case studies in these settings, as well as the use of different terminologies that were more applicable to the schooling sectors according to a number of respondents. Terms such as “classroom” for example and “school leaders or principals” were applicable to the schooling sector but not so for the early learning sector. It was also suggested by some to use the term ‘learner’ rather than ‘students’ so it is inclusive of the early learning sector. Broadening the focus on educational success to also include health and wellbeing was another example given to make Tapasā more ECE inclusive.

Some of the respondents from the early learning sector expressed concern with the implications and expectations of Tapasā and whether they would be required to meet those. This would be problematic for the early learning sector, as they are not funded and resourced for this type of work. Reframing the framework as guidelines rather than competencies may help with minimising some of the expectations and ‘compulsory’ nature of the framework. This view was also supported by feedback from some of the teacher unions who preferred the term ‘guidelines’ which was more empowering, rather than the word ‘competencies’ which seemed to be a ‘deprofessionalising term’.

## Tapasā and other cultural terms and concepts

Some of the respondents expressed concern with the use and definition of the term Tapasā. Some felt that the term “compass” does not adequately describe the concept of Tapasā, as the term compass is “too one-dimensional and finite in direction”. There was some suggestion to replace Tapasā with another term, or if not, a much clearer explanation and definition of what Tapasā means in the context of the framework is required.

Some respondents questioned the use of a Samoan term as the title for the framework and that it might be seen as excluding the other Pasifika ethnic groups. The use of the Cook Islands Māori term ‘turu’ to describe the competencies was also questioned by some. There was emphasis on ensuring that these cultural terms were described accurately. A glossary table that described the terms in the other Pasifika languages was also suggested as a way of being inclusive of the other groups.

Some of the information and concepts in the document were too vague according to some respondents. For example, the analogy of Tapasā as a navigational tool needed further explanation and needed to embrace the maritime symbolism fully and linking it with the teachers’ journey. A number of respondents agreed that a more comprehensive glossary and use of visual diagrams was needed to explain some of the cultural terms and concepts better.

## The content and framework

A high number of respondents liked the ‘Knowing yourself’ and ‘Assumptions’ sections although some felt that the language needed to be stronger and more action oriented. For example, use ‘expected’ or ‘should’ rather than ‘assumes’ or ‘could’ when talking about assumptions. Non-Pasifika respondents especially felt that these sections were useful in helping them position themselves with respect to their Pasifika learners.

Many of the respondents appreciated that there were only three competencies which made the framework easier to read and follow although a small number of respondents questioned whether having only three competencies was sufficient. The reflective and guiding questions were well received as well as the case studies, although some commented that there seemed to be an imbalance in the number of case studies per competency and that more examples of case studies were needed for Turu 2 and Turu 3 in particular.

Clearer links between the case studies and evidence of achievement is also needed according to some respondents with others suggesting annotating and linking the case studies with specific indicators would be helpful. Listing the case studies and guiding questions in separate page or implementation guide was also suggested. Attention to the wording in some of the indicators was also reported to ensure that it wasn’t repetitive and that it appropriately described the distinct changes and progression at the various stages of the teacher journey. Others questioned whether some of the indicators were appropriate and whether a balanced number of indicators within each turu and stage of the teacher journey is needed.

Respondents felt that the useful websites and resources section at the back of the document were beneficial although some felt that some of the references were dated and that these needed to be updated. The table with “Examples of Pasifika models and framework” was well received by a number of respondents particularly non-Pasifika respondents who found it helpful in broadening their understanding of Pasifika values and practice. Some Pasifika educators and academics were concerned with the relevance of these models and frameworks within Tapasā as these are not pedagogical frameworks. Examples of more appropriate Pasifika pedagogical frameworks were provided.

For the most part, respondents liked the progression format in the table that describes behaviours at the different stages of a teachers’ journey from being a student teacher, beginning and experienced teacher and principal. However, some respondents argued that this format did not allow scope for flexibility and acknowledgement that some may already have advanced cultural knowledge. For example a student teacher with advanced cultural knowledge might be placed at the advanced end or leader position of the spectrum.

We also received feedback on how Tapasā linked with Tātaiako and the new Standards for the Teaching Profession. Some respondents commented that they liked how Tapasā had a similar format to Tātaiako because it was a structure that they were familiar with and could therefore understand and

follow more easily. Some of the respondents asked about the role of the Education Council and other agencies such as the Education Review Office in implementing Tapasā.

A small number of respondents were concerned with the limited or lack of references to notions of spirituality and religion within the framework which are a critical part of Pasifika values and beliefs systems. However, others argued that as the Pasifika population becomes more diverse we need to look beyond traditional notions of spirituality and religion.

Other points of interest raised by respondents include notions of bilingualism, multiple ethnicities and identities, island versus NZ born perspectives, the need to future-proof Tapasā and conversely whether referencing documents such as the Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017 dated the framework. In addition, comments were made about being mindful of the differences and unique characteristics of early learning settings compared with compulsory schooling – for example education success in early learning settings will look different from educational success in schools for Pasifika learners.

### Target audience

More work is needed to clarify who the intended audience is for Tapasā according to a number of respondents. Some of the language used caused confusion. For example in some parts it refers to 'teachers' as the target audience yet terms like 'users' is used to described the audience. There needs to be greater clarity and consistency in the terms used that clearly indicates who the intended audience is for Tapasā.

### Implementation support

There was overwhelming support for the need for sufficient and relevant professional learning and development training as part of implementing Tapasā in order for it to be successful in making a positive difference for Pasifika learners and sustainable. As well as professional learning and development training, the range of support and resources needed to implement Tapasā according to the respondents included but are not limited to the following:

- a dedicated website and repository that allows new and current research evidence to be updated
- print, online and interactive resources (publications, videos, references etc)
- workshops, resource/toolkits and webinars
- Pasifika ethnic-specific resources (such as in different languages with different case studies and examples)
- implementation guidelines for teachers and principals
- guidelines for teacher training providers and school boards on how to incorporate Tapasā in their work
- mobile and online applications.

### Some comments on design, accuracy and technical aspects

Although we did not ask for feedback on the design of the framework (we used Word format for the consultation) there were a number of unprompted suggestions from some respondents. These include:

- importance of using Pasifika imagery and symbols
- using colour and visual imageries within the document (for example, a visual diagram of the three turu was suggested)
- use of symbols and arrows to show progression
- use of large font
- use of diagrams to show link between Tapasā, Tātaiako and the Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Notwithstanding feedback on grammar and editing requirements, we also received feedback on the technical style of the document such as the need for consistency and accuracy in referencing style, tables, bullets and other aspects throughout the document and framework.

## Next steps

All feedback will be used to inform the final Tapasā framework. The aim is to finalise and launch Tapasā at the end of August.

# Appendices

## 1. Advisory group and experts' panel

### Advisory Group

*Reno Paotonu*

General Manager - Regional Partnerships, Ministry for Pacific Peoples (formerly Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs)

*Chris Harwood*

Senior Manager, CTL Design, Ministry of Education

*Fatulatetele Tolo*

Chief Advisor, Pasifika Education, Ministry of Education

*Judie Alison*

Advisory Officer (Professional Issues), New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association

*Jenny Thomas*

Education Council (formerly New Zealand Teachers' Council)

*Christina Thornley*

Principal Advisor, Teacher Education, Education Council (formerly New Zealand Teachers' Council)

*Denise Torrey*

President, New Zealand Principals' Federation

*Jason Swann*

Principal, Otahuhu Primary School; Member of the New Zealand Principals' Federation; Member of the New Zealand Pasifika Principals' Association

### Experts Panel

*Tagaloatele Professor Margaret Fairbairn-Dunlop*

Foundation Professor Pacific Studies, Social Science & Public Policy, Auckland University of Technology

*Dr Timote M. Vaioleti*

Senior Lecturer, University of Waikato

*Jason Swann*

Principal, Otahuhu Primary School; Member of the New Zealand Principals' Federation; Member of the New Zealand Pasifika Principals' Association

Note that some of these individuals may no longer be in the same roles or with the same organisation.

## 2. Survey demographic information

Ethnicity data: refers to those who either identifies with only one ethnic group or identifies with that ethnic group and others. For example a person is counted as Samoan if they ticked “Samoan only” or ticked “Samoan” as well as one or more of the other ethnicities. A person who ticks both “Samoan” and “Tongan” will be counted in both of those groups and so forth. This results in percentages totalling over 100%.

### Pasifika students (Years 7-13)

N=116

Gender	
Female	61%
Male	38%
Other	1%
School year	
Year 7-9	62%
Year 10-13	35%
Ethnicity	
Samoan	43%
Cook Islands Māori	9%
Tongan	43%
Niuean	5%
Tokelauan	2%
Fijian	10%
Tuvaluan	0%
Other	28%

### Pasifika parents and families

N=71

Gender	
Female	76%
Male	24%
Other	0%
Age group (years)	
30 and under	6%
31-45	50%
46-55	36%
56 and over	9%
Ethnicity	
Samoan	56%
Cook Islands Māori	7%
Tongan	15%
Niuean	10%
Tokelauan	4%
Fijian	4%
Tuvaluan	1%
Other	28%

## Teachers and student teachers

N=105

Gender	
Female	70%
Male	29%
Other	1%
Age group (years)	
30 and under	8%
31-45	49%
46-55	26%
56 and over	18%
Ethnicity	
Non Pasifika	38%
<i>Those who identified as Pasifika:</i>	
Samoan	30%
Cook Islands Māori	7%
Tongan	7%
Niuean	7%
Tokelauan	3%
Fijian	3%
Tuvaluan	1%
Other	20%
Role type	
Student teacher	51%
Teacher	2%
Principal	11%
Centre manager / Head teacher	2%
Leadership role (DP, Dean etc)	20%
Other	12%
Work setting	
ECE	10%
Primary	26%
Intermediate	15%
Secondary	38%
Māori medium	1%
Tertiary	3%
Other	8%
Years teaching experience	
0-2	5%
3-5	13%
6-10	16%
Over 10	65%

## Tertiary institutions, providers, school trustees and others

N=20

Gender	
Female	85%
Male	10%
Other	5%
Age group (years)	
30 and under	0%
31-45	40%

46-55	30%
56 and over	25%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
Non Pasifika	20%
<i>Those who identified as Pasifika:</i>	
Samoan	45%
Cook Islands Māori	10%
Tongan	5%
Niuean	10%
Tokelauan	0%
Fijian	1%
Tuvaluan	0%
Other	10%
<b>Background</b>	
Tertiary	15%
Tertiary ITE	25%
Government	0%
Education	30%
Professional body, association, network	1%
Teacher union	0%
Private, business	0%
Not for profit, community	15%
Other	10%

### 3. Workshops

Location and date	Number of attendees
South Auckland, 21 June	30
Central Auckland, 22 June	8
West Auckland, 29 June	26
Wellington, 26 June	25
Christchurch, 27 June	20
Dunedin, 28 June	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>

### 4. Participating centres, schools and organisations

Note that this list only includes those where this information was offered – there may be others that we have missed. We have opted not to list the names of individuals for privacy reasons.

Aoga Amata Pre-School, Invercargill
Barnardos Kidstart Hornby Pasifika Early Learning Centre
Best Start
Birdwood School
Cannons Creek School
Carisbrook School
Central West Auckland Team RTLB
CORE Education
Early Childhood Council
EC Management Solutions
Ferguson Intermediate

Glendene School
Hamilton Girls' High School
He Whanau Manaaki
Hobsonville Point Secondary School
Kelston Girls College
Kew Pacific Island Early Childhood Centre
Kidsfirst Kindergartens
KMPSN Pacifica, Pinikilicious Suicide Prevention
Kowhai Intermediate
Linwood College
Mangere Bridge School Pasefika Parent's Group
Manukau Institute of Technology
Manurewa Central School
Manurewa High School
Marian College
Middleton Grange
Ministry of Education (Auckland, Canterbury and Otago regions)
Montessori Aotearoa NZ
MV Consulting Group
Naenae Intermediate
New Zealand Kindergartens Inc
New Zealand Qualifications Authority
New Zealand School Trustees Association
North East Valley Normal Pre School
OMEPA Auckland Chapter
Otahuhu Primary School
Our Lady Star of the Sea School
Pacific Island Community (Tauranga) Trust & Selwyn Ridge School
Porirua College
Post Primary Teachers' Association (Pasifika Komiti)
Pt England School
Punavai O le Atamai, Dunedin
Rangikura School
Raroa Normal Intermediate
Rowley Avenue School
Royal Road School
RTLBA Cluster 6
Saint Thomas of Canterbury College
Samoan Aoga Amata in Aotearoa Association (SAASIA)
Shirley Boys High School
Sir Keith Park School
South Otago High School
Southern Institute of Technology
St Claudine Thevenet School
St Cuthberts School
St Pius X Catholic School
Te Aro School
Te Huinga Raukura Cluster 12 - Manurewa
Te Rito Maioha Early Childhood New Zealand
Tertiary Education Commission
The Child Early Learning Consultancy
Toddlers Turf Childcare Centre
Toru Whetu Kindergarten
Ulimasao Bilingual Education Association (Auckland)
Unitec
University of Auckland (Kainga Pasifika)
University of Otago
University of Waikato
Vision Education
Waikowhai Intermediate
Waitakere College
Wellington Girls College
Whānau Manaaki Kindergartens
White Heron Learning Centre
WHLC
Wiri Central School