ABUSE IN CARE ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY STATE INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE HEARING

Under The Inquiries Act 2013

In the matter of The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in

State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions

Royal Commission: Judge Coral Shaw (Chair)

Dr Anaru Erueti

Ali'imuamua Sandra Alofivae

Paul Gibson Julia Steenson

Counsel: Mr Simon Mount QC, Ms Kerryn Beaton QC, Dr Allan Cooke,

Ms Katherine Anderson, Ms Anne Toohey, Ms Tania Sharkey, Mr Michael Thomas, Ms Ruth Thomas, Ms Kathy Basire, Mr Winston McCarthy, Ms Julia Spelman, Ms Alice McCarthy

and Ms Natalie Coates for the Royal Commission

Ms Rachael Schmidt-McCleave, Mr Max Clarke-Parker,

Ms Julia White for the Crown

Ms Victoria Heine QC for the Office of the Children's

Commissioner

Ms Sally McKechnie for Te Ropū Tautoko, the Catholic

Bishops and congregational leaders

Mr David Stone for the New Zealand State Abuse Survivors

Charitable Trust

Venue: Level 2

Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry

414 Khyber Pass Road

AUCKLAND

Date: 19 August 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

INDEX

EDUCATION REVIEW OFFICE	
Questioning by Ms Schmidt-McCleave	455
Questioning by Ms Sharkey	459
Questioning by Commissioners	514
TEACHING COUNCIL OF A OTEADOA NEW ZEALAND	
TEACHING COUNCIL OF AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND	
Questioning by Mr McMullan	522
Questioning by Ms Anderson	527
Ouestioning by Commissioners	558

4	MS SHARKEY: Tēnā koutou katoa, and malo e lelei, Madam Chair and Commissioners. My
5	name is Tania Sharkey and I'm one of the Counsel Assisting the Royal Commission. By
6	way of visual introduction, I am female of Tongan Palagi descent and today I am wearing
7	red glasses and a black jacket.
8	I will be leading the questioning for the first two sessions within the three breaks
9	today until the lunch break and I will be joined by my colleague later in the day, Katherine
10	Anderson, who will be leading the last two sessions.
11	We have representative witnesses here today from the Education Review Office,
12	and I will let Ms Schmidt McCleave introduce them, and we'll have evidence in chief to
13	begin with.
14	CHAIR: Thank you. Tēnā koe Ms Schmidt-McCleave.
15	QUESTIONING BY MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Tēnā koutou ano ngā Kaikōmihana, tēnā
16	koutou katoa. Ko Ms Schmidt McCleave tōku ingoa. For those who cannot see me, I am a
17	49 yearold Pākehā woman with brown hair and brown eyes. Today I'm wearing a black
18	blouse with red and blue flowers and a cream jacket. Tēnā koutou katoa.
19	Commissioners, this morning, as my friend Ms Sharkey has mentioned, we have the
20	Education Review Office representatives here, and I'll ask them to introduce themselves in
21	a moment, but just to explain who we have, the Chief Executive for ERO is Nicholas Pole
22	and he is on the right; next to Nicholas is Deputy Chief Executive Review and
23	Improvement Services, Jane Lee, and to Jane's right Deputy Chief Executive Evaluation
24	and Review Māori, Lynda Pura Watson. So tēnā koutou, nau mai haere mai.
25	Mr Pole has a written brief of evidence which Commissioners have received. He is
26	going to make some introductory comments and introduce himself and his team, so I will
27	hand over to Mr Pole.
28	MR POLE: E ngā mana, e ngā reo, e ngā rangatira ma, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou katoa
29	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: If you just turn your microphone on, Mr Pole.
30	CHAIR: And before you proceed any further I have to do the formalities of getting the
31	affirmation, we've just jumped ahead.
32	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Sorry, Madam Chair, I had forgotten again.
33	CHAIR: That's all right, it's easily done. And these are the only three witnesses, we don't have

anybody else lurking in the back?

1	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Nobody today, ma'am, no.
2	CHAIR: Thank you. If I just give one affirmation and I'll just ask the three of you to agree in
3	unison if you like.
4	EDUCATION REVIEW OFFICE
5	MR NICHOLAS POLE, MS JANE LEE AND MS LYNDA PURA-WATSON
6	(Affirmed)
7	CHAIR: Now you can embark, Mr Pole, on your opening.
8	MR POLE: Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Nicholas Pou tōku ingoa, Kaihautū mō Tari Arotake
9	Mātauranga ahau, ko Whanganui a Tara e noho ana ahau. I'm Nicholas Pole, Chief
10	Review Officer, Chief Reviewer sometimes we're called, of the Education Review Office.
11	It is a role I have been in since June 2017 covering a period of five years.
12	In beginning I wish to make some overarching comments to the Commission.
13	Having had a long career in education, I'm deeply distressed and saddened by what
14	witnesses who have presented to this Commission have told you about the abuse they have
15	suffered from those working in or connected in education. I want to acknowledge the
16	survivors for their bravery in coming forward and opening the door on atrocities which for
17	too long have kept hidden.
18	This harm has come from some who have exploited their positions and failed in
19	their duty and their moral and professional obligations to support and protect. Equally, we
20	have had periods in our history where there have been omissions in our systems and
21	practises which, from today's perspectives, cannot be condoned.
22	This Commission provides us with an opportunity to acknowledge the shadows of
23	our past, to provide redress for our failings, and to reflect on our current settings to ensure
24	that we learn and strengthen our systems of protection, so that such events do not happen
25	again.
26	The purpose of my appearance here today is to provide current information about
27	ERO, including our role and operations, and the changes we have made and are continuing
28	to make to improve the care and protection of children, and assure that every learner in
29	Aotearoa receives a quality education.
30	Where the Commission raises matters that I have not been directly involved in, I
31	will rely on information provided to me, including documents provided to the Royal
32	Commission. I have also explored some of these matters with people who worked many
33	years ago in different roles prior to the reforms in the system. There may still be gaps in

the information, especially in relation to historical practices, but I will endeavour to assist this Commission to the best of my knowledge and abilities.

Here appearing on behalf of ERO, as the CEO of part of the education stewardship role that I fulfil, I want to fully endorse the acknowledgments which were made to the Commission by Iona Holsted, the Secretary for Education at yesterday's hearings. Iona yesterday addressed the current organisation regulatory framework which operates in the delivery of education in Aotearoa and described to some extent ERO's role.

ERO was established as an independent government department as part of a major transformation of the system that occurred in 1989. Prior to this, the responsibility for school review or inspection, as it was called, rested with the former Department of Education. In its establishment, it is my assessment that ERO extended the inspectorate mandate, adopting a more rigorous and systematic approach to school review and assessment, and places substantially greater focus on the safety of children and keeping them from harm.

The Department of Education which operated through much of that time period covered by your Inquiry operated its processes of review with few guidelines. A primary function was assessing and grading the performance of teachers. This activity equally had little transparency by today's standards.

Since the introduction of Tomorrow's Schools, local governance and self management of schools in the State system, including faith based integrated schools, has aimed at strengthening community involvement in local school provision and decision making, reducing substantially the social distance between central bureaucracies and the operation of the school within their communities. This governance arrangement has increased the accountabilities of practitioners working in schools by observing them up to direct scrutiny from their communities.

ERO, over the last 32 years, has played a major part in driving local accountability and ensuring that boards of trustees focus on those things that matter most; the care and protection of children, and ensuring that every learner receives a quality education.

In saying this, self-management has also seen many struggle to fulfil these obligations to fully understand them. There have been differences in interpretation and a lack of understanding of the intent of some central guidelines and legislation.

Many continue to work in isolation with little opportunity for support and the adoption of change in the system can be slow. I believe the recent establishment of Te

Mahau within the Ministry, as Ms Holsted talked about yesterday, starts to address this at this time.

ERO today's prime emphasis is around ensuring quality education provision, understanding learners' achievement and progress, and the underlying contributions that work towards these outcomes. Our whakatauki, ko te tamaiti te Pūtake o te kaupapa places the child always at the heart of the matter in framing our work and our approach.

ERO's mandate is provided by the Education and Training Act 2020. This Act empowers me as Chief Review Officer to initiate reviews, report and publish findings on the provision of education, and the care of children and young people in Aotearoa. In practice, ERO fulfills this mandate through two core functions. Institutional reviews and a programme of system-wide inquiry, evaluation and research.

As Chief Review Officer, while accountable to the minister of the day, we remain independent from influence. I administer reviews on my own motion and despite section 52 of the Public Service Act, which defines the accountability on chief executives.

The minister of the day may also request that ERO look into particular matters in the system. Our mandate extends to education entities that are owned or operated by the Crown, funded by parliamentary appropriation, or regulated by or under statute. Our focus does not go beyond secondary schooling.

ERO is not mandated to deal with complaints, resolve disputes, or provide an advocacy function. We do not have powers to direct or enforce compliance or actions by individual entities. Where we identify concerns, our obligation is to report and to raise them with the appropriate entity. We equally do not have a function of policy or resourcing.

ERO's monitoring and oversight also differs between State and State integrated schools and registered private or independent schools where our scope is substantially more limited. ERO's reviews are conducted by approximately 135 review officers that I delegate in my capacity as the Chief Review Officer. They review and report on education delivered by early learning, kōhanga reo, puna reo, schools, kura and whare kura throughout New Zealand. This wide spectrum of education providers reflects the breadth of ERO's work across paradigms. This also extends to the review of hostels and boarding facilities which we took on from the start of 2002.

As a government department, ERO gives effect to the Crown's obligations under the Treaty. We strive to do this through partnerships, participation in decision making, and placing a focus on successful outcomes for Māori in the settings and communities that we

work in. There are currently 2,400 schools and 5,500 early learning services which are generally reviewed on a three-year cycle. Our focus is on quality of educational provision, and recent shifts in our approach aim to work along schools and early learning services in a drive for improvement.

Where we hold concerns, we place greater intensity and frequency in working with these entities. Reports of our findings are prepared for the Minister of Education and for the wider community of Aotearoa and in every case we will publish and make this publicly available.

While providing natural justice opportunities for entities to correct errors of fact, the findings and recommendations that we report are based on our integrity as an agency and the judgments and assessments of the evidence that we collect.

In respect of schools as Crown entities, we're obliged to keep the Minister of Education informed about their performance and the performance of the system.

In a programme of national inquiries, which may be pertinent to the Royal Commission in terms of your explorations, we have recently undertaken work into education provision for those in the care and youth justice settings, learners with disabilities, the safety of students in hostels and schools, into alternative education, teen parent units and bullying in schools.

Over recent years, the Education Review Office has also developed an extensive programme of research into Māori medium education provision and the delivery of Te Ao Māori. As an example, a recent work Te Ara Huranui provided an insight into Māori enjoying educational success as Māori, aspects of mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori and Te Ao Māori.

The establishment of ERO in partnership with other central education agencies, including the Ministry of Education, the Teaching Council, changes in legislation and regulatory settings, greater professionalisation amongst teachers, the strengthening of systems and practices in child safety and well-being have, over the decades, from our perspective, contributed to an increase in awareness and improvement in the protective settings for children and young people in education.

In performing our role, we provide one element in that protective layer aimed at ensuring that young people are safe and that their welfare is supported while in education. In saying this, I acknowledge that we have made mistakes, let down individuals and families. Where we have identified these failings, it has been our approach to learn and improve our practice and oversight. Nō reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou katoa.

1	CHAIR: Kia ora Mr Pole.
2	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Ngā mihi ki a koe Mr Pole. Just for Commissioners' benefit, you
3	do have Mr Pole's written brief which expands on the points he has summarised today and
4	in particular I imagine you will want to explore with him his recommendations that he has
5	made at the end of his written brief.
6	Just before I pass you over to my friend Ms Sharkey, Mr Pole, could I ask you to
7	visually describe yourself and also for your team to introduce themselves, thank you.
8	MR POLE: I've been very scared about this; am I an old, aging male or a middle-class male,
9	blonde greying hair, a beard, glasses, I'm wearing a blue jacket and a red and blue striped
10	shirt.
11	CHAIR: That's an excellent description, Mr Pole, do not be alarmed.
12	MS LEE: Kia ora tātou, I am described as a middle-aged woman of Māori descent of slight build
13	or medium build, I have short dark hair, I wear glasses, today I am wearing a yellow and
14	black jacket and a black dress.
15	CHAIR: And your name?
16	MS LEE: And my name is Jane Lee.
17	CHAIR: Thank you.
18	MS PURA-WATSON: Tēnā tātou katoa. Tēnā koe e te rangatira o te Commissioner. Ko Lynda
19	Pura Watson ahau, ko au te Kairuruku o te Tari Arotake Mātauranga. My name is Lynda
20	Pura-Watson, I'm a Deputy Chief Executive Evaluation Review Māori. It's always hard to
21	describe yourself, I should probably let someone else do that. However I am Māori, I have
22	lots of earrings in my ears I'm told, I have short grey hair. My grandchildren would say I'm
23	elderly and today I'm wearing black. I'd also like to suggest that my face exudes warmth
24	and generosity, so tēnā tātou.
25	CHAIR: Kia ora.
26	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Tenā koutou. I'll hand you over now to Ms Sharkey who will
27	have some questions as Counsel Assisting the Commission and no doubt Commissioners
28	will as well. Thank you.
29	CHAIR: The practice that we've had, and this will be for Ms Sharkey and yourselves, but she will
30	direct her questions perhaps to one of you, but if any of you wishes to answer, feel free,
31	won't you. All I ask is for our stenographer is that you identify yourself as you go and that
32	you keep what you say clear and not too fast please so that it will all be typed up. Kei a koe
33	Ms Sharkey.

1	QUESTIONING BY MS SHARKEY: Thank you. Yes, so very happy to be guided by you,
2	Mr Pole, if someone else is more appropriate to answer these questions. But I guess I do
3	want to start by thanking you for endorsing the acknowledgments that Ms Holsted spoke to
4	yesterday. And also there were some recommendations in NTP 449, the response, which
5	were actually quite helpful, and what I intend to do is to explore that as we move through
6	these sessions.
7	So yesterday was interesting and I just wanted to pause because we're in the
8	education system, some of that will flow in to today. I just want to start with Te Tiriti.
9	In NTP 449 in your response, what I'll call as your response, you talk about and
10	this is at paragraph 2.18 a strategy and ERO's commitment to honouring your obligations
11	to the articles in Te Tiriti. Have you got that?
12	MR POLE: Can we bring it up?
13	MS SHARKEY: Yes, sure.
14	CHAIR: Ms Sharkey if we could orient ourselves, when you say response, if you could explain
15	for the public what this is please?
16	MS SHARKEY: Yes, so a request for information went to ERO and I just remember something I
17	was asked to point out that where I refer to ERO I'm talking about the Education Review
18	Office. That's for,we have some survivors watching this morning who made that request
19	So an information request went to ERO and this is the response that was provided.
20	And what I'm asking Mr Pole to speak to in that paragraph, it's pointed out we're talking
21	about ERO's commitment to honouring the obligations in Te Tiriti, and it's a topic that I
22	would like to explore.
23	And so my question is, when you refer to obligations, you are confirming that you
24	do have obligations?
25	MR POLE: Absolutely.
26	MS SHARKEY: And I just want to draw out in respect of those obligations, is that an obligation
27	to protect Māori from harm in education settings, what do those obligations look like?
28	MR POLE: Those obligations, as I see them, are to give effect to the obligations of the Crown in
29	terms of the Treaty.
30	MS SHARKEY: We've heard a bit about that, but in your words, in your brief you say
31	obligations, but are you saying could you just expand on the difference you're talking
32	about there?

1	MR POLE: It does extend to ensuring care, it ensures equity of outcomes, and in terms of the
2	work that we do, that Māori learn and succeed as Māori, that the Crown, through our
3	schooling system, affirms culture, identity and supports language.
4	MS SHARKEY: Right, carry on.
5	MR POLE: Maybe I'll go into how that manifests itself, does that help?
6	MS SHARKEY: Yes.
7	MR POLE: I think in subsequent parts of our brief we have outlined that or, sorry, our response
8	to produce, notice to produce, has covered that.
9	So first and foremost, Māori outcomes and support for Māori learners is the number
10	one area that we focus on when we are going into schools, or early learning services. What
11	does the school know about those outcomes, how well are Māori learners succeeding, and
12	how well are schools succeeding in terms of meeting their own Treaty obligations.
13	Since the changes to the Education Training Act in 2020 placed specific obligation
14	on boards, there's been that a board supports Māori learners in terms of Te Ao Māori,
15	mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori and Tikanga Māori; that these are in fact occurring in a
16	school setting, and where they are not, ERO will draw that to the school's attention and will
17	start working with the school to support them in that journey.
18	MS SHARKEY: Right. Because at paragraph 4.2 and you referenced it before, the whakatauk
19	that has been adopted by ERO, and you refer to the child being at the heart of the matter.
20	MR POLE: Absolutely.
21	MS SHARKEY: Okay. So in that Te Ao Māori, children are seen as taonga?
22	MR POLE: Absolutely.
23	MS SHARKEY: Your colleagues are nodding their heads.
24	MR POLE: Yes.
25	MS SHARKEY: And inherent to that is that their well-being and safety is protected.
26	MR POLE: Absolutely.
27	MS SHARKEY: And at paragraph 2.18, again this is the NTP response, we talk about the
28	principle of protection and you would have been familiar with some of the evidence that
29	was discussed yesterday?
30	MR POLE: Yes, I am.
31	MS SHARKEY: There was discussion about MOE's commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and a
32	commitment to actively protecting Maori students from harm. And I just want to ask
33	whether ERO consider the act of protection of Māori students from harm an obligation that
34	you do have?

1	MR POLE: Yes, we would say we do have that.
2	MS SHARKEY: And there was a discussion before about State integrated and private schools.
3	Does ERO's commitment in terms of how you carry out its role in respect of tamariki
4	Māori, does that change when we're looking at different school settings?
5	MR POLE: So over time our obligations in terms of independent or private schools has changed.
6	So when ERO was first established through 2010, our obligation in respect of private
7	schools was in order to confirm their licensing or registration status, whether they were
8	deemed as efficient.
9	MS SHARKEY: Yes.
10	MR POLE: And that was the limit of ERO's mandate in working in those schools. Subsequently
11	in 2019, the Education Act was amended to include an additional element which was
12	around ERO having a role in confirming licensing arrangements that ensured a school was
13	physically and emotionally safe.
14	MS SHARKEY: 2019?
15	MR POLE: 2019.
16	MS SHARKEY: So it's only very recent.
17	MR POLE: It is a recent change, yes.
18	MS SHARKEY: So in the past that hasn't been done well.
19	MR POLE: In respect of independent and private schools, that is the case.
20	MS SHARKEY: So when Māori children have experienced abuse in educational settings, in
21	schools, to what extent does ERO accept responsibility in terms of its commitment to
22	actively protecting Māori children from harm?
23	MR POLE: In terms of our role and function, it is my expectation that we will, if we have done
24	our job properly, to have highlighted and reported on that, to have raised it in those contexts
25	and to support interventions where that has been the case, where we have identified it.
26	MS SHARKEY: Okay, Mr Pole, I've just been given a signal, one of the Commissioners has a
27	question.
28	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Thank you Ms Sharkey. I just had a quick question
29	around so it's only been in place since 2019; how many schools have you then reviewed
30	with this new mandate, this additional safety mandate?
31	MR POLE: I'll ask my colleague Jane Lee.
32	MS LEE: It's my understanding since 2019 that we've carried out over 17 reviews in private
33	schools, and asked about the health and safety of students in relation to that criteria.

COMMISSIONER STEENSON: And that's out of a number of, a total number of?

1	MS LEE: I don't have that information for you, I can't recall off the top of my head. I can get that
2	information for you.
3	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: That would be helpful, thank you.
4	MR POLE: I would just say, private schools in the New Zealand setting are very, very small in
5	number.
6	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Yeah, thank you.
7	MS SHARKEY: Mr Pole, you might have heard yesterday there was a discussion about systemic
8	racism. And I just wanted to know what your thoughts were on that discussion about
9	racism within the education system. Could I have your views on that please?
10	MR POLE: So I think the Secretary traversed this in terms of is racism endemic throughout the
11	system, and we can't say that. What we can say is that some of the practices and some of
12	the policy settings that have existed in the past did result in discrimination against certain
13	groups of kids, and some of the schools that you are dealing with here, it's alarming that we
14	would take young Māori kids from the far north from their whānau and put them in places
15	such as [GRO-B] in North Otago with no capacity for communication, engagement or
16	a capacity to maintain connections with their culture and their language.
17	MS SHARKEY: Okay. I just want to unpack this a little bit.
18	MR POLE: Yeah.
19	MS SHARKEY: Right, because we've heard an acknowledgment earlier on this week,
20	institutional racism and legislation policy and systems, that was Whaikaha just to clarify,
21	contributed to the abuse of Māori Pacific peoples in Health and Disability care settings and
22	I'm just asking whether in your view and the experience that you've had in the education
23	system, whether that acknowledgment extends to what's happened in ERO in the past and
24	present as part of the education system.
25	MR POLE: ERO as an organisation I think has been on a learning journey over the last 30 years.
26	MS SHARKEY: So is that a yes?
27	MR POLE: Well, in terms of dealing with issues of unconscious bias. We, early on as an
28	organisation, placed a focus on Māori learning outcomes and features in the system that
29	would support Māori outcomes. We've worked very hard as an organisation to work in the
30	Māori medium sector, and as our notice to produce shows, we have gone through a process
31	of developing partnerships in a co-constructed for Māori by Māori approach to the way we
32	work in the system. We are guided by Māori communities, our Māori leadership in the

work we do. So that for me is answering part of your question.

1	But the second part is yes, in the past denial of te reo Māori in our schools and
2	people being caned for the use of te reo when at school, the failure to provide te reo in
3	school, or even as recently as the mid 80s where you saw things like School Certificate
4	where the scaling of that exam meant that only 35% of Māori kids going through School
5	Certificate could pass, or would pass based on the approach the Department of Education
6	had at the time, are all manifestations of a system that was blind to their Treaty obligations
7	and resulted in racist outcomes.
8	MS SHARKEY: Right, a system that was racist?
9	MR POLE: I said resulted in outcomes can be perceived as racist.
10	MS SHARKEY: A number of survivors in both the Māori and Pacific peoples hearings spoke of
11	their treatment in educational settings, and I just want to bring in one of the challenges you
12	outline in your NTP response at 11.10(a). You talk about substantial inequities, and if
13	I could just read into evidence:
14	"First and foremost our system continues to underserve many groups of learners and
15	substantial inequities persist. This includes large inequities in outcomes and poorer
16	experiences in our school settings by Māori and Pacific learners and those with
17	disabilities."
18	So Mr Pole, just on that issue, and I'm looking at the scope period and
19	contemporary.
20	CHAIR: And for clarification for everybody, scope period is the scope of our terms of reference,
21	which is 1950 to 1999.
22	MS SHARKEY: How has the education system continued to underserve children for so long?
23	MR POLE: I think the education system has found adaptation, its strategies, its philosophical
24	underpinnings to the delivery of pedagogy or teacher training practice has been slow to
25	adapt. As a system we are changing. The intent and will of schools is to provide the best
26	education they can and schools are shifting. But as I said in my introductory statement, it is
27	slow.
28	MS SHARKEY: Right. But, and survivors listening to this and how the education system has
29	been perceived by them as abusive; is this where we come back to these inequities, is this
30	whole discussion about discrimination part of that, part of how these inequities have
31	resulted?
32	MR POLE: I think there are deeper underlying issues at play here.
33	MS SHARKEY: Such as?

MR POLE: Well, in some of the work and in terms of the paragraph that you highlight, a strong 1 phenomenon or factor involved for learners in these schools has been one of poverty. They 2 are broader issues than just the education system. Over the last three years, as that 3 paragraph highlights, Covid has confounded some of the impacts on learners in these 4 schools, and this has been disproportionately, as we say there, in Māori and Pacific Island 5 located communities. 6 MS SHARKEY: Okay. Just on this paragraph, so how can Māori, Pacific and those with 7 disabilities, you say there, with poorer experiences in our school settings, how does this 8 happen when we have agencies who are responsible for those experiences, how is this able 9 to continue? You brought up poverty before, but what needs to happen in your view? 10 MR POLE: So there are multi-layers to this and so I think Ms Holsted outlined some yesterday, 11 so how we ensure a priority in our teaching practice, so I think she talked about Tapasā and 12 a whole range of work we're doing to raise capability of teaching staff with respect to 13 delivering appropriate, culturally relevant education for Māori and Pacific learners. 14 It is around resources provided to these schools, and again yesterday the highlight of 15 the new equity funding targeting these schools in these communities. It's working to ensure 16 that our system respond to the needs of individual learners much more closely. So when 17 ERO is working in a school and we're talking about how are things going for Māori and 18 Pacific learners, we're going down to what are the numbers of kids who are at risk of not 19 succeeding, what are their names, what are their needs, what are you doing about that. And 20 21 so in our role we are trying to place a spotlight on ensuring that every single learner gets the best chance they can in terms of the professionals that are working with them. 22 MS SHARKEY: Right. And we just talked about the learners, Maori and Pacific learners, but 23 also those in disability settings as well. You follow from that alienation from education, 24 25 that's another challenge that you identified and that was mentioned yesterday as well. Did you watch, or were you briefed on the witnesses that we heard in those three hearings, 26 Māori, Pacific and disability mental health hearings? 27 **MR POLE:** I did not watch them, I've had some of that feedback provided to me. 28 29 MS SHARKEY: Just in looking at alienation from education, because that was something we kept hearing. We heard from survivors about how the abuse, racism, cultural neglect they 30 experienced in educational settings, negatively impacted their experience of school and 31 about how their experiences in education settings led to behaviour such as truancy, petty 32 crimes, gang involvement, and that then led them into pathways into the care system. And

we had experts which we had put in the bundle who spoke in their expert opinion about 1 what the negative experience of education can do before entry into care. 2 So my question is, what does ERO see as its role in ensuring that these experiences 3 of abuse, cultural needs, barriers, don't continue and are recognised and adequately 4 addressed as part of your oversight and monitoring role? 5 MR POLE: I think there's two elements to your question there. So the first is we as an 6 organisation, through our national studies in evaluations around the system's performance, 7 have placed a spotlight on these issues. Our work recently around learning in residential 8 care highlighted continuing issues in terms of transience for a number of those people in the 9 care of Oranga Tamariki and the need for education to stay connected with them. 10 Our follow-up to that was to develop a set of recommendations for policy work and 11 change to occur that will see that that is removed or reduced substantially. 12 So in terms of the work we're doing, we're placing a spotlight on those issues, we're 13 looking at what good practice is and where it works successfully, and we're trying to effect 14 change in partnership with other agencies and making recommendations to the ministers of 15 the day. 16 MS SHARKEY: Okay, so we'll explore that I think now then, because the statutory and 17 regulatory framework is of particular interest. So the statute, Education and Training Act 18 2020, and correct me if I'm wrong, but there are have been no fundamental changes to 19 ERO's statutory role since it was created? 20 MR POLE: No, that's incorrect. So I think I referred to 2002 changes in terms of boarding and 21 hostels. 22 MS SHARKEY: Yeah. 23 MR POLE: I think the 2020 Act also saw some changes to allowing ERO to go into family 24 25 homes when they were providing early childhood services out in a home. And last week parliament agreed to extend ERO's mandate to the review of professional learning and 26 development provided to teachers and those working in schools in early learning services. 27 MS SHARKEY: Okay. So in terms of the statutory framework we're looking at 11 sections of 28 29 the Education and Training Act. And you mentioned before, just before I come back to the statutory framework, in your introductory session at the beginning, your accountability. 30 And so as CE, you're accountable to Public Service Commission, is that right? 31 **MR POLE:** I'm employed by the Public Service Commissioner. 32 MS SHARKEY: Do you have a direct line to the minister? 33 MR POLE: Yes I do, so I equally report to the minister of the day in terms of education.

- 1 MS SHARKEY: Okay, so are there two lines of reporting then?
- 2 MR POLE: There's the employment obligations which report to Public Service Commissioner
- and then in the partaking of our duties, so called ownership issues, they rest with, first and
- 4 foremost, the Minister For Education and then with Parliament through the select
- 5 committee process.
- 6 MS SHARKEY: And so that direct line to the minister, how often does that happen? On an as
- 7 needs basis or are there regular kind of meetings, or what does that relationship look like?
- 8 MR POLE: We would meet with ministers on a weekly basis.
- 9 MS SHARKEY: Okay.
- MR POLE: Across the organisation, if not multiple ministers on multiple days.
- 11 MS SHARKEY: Okay.
- MR POLE: We will also, if there is a specific issue that we believe attention needs to be drawn
- to, we will provide a briefing to the minister, or in fact request meetings associated with
- multiple ministers. So the example that I gave earlier of the work we did in residential
- care, that involved bringing together the Minister For Children and the Minister For
- Education to work through the recommendations that we were making to them about things
- that needed to change.
- MS SHARKEY: Right, it's good to get an idea of how that relationship is, what it looks like.
- 19 **CHAIR:** Ms Sharkey, are you going to ask any questions about that residential care review?
- 20 MS SHARKEY: Yes, a bit later on.
- 21 **CHAIR:** I'll leave it until that.
- 22 MS SHARKEY: So just coming back to the statutory framework. So Mr Pole, is there a specific
- statutory purpose to ERO or to the Chief Review Officer, other than the broad section 4?
- 24 MR POLE: No.
- 25 MS SHARKEY: And so section 4 is where we're looking and that supports health, safety and
- well-being?
- 27 MR POLE: Yes.
- MS SHARKEY: So really that's where you come back to in terms of the legislation?
- 29 MR POLE: Yes.
- 30 **MS SHARKEY:** In your view, is that sufficient?
- MR POLE: It hasn't limited how I have been able to act and fulfil my duties over the past five
- 32 years.
- 33 MS SHARKEY: But is it sufficient?

1	MR POLE: Where we have sought additions to the Act, such as the one I raised in terms of home
2	care, the government of the day has chosen to make those changes. There have been other
3	areas where we have said that our powers might be considered to be extended and the
4	government of the day at those times have chosen not to.
5	MS SHARKEY: In order to make changes it all takes time though, right, you'll ask for changes
6	and that all takes time to push through?
7	MR POLE: It's also about clarity of the respective roles that sit between the Education Review
8	Office, the Ministry of Education, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, and others.
9	MS SHARKEY: Yes, which we will come to. So at paragraph 4.2 of your brief of evidence you
10	describe ERO's prime emphasis, is revolving around ensuring the quality of education
11	provision, understanding learners' achievement and progress, and the underlying conditions
12	that contribute towards these outcomes. And I just wanted to clarify your agreement that
13	child safety and wellbeing in schools would be an underlying condition.
14	MR POLE: Yeah, absolutely. It's number one in terms of when we are working with schools.
15	MS SHARKEY: Right. Now coming to the role of ERO, and I saw your briefing to the incoming
16	minister 2020. And on page 5 we don't need to bring it up you'll be well familiar with
17	it, you say to the minister, "we are your eyes and ears on the ground". And that for me
18	evokes quite powerful imaging, "we are your eyes and ears on the ground." And is that
19	because you're at the frontline, understanding what's happening in schools, how safe
20	students are; is that what you mean by that?
21	MR POLE: We are in schools every single day. We are in early learning services every day. We
22	are in those communities and in terms of the changes that we presently are pushing forward
23	on, that relationship is only going to be strengthened.
24	MS SHARKEY: Right. And would you agree that the public and communities are also likely to
25	see you as the eyes and ears on the ground for them?
26	MR POLE: Yes.
27	MS SHARKEY: And as you said in your brief, Tomorrow's Schools has increased accountability
28	by opening schools up to greater scrutiny from communities, so that makes sense when you
29	say "we're eyes and ears on the ground". So eyes and ears on the ground for the minister,
30	for parents, and that also extends to our children?
31	MR POLE: Yes, absolutely.
32	MS SHARKEY: And your understanding of the importance of these ERO reports, the great
33	reliance that many parents place on them.

MR POLE: Yes.

1	MS SHARKEY: And how in reading those reports they make decisions about what school their
2	children go to; you'd agree with that?
3	MR POLE: For some parents it is part of their decision process.
4	MS SHARKEY: And for some schools they use it as marketing material. "We've got a fantastic
5	ERO report, this is how well we're doing, bring your children to our school." Agree?
6	MR POLE: Yes, that has been the case in the past.
7	MS SHARKEY: Yes, it has been the case in the past, yes, okay. But those reports, as you say in
8	your evidence, reviewing and reporting, you're reliant on the veracity of self-reporting of
9	schools?
10	MR POLE: Not entirely.
11	MS SHARKEY: But you are reliant?
12	MR POLE: So our process requires at the front of that process an attestation or self-report by
13	schools to their compliance with their statutory obligations and regulatory obligations as
14	schools?
15	MS SHARKEY: Right.
16	MR POLE: In our process, we will probe and go into those, and in particular those areas
17	associated with health, safety and welfare and well-being. Yesterday, for instance, the
18	question was raised about seclusion. That is an area since 2016 that we explicitly look at
19	and question and probe. That probing goes not only to is there a seclusion room, but what
20	are the practices around behaviour management that this school is adopting in the
21	capabilities of teachers in managing difficult or challenging behaviour at a time.
22	So while there is an attestation process, we go deeper. We will probe. That probe
23	includes talking with the board about what they know and what assurances they are getting
24	from the principal and the leadership in the school about compliance with their policies; it
25	includes talking with the senior leadership team; talking with students, and with parents and
26	with other teachers in the school.
27	MS SHARKEY: Okay. Can a school say to you that they're not yet ready for a review?
28	MR POLE: It would depend on the circumstances.
29	MS SHARKEY: But they can say that they're not ready for a review?
30	MR POLE: Well, so if the school had had, this week, all of the senior leadership go out with
31	Covid, then we would say it's probably not appropriate for us to be in that community. If
32	the school was dealing with a tragic suicide of a respected member of that community, then
33	equally.

MS SHARKEY: But you will rely on what the school tells you is the issue of the day?

1	MR POLE: We will work it through with the school. In saying that, we are shifting the approach
2	we operate with schools to maintain in an ongoing relationship, so we're touching in with
3	the school very frequently all of the time about what's going and how they are progressing
4	in terms of actions that we've worked through with the school that need to be undertaken.
5	MS SHARKEY: Right.
6	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Can I just ask a question there, just a point of clarification,
7	Mr Pole. So we can assume that there's a consistency, so it's the same reviewer that goes
8	in, or same team of reviewers?
9	MR POLE: So the shift at present that we're going through is there will be the same reviewer
10	over time for the time with which they are working and its appropriate. They will on
11	occasion be supported by other reviewers coming in and supporting them. For instance, if
12	they do not have depth of te reo and pedagogical understanding about the teaching of te reo,
13	then we will have one of our experts in the delivery of te reo, or Samoan, accompany that
14	reviewer for that part of the exploration with the school.
15	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you.
16	MS SHARKEY: But coming back to the statutory powers, no other powers than to collect
17	information and prepare those reports?
18	MR POLE: That is correct. Oh, prepare, and publish.
19	MS SHARKEY: Yes, prepare and publish the reports. And there is a devolved and autonomous
20	nature of schools?
21	MR POLE: That is correct.
22	MS SHARKEY: And that can make it quite difficult, that can present some challenges?
23	MR POLE: Yes, it can.
24	MS SHARKEY: And there's a high reliance on the board of trustees to support, when I say
25	leaders, let's say principals?
26	MR POLE: Constitutionally boards of trustees are the governors of the school and have the
27	accountability in that governance.
28	MS SHARKEY: As you say, not all boards are able to support the leaders.
29	MR POLE: Some boards struggle.
30	MS SHARKEY: And what do you mean by that?
31	MR POLE: So
32	MS SHARKEY: Is it capability issues?
33	MR POLE: It can be capability issues, they focus on the wrong things, they find it challenging to

probe or hold account the senior leadership in the school. Maybe some of my colleagues

1	who have been involved recently with the school reviews might comment on some of those
2	challenges.
3	MS LEE: Jane speaking. Some of those challenges that a board might face is, in picking up on
4	Nick's comments, it could be around capability and understanding their role and
5	responsibilities as a board, it could be also relationships with their senior leaders of the
6	school, other challenges that a board may face is the community relationships and
7	expectations of the community.
8	MS SHARKEY: Right. Board of trustees who wield quite a bit of power, don't they?
9	MS LEE: Yes, they are responsible for the education and delivery of quality education in the
10	school.
11	MS SHARKEY: Right. And just on a -digress for a brief second while I'm on this issue; we had
12	talked about before alienation from education and I'm just talking about -exclusions it- was
13	expelled in my day, but it's -exclusions I think now. Board of trustees are responsible for
14	making those big decisions or
15	MR POLE: Yes, it rests with the board.
16	MS SHARKEY: Right. So in terms of exclusions, do you have a view on whether such a huge,
17	massive decision should remain with that board? Should it be an independent body looking
18	at that, someone who's not really tied to the school? Just a question, because that's a big
19	issue for Māori and Pacific children.
20	MR POLE: So my own view is there should be greater protections and greater advocacy and
21	support for whanau going through the process of having their child stood down or
22	excluded.
23	MS SHARKEY: Because the impacts are long-lasting, once you lose a child in education it's very
24	near impossible to get them back.
25	MR POLE: The obligation should be that if for certain reasons this child is excluded, that there
26	are alternative arrangements with alternative schools where this child can be placed.
27	MS SHARKEY: Right.
28	MR POLE: Now, our work that we released a year back looking at Te Kura said there were too
29	many of these kids being alienated from their school setting and being placed on the roll of
30	The Correspondence School.
31	MS SHARKEY: Yes.
32	MR POLE: That is an issue and that is something we have asked the policy agencies, primarily
33	the Ministry, to work on.

MS SHARKEY: Because we do have a number of survivors who, for one reason or another, got kicked out of school, left school.

MR POLE: Just before you move to your next question, can I come back and say that equally we have seen across the motu parents and grandparents contributing to their boards of trustees with a diligence, a commitment that is unbelievable in terms of time and an absolute rigour in terms of the work that they are doing. And I'll deviate here if I can, if I'm allowed to.

I went into Christchurch in 2011, flew in the night after the earthquake. First part of what I did is in that environment I went around and visited every school, just to look at the level of damage. On going to one school in probably the poorest part of Christchurch, and prior to that I'd been to many others and they were wastelands, there was no one there, there were cars locked in the garage, I even went into one principal's office where his wallet was left on the desk. This poor part of east Christchurch, the entire board came out to visit me and talk about their community and already the restructuring of their community. They were parents who were struggling themselves. I went and looked at that school and the planting and the landscaping showed months, if not years, of work of busy bees and work to make that school the most beautiful thing it could be within their community for their tamariki.

So when we get it right, it works extremely well. And that happens across the country every month, every couple of months by volunteers who are running these schools.

- **MS SHARKEY:** Thank you for that Mr Pole. There are many that don't and I guess in terms of us wanting transformational change, it's about looking at those where there are struggles out there.
- COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Thank you, Ms Sharkey, Mr Pole, you sometimes referred to kura, I'm not sure whether you're referring to schools generally or to kura kaupapa; could you just clarify for us what you do --
- **MR POLE:** I'm talking about State and State-integrated schools which include kura and whare kura.
- **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Yeah, when you were talking about exclusions, as it's called now, you referred to kura, I wasn't sure whether you were talking to kura kaupapa. So it will vary according to the context.
- MR POLE: Yeah.

MS PURA-WATSON: Kia ora, Lynda speaking. Nick was referring at that point to Te Kura
which is the overarching -- the old Correspondence School, and in relation to the old
Correspondence School the children who have been let go from their schools and may be

1	needing additional support through an education programme, and now I'm sure that
2	prompts Nick to jump in and say his next point.
3	MR POLE: Thank you.
4	CHAIR: It would be easier, and I think it's an important question so we do know what you're
5	talking about; if we're talking about kura kaupapa talk about kura kaupapa, then we know
6	that that's the focus, otherwise "kura" has a more general meaning.
7	Did I take it from that that the word "kura" is also the word you use for The
8	Correspondence School?
9	MR POLE: So The Correspondence School has named itself Te Kura.
10	CHAIR: Te Kura, right.
11	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: I also have a question just in relation to Ms Sharkey's
12	questions around expulsion from schools and the board. So I guess my question is
13	understanding the cultural competency levels of these boards, 2,500 across the motu. In
14	your assessment, do you think that's satisfactory?
15	MR POLE: Firstly, boards represent and reflect their community, they are elected from their
16	community. We see some schools who do this well; that's not the majority. So at the
17	moment in terms of our assessment and our assessment with respect to responsiveness to
18	Te Tiriti, only about 10% of schools we are working with we would say are reflecting their
19	obligations to the fullest extent at present.
20	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Thank you.
21	MS LEE: Excuse me, would it be helpful if we explained what ERO did and how it looked at
22	suspensions and exclusions while on site in the school?
23	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Absolutely, thank you.
24	CHAIR: It may be something, let's just check to see whether it's going to be something that you're
25	going to explore. We're looking at the systems and processes here, more the systems than
26	the
27	MS SHARKEY: I'm happy for the witnesses to expand on that.
28	CHAIR: That's fine, I just didn't know if you were going to do this later, but if now is the
29	appropriate moment we'll do it.
30	MS SHARKEY: Now is a good time.
31	CHAIR: Okay. Yes.
32	MS LEE: So when we visit the school we do look at suspensions and stand-downs as part of the
33	board assurance statement and compliance. So the review officer would look at, not the
34	reason why the student was stood down, excluded, but would look at to see whether the

processes were followed. Those processes being that they had notified the parent and the 1 child of their rights in relation to the stand-down and suspension, and that the meeting for 2 the exclusion was held in a timely fashion and that the parent was informed that they could 3 bring support to that stand-down meeting. 4 You would also look from a perspective as to whether the school has a systematic 5 process for ensuring that they are following the expectations and the requirements around 6 stand down and suspensions. 7 We would also look for patterns of suspensions and if there was a disproportionate 8 number of exclusions, then we would look at that and ask questions around that, and if they 9 were not compliant in that, we would report that in our report. 10 COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Thank you very much for that. 11 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Excuse me, Ms Sharkey, I've got some questions on the Treaty but 12 I'm just wondering -- I don't want to interrupt the flow so I can ask them after the break, if 13 you like, I just don't want to stray too far from the kaupapa. 14 MS SHARKEY: I just had one other question in relation to that and then I'm mindful that we've 15 got a break in 15 minutes. I just wanted to tie off this topic. 16 Ms Lee, as you were talking there about what you do to find out more information 17 about stand-downs and exclusions, that's at the end though, right, that decision has been 18 made in respect of that child? 19 MS LEE: Correct. 20 21 MS SHARKEY: Right, so what I'm -- and I think we'd discussed before, is that something needs to be done before we get to that point, correct? 22 MS LEE: Correct, yes. 23 MS SHARKEY: And so just in terms of that power, staying within that board of trustees, there 24 25 could be merit in there being another body to look at that? Yes? MS LEE: Yes, there could be. 26 MS SHARKEY: Should there be? 27 MS LEE: There was a recommendation in Tomorrow's Schools about having an independent 28 29 body to deal with complaints. That might be the potential, could be extended to that, yes. MS SHARKEY: Thank you. Ms Pura-Watson had her hand up first. 30 MS PURA-WATSON: Aroha mai, I just thought it was an opportune time to talk about the Māori 31 medium paradigm and the differences, and while the law is the same and the expectations 32 are the same in relation to what's required, there are just a couple of things I'd like to bring 33 to the table, firstly about the way the board is formed, the voice of whānau, hapū and iwi,

and then secondly about exclusion, suspension; and the other E word which was about gone forever and -- yeah, sorry.

So firstly, the boards for kura kaupapa Māori, Ngā Kura Ā Iwi, Kura Motuhake generally always have nominated people responsible to participate on the board. The boards run quite differently in terms of they uphold the law around confidentiality, and yet they work in a far more collaborative way with their communities. It's quite different, so as a board if they need additional skills and expertise, they take the time to bring that in through the governing bodies, peak bodies, who provide expertise similar to the way NZ STA does in English medium settings.

However, the Te Rūnanganui o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori, Ngā Kura Ā Iwi generally come in and provide the support so that boards have the wherewithal to deliver on their expectations, it's a very strong, overarching support network. Beyond network, that was the word that came out of my mouth at that moment.

Then secondly in relation to expulsions and suspensions, they don't. They don't and it's checked and very carefully understood that a child is a taonga through that education space, paradigm, and they arrive at school and they are worked with to deliver the education that they get, require, while at the same time never given the opportunity to be released out until their education journey has moved through in that way. Quite different, and I'm not sure if that's where you were heading in terms of your question around what kind of options might boards have.

So in relation to kaupapa Māori, that's the way that works. And then just to come back to the English medium paradigm, they do have, as Iona mentioned yesterday, NZ STA who's able to provide the boards with ongoing support, and so between the two paradigms we have different things operating and the Māori paradigm needed to be mentioned as well.

MR POLE: And in terms of the Māori medium school Ms Pura-Watson was referring to, that is the kaupapa Māori.

CHAIR: Kaupapa Māori, yeah.

MS SHARKEY: I think that's a good segue into Commissioner Erueti's questions perhaps.

MR POLE: I just wanted to add two further perspectives around exclusions. The first is, and it may be a consideration for the Commission, that actually we have a system that doesn't have exclusions, that schools and communities need to work through how to support the needs of every learner.

In many schools that we have worked with where there are high numbers of exclusions or stand-downs and so on, we find generally the layers or the conditions in the

school are equally weak, and often it is a manifestation of the quality of teaching, the 1 quality of leadership, the quality of governance, practices and systems in the school, and a 2 lack of that collective teacher efficacy where teachers are working together around making 3 sure every single learner is successful. 4 In those schools, they're the schools that I'm talking about where we go in and we 5 spend a long time working alongside them, diving deep into how can we address these 6 things factor by factor. Most notably starting with school leadership and school leadership 7 probably more so than governance, although governance is an element in it. 8 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Tēnā koe Mr Pole. I'm just trying to determine where your 9 statutory directives under the Te Tiriti come from. Could you explain that? 10 MR POLE: So first and foremost from the Public Service Act and then now at the same time the 11 2020 Education and Training Act. 12 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Yes, but it seems, in looking at the Treaty clause, that there's a 13 statement that's issued by the minister in consultation with Māori, is that right, about what 14 your Treaty obligations are? Not sure? 15 MR POLE: No, sorry. I think the statement you're referring to is the NELPs or the National 16 17 Education Learning --**COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** It's section 9 small paragraph (c), that seems to be where it comes 18 from. But Ms Sharkey brought up your statement of your Treaty policy and it is interesting 19 that you refer to the three Ps, if you like, the Treaty principles, but I think the Tribunal and 20 21 others have noted that the thinking has moved from those three Ps more recently to greater emphasis on the Act of participation, so if someone was trying to find what your Treaty 22 obligations are, if they're not specified clearly in the Act for the office, are they somewhere 23 accessible to the public and to Māori? 24 25 **MR POLE:** Not beyond the statements that I think you're referring to. COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Okay. Are they on your website or... 26 MR POLE: Well, our website has an outline of ERO's strategy, Māori strategy and our 27 commitment to Te Tiriti. And I've got to say our practice and our processes go beyond 28 merely the three Ps. We are actively involved, as we are now shifting our methodologies to 29 ensuring decision-making and looking at decision-making by schools in partnership around 30 the decisions that schools take in ensuring a localised curriculum. 31 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** My point is it's important to know what those standards are, 32 because some are lower and higher than others, and also for them to be public so everyone 33 sees them. 34

1	But my other question is, just to clarify on your comment, I think you said that
2	racial discrimination was not endemic or systemic in the education system. Are you saying
3	to us that and you in your position as a leader, educational leader will know the history of
4	Māori Crown relations in this -sector - that- across time that there's no evidence of systemic
5	racism within the education system, historically across our knowledge of the history?
6	MR POLE: I think I've stated that there have been elements in our system that have openly and
7	actively discriminated against Māori.
8	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Yes, you said something like that, so different bills and policies
9	say, but not across history, no evidence of the systemic racism. You're not prepared to
10	recognise that? Okay, thank you, just wanted to clarify, kia ora.
11	CHAIR: We've got a couple of minutes, I wanted to ask just to go back to the issues that we just
12	talked about expulsion sorry, that's the old-fashioned word. Have you come to the end of
13	your questions on this topic at this stage or not?
14	MS SHARKEY: I was about to shift into how that ties into the next topic of well-being, but if
15	you want to finish that, I'm just mindful of the time.
16	CHAIR: I think what I might do, ask my question, check if there's nothing else arising and we'll
17	take the break and then you can move. It strikes me, Mr Pole, that you have said something
18	quite significant for the Commission to consider. And it flows out of Ms Pura-Watson's
19	very interesting description of the way boards of trustees for kura kaupapa act in a different
20	manner and with different results. And I really want to get this really clarified now,
21	because I think it affects not just this issue of expulsion, exclusion or suspension, but
22	maybe across the board.
23	And that is that the impacts on children, the outcomes for children are a
24	manifestation sorry, negative outcomes for children are a manifestation of the way in
25	which a school operates, and I use that in its widest sense, from the leadership of the
26	schools, the governance of the schools, the culture of the school and the like. Is that really
27	what you're saying?
28	MR POLE: That's exactly what I'm saying. And we have a lot of evidence and a lot of insight
29	from working with schools to that effect.
30	CHAIR: And would you agree that whilst that is obvious, and we've got a practical example here,
31	haven't we, in the kura kaupapa paradigm, which says we will not exclude, we will not
32	suspend, but we will make sure it works. Do you see that that philosophy, that method of
33	working could apply across the board to other things? And I mean I note your references to
34	the disability or the disabled children and the low levels of inclusive practices which are

demonstrated, so if good practice is demonstrated there are good outcomes for children, it sounds obvious, but I just think, I think we often skirt around this and I really want to hammer it home.

MR POLE: So there's a couple of observations that I have. The first is the relationship with a child and their family, and I think Iona Holsted in her evidence yesterday said increasingly we are saying that that is critical; understanding who that child is and what's going on in their lives and getting in there early and responding to their needs before they get out of hand.

We have other models around the country which have been explored, so for some time in Dunedin the secondary schools have agreed where a student may have, I'll use the term "outworn their welcome", that they are brought into another sister school or another school in that community, and that's equally been explored over on the Coast in Napier. But first and foremost, my desire is that we have the well-being, which we'll go to next, and the welfare and the identification approaches to manage and support these kids to be successful in the environments they're in.

CHAIR: And also support the schools to create the environment in which that can flourish.

MR POLE: That was my reference yesterday, or earlier in my opening about Te Mahau and the work that the Ministry is doing to regionalise. Those schools that we identify, and I can think of one that I've been very closely involved in, we have been in that school for four years now to try and rebuild all of those facets and the conditions that are operating in that school to ensure that those learners -- and those learners in that school are 50% Māori and 50% Pacific -- shift from a regime that expels or excludes substantial numbers of students. To date that is looking successful but it still has a long way to go to be resilient and sustainable.

CHAIR: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Just one comment, and it really just is a comment, an acknowledgment of the statements that you've all made, that because I know -- well, what we've heard out in community, of course, is that in some of your former, I think they were called partnership schools but around your Pacific partnerships schools which are now integrated, that where there's a predominant world view that is healthy and holistic, like in kaupapa Māori where that's the predominant world view, that it's much easier to be able to apply it because the paradigm shift is quite different.

MR POLE: Yes, I would agree and we've done work where we've profiled those schools, and in terms of some of what you're exploring around faith-based schools, there are some integrated schools who provide superbly for their Pacific learners.

COMMISSIONER STEENSON: I just have one question as well, just a follow-up question for Ms Pura-Watson. Just around that kura kaupapa methodology you spoke of, so what happens, say, for a student who -- I guess what I'm trying to think through, is say a student is found -- I'm making this up -- selling something, selling drugs, like meth or something, or has impacts on other students' safety. So obviously that is quite a significant social issue for the school to have to deal with to keep that student there and ensure the other students are kept safe at the same time. So I'm quite interested to understand the process there.

MS PURA-WATSON: I can talk about what I know given the philosophies that guide in this paradigm. So children are viewed as taonga, I mentioned that, and in their philosophies they're articulated in that way. They also talk about them as being tama-ariki, children from the God, so whichever day, in relation to your comment about maybe not being on form or doing something not the right -- not legal potentially, it's quite different in kaupapa Māori, because the child basically has a korowai wrapped around. So if it's an illegal drug like you've kind of mentioned, then the right people are brought in to support counselling, both for the child and the family. So it's a full and complete wrap-around.

We've seen it, I have personally seen examples where this has happened so that the child has had a difficulty, been nurtured, the parents have been supported to accommodate that need, and then basically the school's always there. And more and more, even if it's reversed, I'll go the other way, where the whānau needs support, they are wrapped around too and the children are nurtured within the larger whānau, hapū, iwi context.

Now it sounds like I'm speaking in the language of fabulosity. It is a truth and the evidence that we've gathered since 2000 demonstrates that actually there is an alternative way to deal with children. Having said that, in answer to your question, in English medium settings it's similar, it's articulated differently, but the components of care and welfare are very similar, where it works.

COMMISSIONER STEENSON: So how do the other families of other children feel about that in the meantime? Because I totally agree it's fantastic that that particular student gets that wrap-around with their whānau. But I'm just interested to understand in a non--Māori -- if you're going to spread it, how would that reaction be --

MS PURA-WATSON: I'm not sure about how you would spread it. What I do know, to your comment, is that if you are born in a space where it's normal to be supported on a day that

might be difficult, if it's normal as walking down the road or breathing, then that normality 1 2 enables it to just be a constant, so other children don't see it as preferential treatment, the child is being supported, is supported by other children as well. Because remember, it's the 3 kaupapa, it's whānau, hapū and iwi coming together in a philosophical underpinning that 4 supports education for these children. I'm not sure if I --5 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** You have, what I'm trying to reconcile is whether that would 6 work in a non -Māori space. 7 CHAIR: Can I just -- this is a very important line of questioning, but I'm really conscious of our 8 timing and our workers. Can we hold the answer to that question and maybe follow it up 9 when we come back in 15 minutes, give you a chance to think about it and give some 10 fingers a much needed rest. So we'll come back at 10 to 11. 11 Adjournment from 10.38 am to 10.53 am 12 CHAIR: Welcome back, everybody. Thank you, Ms Sharkey. 13 MS SHARKEY: Thank you, Madam Chair, I think we're going to receive the answer to that 14 15 question. CHAIR: Thank you. 16 MS PURA-WATSON: Could you just repeat the question, sorry. 17 COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Sure, I guess what I was trying to reconcile in my mind was 18 whether the kaupapa Māori approach, which is underpinned by Māoritanga and a Māori 19 way of living, whether that would easily translate across to non -Māori settings where 20 perhaps parents and families have a different basis and way of operating, with regards to 21 having a student removed or not for, say, something that they considered was unsafe for 22 their child, just that different lens and acknowledging that. 23 MR POLE: It's my belief that, yes, it can. I think a lot of schools are exploring restorative 24 25 practices as part of their behaviour and their school management programmes. Those schools are not excluding or standing down students. It comes with layers of how the 26 school firstly sets expectations around behaviour and how it responds to those. So I think 27 we can learn a lot from kaupapa Māori practice, and I think it can work well in English 28 29 medium settings. MS PURA-WATSON: If I may, I think also what we can see, while this is a kaupapa Māori way 30 of living and educating, there are also elements across the country where iwi have provided 31 additional kinds of support. So if I go to-- the first initiative I would potentially put on the 32 table is Kai Tahu are currently looking at the ending streaming. Ending streaming pushes 33 schools to no longer put us in categories or define how we breathe, rather it's an opportunity 34

to insist that schools learn to understand about the child and their learning needs. That's the first thing in terms of iwi are currently providing a range of options, and that's one that I can think off the top of my head.

Then secondly, in terms of education initiatives that have come out of the Ministry of Education and aligned with other core programmes, building capability in that English medium setting, I'm not sure if as a group you will remember Te Kotahitanga which was an initiative in schools many years ago. More recently has become the -- became the genesis to build on poutama pounamu which is a really strong professional to programme provided for schools and professionals to support them to understand what being culturally responsive in a setting and across communities would look like.

So to your point, could it be, could the kaupapa Māori approach influence, we believe as Nick's described, yes. Has it grown legs already? Another yes, because there are a number of things that the system is working to make the changes that give a similar outcome for learners.

COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Yeah, thank you for that. I have no doubt that there's lots that it can influence, so it was just around that particular point on exclusion. So I guess your answer is that yes, State and integrated and private schools could also benefit from that philosophy?

19 MR POLE: Yes, absolutely.

- **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** Thank you.
- **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Excuse me, Ms Pura-Watson, the Ngāi Tahu example, I didn't catch your first sentence.
- **MS PURA-WATSON:** Ending streaming.
- **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** It's streaming.
- **MS PURA-WATSON:** Tokona Te Reo is the --
- **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Sorry, sorry, I can't quite hear sorry.
- MS PURA-WATSON: No, that's probably because I speak softly. So Tokona Te Reo is the programme that's been operated by <u>Kai Tahu</u> and in partnership with the CEOs -- I think that's correct, isn't it, Nick -- and is looking at ending streaming throughout the system.
- **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay, yeah, ka pai, thank you.
- **CHAIR:** Ms Sharkey, we're eating into your time. So please.
- **MS SHARKEY:** Yes. No, that's fine, very important discussion. And something that brings me
- to this wellbeing issue, we had an expert psychologist in the Pacific People's hearing,
- Dr Julia Ioane, and she said that a rollout programme was needed in schools to promote a

trauma informed system. Specifically, she said, culturally appropriate training was 1 important in order to respond to trauma and violence as these are often the main barriers to 2 learning and are pathways to suspension and exclusion from school. 3 And I just wanted to ask, there's a bit to absorb there, right, but what are your views 4 in regards to that statement she makes? Her statement was in the bundle. 5 **MR POLE:** I absolutely agree with what she said. 6 MS SHARKEY: So I'm aware that ERO have a, is it a research development -- how do you see 7 ERO's role in promoting a more trauma-informed education system? 8 MR POLE: Let me just maybe give some examples of what's going on at present. So post the 9 earthquake, a wellbeing programme called Manaaki was developed in Christchurch for 10 primary students. It covers the entire Canterbury DHB region, it has focused on 11 trauma- informed practice, culturally responsive practice and being a partnership between 12 health professionals, welfare professionals and the schools. It has involved clustering 13 schools into groups of around ten and providing layers of response to the needs that are 14 presenting from kids who are showing-,-- were showing up at school with anxiety to also 15 dealing at the other end of the spectrum with children and young people with deep 16 challenging concerns and complexities in their family. 17 It involved all of the associated professional community agencies and the education 18 sector groupings like RTLBs and social workers in schools, all working in wrapping those 19 services around the child. That has been extended in this last budget to six further DHB 20 21 areas. ERO and I have looked at that programme, from my assessment and it has had two 22 other independent evaluations, it is a fantastic response to the points that you have just 23 raised by the witness you talked about. 24 25 CHAIR: Does your reference to the DHB districts indicate that there is an involvement with health as well? 26 **MR POLE:** Yes, it's a partnership between health and education. 27 **CHAIR:** Thank you. 28 29 MR POLE: It's locally determined and arranged, so it's not just a carbon copy and it's going to be rolled out, it's actually the leadership in both sectors getting together and co-constructing 30 how it's going to look for our location. 31 CHAIR: And a recognition that education and health are almost inextricably linked in many 32 ways, aren't they? 33 MR POLE: I would add in there "and welfare support services". 34

1	CHAIR: That's right, thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: And it won't be one of the things that's lost in the big
3	transformative systems that's going on right now.
4	MR POLE: I would hope not. So the money coming through government is guaranteed, while
5	I'm in my role, because that's one of the most outstanding programmes I've come across. It
6	also has another element to it for classroom teachers where they can look up I'm meeting
7	these challenges with a particular learner that's in my class or a particular circumstance and
8	you can go into resources to find how you might want to adapt your practice, or actually
9	call someone and seek advice on that.
10	So I would hope long-term it's nationally rolled out and the evidence in terms of its
11	impact in terms of dollar value return is very high.
12	CHAIR: Thank you.
13	MS SHARKEY: Because in tying that to your challenge at 11.10(d), well-being of children,
14	coming back to that particular expert who spoke about the impacts of abuse on children's
15	well-being and mental health, but you're seeing this as a growing concern?
16	MR POLE: Yes, it is.
17	MS SHARKEY: And children being diagnosed at younger
18	MR POLE: Earlier in their lives, yes.
19	MS SHARKEY: And that's in relation to could you expand on that just a bit?
20	MR POLE: So in relation well, in relation to dealing with complex behavioural issues.
21	MS SHARKEY: Right.
22	MR POLE: Trauma in their lives, neurodevelopmental challenges in reading or processing
23	cognitively.
24	MS SHARKEY: So in coming back to that trauma informed but also training that enables those
25	who are working with our children to know what they're doing and how to handle that?
26	MR POLE: Absolutely. And so recent work that we have done, some of our, well, core
27	recommendations have been about first and foremost nationally getting some consistent
28	guidance about approaches to dealing with trauma informed practice and ensuring trauma
29	informed practice and models of teaching practice, and ensuring that this is extended
30	throughout the teaching community, and in particular as we see more kids in local
31	communities.
32	MS SHARKEY: Okay, I might stick with that, the training and support topic.
33	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Sorry, Ms Sharkey, can I just?
34	MS SHARKEY: Sure.

1	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: What's the name of the programme? I missed that
2	MR POLE: Manaaki.
3	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Thank you.
4	MS SHARKEY: Just in terms of the review officers, so since 1989 what explicit review
5	procedures relating to the relevant sections of the Education and Training Act were in place
6	to guide review officers in investigating and reporting on schools? Would you be able to
7	answer that question?
8	MS LEE: We have a manual of standard procedures in relation to how review officers undertake
9	a review from pre review on site and post review. Does that answer your question?
10	MS SHARKEY: Can you describe the explicit review procedures?
11	MS LEE: So, for example, if- the preon-site review would be contacting the board to indicate
12	there will be a review, then we would meet with the board in relation to what that onsite
13	review would look like, and that the expectation would be that they would let their parents
14	know that we would be visiting the school between the dates specified. Then while on site
15	we would follow up and meet with leaders, teachers, speak with students and also-parents
16	who'd wished to meet with us. We would look at various procedures and policies, we would
17	undertake observations in classrooms, and we would also look at the physical safety of
18	students and emotional safety of students while on site.
19	MS PURA-WATSON: Could I add to that please, if I may? Earlier in ERO's establishment we
20	had a code of conduct and it basically required that we understood our role and it was
21	aligned very strongly to the Public Service code of conduct. It held us to account in terms
22	of how we commit and our role as public servants. It's really important to, I think I'm not
23	sure quite sure if you were going there, but I wanted to put that on the table.
24	Then secondly, we all come from the range of schools, kura, kōhanga, puna reo, our
25	workforce is built up of experts, people who have been a part of an education system either
26	as principals, teachers and so they understand the system, so they come with a code of
27	conduct, an understanding of education, and then they move into then being able to work
28	within the methodologies that have been developed by ERO and since the timeframe you've
29	identified, we have moved from audit through to accountability reviews, education reviews
30	and now into an improvement evaluation.
31	So depending on which particular time, ERO's continued to grow and our
32	expectations of review officers have grown as well to ensure that we are I'm not sure this

is appropriate and my colleagues will probably tell me off later, but fit for purpose,

particularly in terms of service to the communities that we work in.

33

1	Now, if I've taken your question the wrong way, my apologies.
2	MS SHARKEY: No, no, that's fine.
3	MS LEE: Can I also add to that, in relation to Lynda's comments is that we also have an extensive
4	professional learning and development programme in relation to key areas of interest in
5	education at that particular time.
6	MS SHARKEY: These are all new initiatives, they weren't there in 1989?
7	MR POLE: My understanding is by 1989 - ERO evolved as an organisation in its practice.
8	Originally- we started off in terms of thinking about, working through the issues that you've
9	previously raised around attestation and so on, had a handbook. Our practice has evolved,
10	has become more sophisticated, there is more guidance and I would say much more
11	thorough. I'm more than happy to share with you the guidance that we have. We have
12	MS SHARKEY: Just before we move to there, Mr Pole, I just want to bring you back to the
13	historic part of the scope period. Because during that period there was no specific
14	professional training for review officers to identify things such as bullying, sexual
15	harassment, abuse; would that be correct?
16	MR POLE: I don't have that information.
17	MS SHARKEY: And review officers wouldn't have had that ethnic specific cultural training to
18	help them understand cultural -approaches -during- that relevant period?
19	MS PURA-WATSON: During that period. Can I go to the staffing at that time and I can speak to
20	it and I want to acknowledge those who have passed, because in terms of whakapapa,
21	ERO's got a strong whakapapa for Māori and around Māori. So w-hen ERO was first
22	established during the 1989 period there were a number of-Māori who were employed who
23	influenced the way that ERO worked, strongly in relation to the way they worked,
24	acknowledging Tikanga Māori, and often following the protocols, marae protocols of entry
25	And that sounds very twee. However, these were leaders in education, and the name, I'm
26	not sure if we're allowed to name them, but there are a number of them who influenced
27	ERO's initial direction.
28	Whilst it might not have been a particular professional development programme, by
29	their presence and their number, and there were quite a number, they influenced the way
30	ERO traversed sometimes difficult situations in schools for Māori.
31	MS SHARKEY: Okay. For the other priority groups, Pacific peoples and disability?
32	MS PURA-WATSON: From my knowledge and remember, mine is about whakapapa for Māori,
33	there were very few, if any, Pacific people and I'm not sure that there were any disabled.
34	MS SHARKEY: So just coming forward to present day, I think you said is it 135 officers?

- 1 MR POLE: Yes, that's correct.
- 2 MS SHARKEY: And could you please for us describe the make-up, the ethnicity.
- 3 MR POLE: So it sits at over 20% Māori and Pasifika...
- 4 **MS LEE:** 10%.
- 5 **MR POLE:** About 10%.
- 6 **MS SHARKEY:** And for disabled?
- 7 **MR POLE:** We don't have that information.
- 8 **MS SHARKEY:** Right.
- 9 **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** Would you like to estimate the number?
- 10 **MR POLE:** Very small.
- 11 MS SHARKEY: Is that something that you are looking at?
- MR POLE: It is something we are looking at, it is something we work very hard around. There
 are certain rigours in the role as a review officer or working in the field, and one of those
 things is we draw our people from senior leadership roles in the sector, and so a large part
 of our approach is structured by the profiles of people who are working in leadership roles,
 in management roles, in schools today.

In saying that, we are looking at approaches where we can second and source and I would say when we are working in particular projects associated with disabled learners, we will partner actively with the disabled community in that work. And the most recent piece of work which we will publish in a couple of weeks' time we had the Human Rights Commission with responsibility for disability and the Office of Disability Issues as partners in undertaking that work.

- 23 **MS SHARKEY:** But that is a significant, would you call it a gap?
- 24 MR POLE: It is a gap, yes.
- 25 **MS SHARKEY:** Right. That needs to be addressed?
- 26 MR POLE: Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

- MS SHARKEY: And just looking at the current framework you said that review officers come
- from senior leadership and management roles in the education sector and they work in a
- range of schools. I just wanted to clarify what do you mean by "they work in a range of
- 30 schools"? They're not working in the schools, they --
- 31 MR POLE: Sorry, working "with".
- 32 MS SHARKEY: Right. And so you talk about extensive training. Does that include issues such
- as we've been talking about today, racism, unconscious bias?

1	MR POLE: Yes, so our workforce has all recently been through Courageous Conversations
2	About Race, which is a programme about acknowledging racism and understanding that.
3	They, as part of our commitment this year, allhave objectives around te reo and growing
4	and expanding their te reo capabilities, growing an understanding awareness and
5	acknowledgment of tikanga, and obligations in terms of local contexts and local history.
6	Equally through our Pacific commitments, all of our frontline reviewers are working
7	through or have worked through, if they have been with us for a while, Tapasā which is the
8	training programme for teachers in the sector about acknowledging Pacific pedagogical
9	approaches and needs.
10	MS SHARKEY: Is that delivered by the Teaching Council, is that right?
11	MR POLE: Yes, and also delivered internally from Apaulie(?) Pasifika. So we have a senior
12	leader in ERO whose responsibility is ensuring culturally responsive practice by all of our
13	frontline review staff
14	MS SHARKEY: H-ow do you assess, monitor and assess how the reviewer's cultural awareness
15	and competency goes once they've done that programme? -Tapasā I understand, but as we
16	heard in our Pacific people's hearing, ethnic specific were not-, it's not homogenous
17	Pacific peoples.
18	MS LEE: That would be monitored through their ongoing performance appraisal. As Nick has
19	said, they will have certain goals and expectations around that. It also is through our
20	ongoing monitoring of our strategies around the Pacific and Māori strategy as to how we
21	are monitoring and tracking towards achieving those goals.
22	MS SHARKEY: Do you get feedback from the schools or parents about reviewers?
23	MS LEE: Not from parents as such, unless they wish to talk about the findings of a review.
24	However, we do seek feedback from schools in relation to how well the review has gone or
25	how well the review has contributed to their school improvement, not specifically about
26	reviewers.
27	MS SHARKEY: Right, okay. And so with those reviews you mentioned before that you do talk
28	to some students, you do talk to some parents possibly?
29	MS LEE: Yes, we do.
30	MS SHARKEY: How are they selected? How does that happen?
31	MS LEE: I can only speak from my experience as a review officer. I would have randomly
32	selected those students from a list that the school would have given me at the time of the
33	review, and as I said prior, parents would have been informed of our review and they could

approach us or we would have asked the school to select a group of parents or, in some 1 cases, given us the contact details of those parents so we could make contact ourselves. 2 MS PURA-WATSON: I'd just like to add, there is variation in the way we move in terms of our 3 work, and it's not -- it is important to note, so Jane has referred to the process that 4 acknowledges the conversations or listening to the voices of children and parents. In the 5 Māori medium space we can't start our work without hearing them first, and by that I mean 6 the kura kaupapa, Kōhanga Reo establish who they want to speak on their behalf, they take 7 the opportunity to. W--e are quiet, we are manuhiri, so we are there to listen to their voice 8 and we then move into having, as Jane has indicated, the ongoing conversations both with 9 whānau and learners at different points. 10 So the point I'm trying to make here, and I just would like to take it slowly, is that 11 our processes have evolved. We give mana to the voice of the learner more frequently now 12 than we have, and we learned about that and the need for it because kaupapa Māori said, 13 "no, stop, korero has mana, we need you to listen". And we've adopted that notion or the 14 importance of listening to voice. 15 To that, you'll see now in our research projects that are being done, both in Ihuwaka, 16 which is one part of the business, and Te Pou Mataaho, which is the Māori medium space; 17 we actively seek learner whānau, hapū, iwi voice in our reports because it has value and it 18 19 truly tells the fulsome story. MS SHARKEY: Yes, there are other groups that also have that holistic whānau approach, the 20 21 importance, Pacific peoples are one example. Is there that same approach there under the English medium? 22 MS LEE: In English medium we would speak to Pacific parents, Māori and Pacific students while 23 we're on site. 24 25 MS SHARKEY: Then the statement of the expert psychologist is in the bundle, she talks about the barriers, Ms Holsted mentioned yesterday the strength in the child's voice, but our 26 expert clinical psychologist also spoke to the barriers in children being able to disclose 27 abuse as well. Do you have and identify that challenge? 28 29 MR POLE: Can I answer that. Yes, we do. And -it's fair to say we continue to work through how do we capture that voice and how do we have safe ways in particular contexts where 30 children and young people can disclose -bullying. We are presently working in a context 31 where we are looking for former students to talk with us and to seek out former students to 32

come in, to run anonymous surveys in that school where we can get at the extent to which

there are things occurring to those students that are hostile, inappropriate to their inclusion 1 2 and sense of belonging in that entity. It is challenging when a review officer is in a school for maybe two or three days 3 for young people particularly to feel confident to raise issues or speak out. 4 Our changes in our approach and establishing a longer-term relationship with school 5 entities, one of the aims in that is so that our evaluation partners, we are calling them, can 6 be known by and a potential port of call by parents or by learners should there be concerns 7 that they feel uncomfortable surfacing within the boundaries of that school community. 8 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** So between reporting periods they can reach out. 9 MR POLE: Between reporting periods, and as I said, it's our intention to be back there regularly 10 and be part of the school fabric, so to say. 11 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Can I ask just briefly, is there an effort to match, to have a review 12 officer who goes to a kōhanga or kura, endeavour to have a Māori review officer establish 13 that relationship? And the same for Pasifika, disability? 14 MS PURA-WATSON: So ERO has a really strong,- over a 20- year period,- has established a 15 process that we have a team of Māori review officers who are capable, who have evaluation 16 expertise, te reo Māori, kaupapa, who work in those arenas that you're talking about. 17 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Good. It must be hard to grow that pool because you would need 18 19 a significant pool in order to cover all the kura. MS PURA-WATSON: In that regard we've traversed the space carefully, because, as you 20 21 say -- and the demand is high. So what we do do is over the years we've built really strong relationships with the peak bodies and we second, we bring those teachers and learners into 22 our space on secondment and we do a training, we train them in evaluation and they equally 23 train us in their philosophies. So a mutually beneficial engagement with our peak bodies so 24 25 we're building evaluation capability and they continue to build our workforce capability around kaupapa. 26 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Who are these people that you bring in to second? 27 MS PURAWATSON: Staff from the National Trust, National Kohanga Reo Trust, so these are 28 29 practitioners from Kōhanga Reo and people from Te Rūnanganui, teachers, principals from Te Rūnanganui o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori, and Ngā Kura a Iwi, again, principals and 30 teachers. And it's, as I've suggested, an opportunity to build our capability while at the 31 same time building theirs. 32 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** When you say second, do they sometimes carry out a review 33 officer function? 34

1	MS LYNDA PURA-WATSON: They come in as part of the review team and they learn the art of
2	evaluation and work alongside us, yeah.
3	MS LEE: That is similarly equal in English medium, that we will endeavour to ensure that the
4	review officer and evaluation partner particularly in the approach that we're taking now, is
5	matched to the school. Also, we have a leadership partners programme that we have
6	piloted for over two years where we can draw on or second leaders in schools from English
7	medium into work with us over an extended period of time where they are trained as review
8	officers and receive the same level of induction, and we hope to grow that and we have
9	several Māori and Pacific leadership partners.
10	MS SHARKEY: But in respect of Deaf and disabled communities though, there is a significant
11	lack?
12	MS LEE: Yes, there is.
13	CHAIR: Ms Sharkey, are you moving on to complaints at some stage?
14	MS SHARKEY: At some stage, yes.
15	CHAIR: Then I'll hold my question for Mr Pole about complaints until we get there.
16	MS SHARKEY: I just wanted to continue, we'll talk about partnership, and in the briefing you
17	referred to MOE as a critical partner. Does the same emphasis extend to families and
18	community, because, quite rightly, Ms PuraWatson, what you describe is exactly for a
19	number of groups how we would want to see that relationship?
20	MS PURAWATSON: Absolutely. I'd like to just go to one of the first points around the
21	relationship and how big it is. So yes, with the Ministry. We have over the years been
22	called to account, ERO, and so during 2000 Te Rūnanganui o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori
23	asked us to stay away until we learned how to do the job best with Māori. As a result of
24	that, we then moved to the co-construction of how we would work, which is working with
25	the overarching governing body and with each school and with each community.
26	Then we moved and learned from that experience, so that's one additional partner in
27	the picture, Te Rūnanganui. Then we moved and by 2002, we then developed another
28	relationship because it was an expectation of Māori with the Te Kōhanga Reo National
29	Trust, and that was in 2002, where we developed a new methodology with indicators,
30	crafted together with ERO facilitating. So that's another major relationship.
31	Then we moved into working with Ngā Kura a Iwi,we developed methodology
32	and indicators, which then strengthened our working relationship across the Māori medium
33	space. What that also did was lead us into another arena and we're so small, we can only do

what we can do. In this instance we've since had requests from iwi and where we are able

to, we respond by providing an evaluative service. The example in this space would be Ngāti Kahungunu where they came and asked if we would look at co--constructing evaluation in Kahungunu for the schools, early learning services and kura in that particular iwi.

So it's over time the notion of who we engage with and our relationships and who they are with has grown as well. So while the Ministry is a very strong partner, we also have multitudes of others who are significant.

MS SHARKEY: You've outlined a number of the partners that you work with but as you said, small organisation for 2,500 schools, and I come back, the statutory framework is silent on who ERO should work with, so that's a big job.

MR POLE: Can I just maybe add to what we've said about those partnerships. First and foremost, and it's a critical element in our framework when we are working with schools, is ensuring the quality and the depth of partnership which the school has with its community and the parents, whānau and iwi within its setting. So it is not -- we do not see it as our role to go in and broker those partnerships. Yes, we want to hear how education is going for that community.

But at the end of the day what we want to do is ensure a sustainability in the school's connections and ownerships of the wishes and aspirations for their tamariki that that community has, and to deliver on that and to resolve and work through the challenges that will no doubt occur every day or every week.

MS SHARKEY: Is that part of wanting to maintain an independence?

MR POLE: I see it as it's about ensuring a quality education is delivered in that teachers and the community do that for themselves. Where that's weak, where there are tensions, we will step in and that may go as far as recommending interventions where in fact a board might be stood down and that would be recommendations to a Minister or to the Secretary For Education, because there's a fundamental breakdown in the relationship between a school and its community.

MS SHARKEY: Right, because those levers for change in terms of dissolving boards and appointing Commissioners, and statutory,-- is it LSM-- specialist advisors, that's all with MOE, but not with ERO.

MR POLE: It sits with the Ministry of Education, yes, but ERO can make recommendations and there is a long track record of where we have made recommendations about interventions in terms of dealing with issues that we see in the school where we see little capacity amongst those there to deal to those issues themselves.

1	MS SHARKEY: Okay. I'm just coming to a new topic. If we could bring up- it's a school, and a
2	number of- ERO reports relating to this school, and it was discussed yesterday, if we could
3	bring up
4	CHAIR: For clarity, we're going to be talking about a particular case of a school which won't be
5	named.
6	MS SHARKEY: Yes which will not be named.
7	CHAIR: Thank you.
8	MS SHARKEY: If we could go to appendix 1 and Ms Holsted was taken through this yesterday,
9	I'm not sure if you'll be aware of the evidence provided.
10	CHAIR: Let's put it up. Again, for the audience in the room and those watching, you will not see
11	these documents because they contain matters of privacy which have not been able to be
12	redacted but counsel will read out the parts that she's referring to so that you can hear
13	it won't you counsel?
14	MS SHARKEY: Yes, I will. We're just trying to get the technology going. I think it's page 30.
15	It's moving a bit slow today.
16	Whilst that's coming up, Mr Pole, in talking about this school there are a number of
17	ERO reports carried out in relation, and we've read them all, they're in the bundle.
18	CHAIR: Now you can see the name of the school that is going to be referred to.
19	MS SHARKEY: There are a number of ERO reports in the bundle and there was an audit 1995
20	which raised some issues then we have through to 2009 several ERO reports, a 14 year
21	period that there were matters of concern related to bullying and violence in the school.
22	Would you agree with that?
23	MR POLE: Yes.
24	MS SHARKEY: And when I talk about successive ERO reports to MOE, there was one to the
25	Minister where the Minister got involved regarding bullying and violence, and
26	I acknowledge the survivors who suffered terrible abuse and are watching today. What
27	more could ERO have done given the matters of concern outlined in several ERO reports?
28	What more could have been done?
29	MR POLE: In reflecting on this case, I think ERO should have approached the Police and laid a
30	complaint with the Police if we had foundations for making those judgments.
31	MS SHARKEY: When you say "if" you had foundations.
32	MR POLE: If we had foundations, if we were aware of incidents that had occurred against
33	children, that would be our obligation, or child on child.

- MS SHARKEY: There are a couple of reports there where nothing is mentioned. And the
- 2 concern with that is that there was a bullying and violence pattern throughout. How was
- 3 that not picked up?
- 4 MR POLE: I can't comment on what the team saw at the time, or equally what they discussed
- 5 with the leadership in the school or the governance of the school.
- 6 MS SHARKEY: Right, so we come back to that self-veracity, it's what they were told at the
- 7 time?
- 8 MR POLE: Not necessarily, there may have been discussions that review officers held with the
- 9 school, raising concerns.
- MS SHARKEY: Would it be common for there to be a number of reports that reference bullying
- and violence and then for another report to be absolutely silent about the previous report's
- issues on that; is that acceptable?
- MR POLE: It seems abnormal in the circumstances. Generally, a subsequent review, going into a
- school subsequently, involves you looking deeply into the previous records and our
- engagement with that school going through the file for that school.
- 16 MS SHARKEY: So in your --
- MR POLE: I think in the chronology for the school ERO was back in the school very frequently,
- very regularly, it wasn't on a three- to five-year cycle over that period of 14 years you've
- 19 talked to.
- 20 MS SHARKEY: Right.
- 21 **MR POLE:** Which meant that in our system it was a concern to us.
- MS SHARKEY: Yes, but unfortunately the failure of someone to act meant that that abuse and
- bullying continued. Is that correct?
- 24 MR POLE: I acknowledge that.
- 25 **MS SHARKEY:** And in your view, what would, or should MOE have done?
- MR POLE: I think this school is a clear example of a serious series of interventions.
- 27 **MS SHARKEY:** Sorry, could you explain that?
- 28 **MR POLE:** A series of interventions.
- 29 **CHAIR:** Which did or did not occur? Do you know?
- 30 MR POLE: No, I don't know.
- 31 **CHAIR:** The fact that the reports year after year continued to repeat the same problems indicate
- that if there were interventions they weren't successful.
- 33 MR POLE: Yes.
- 34 **CHAIR:** If there were interventions at all.

- MR POLE: Absolutely, and I note in this-- the records for this school that the Deputy Chief
- 2 Reviewer actually took -- actually wrote directly to the board chair and to the Ministry
- raising our concerns that we could not give confidence about the safety of the school.
- 4 MS SHARKEY: Right. And the board didn't agree.
- 5 **MR POLE:** The board did not agree.
- 6 **MS SHARKEY:** Right, so then you have an ongoing issue, right?
- 7 **MR POLE:** Yes.
- 8 MS SHARKEY: Because -- of the issues that are going on between MOE, ERO and the school, the
- children are still there going through what is happening in that school. So in ERO's
- situation, there isn't more you can do other than ask MOE to step in?
- 11 MR POLE: Not in terms of our existing powers. It's to review and report. In this situation we
- were regular returnees to the school because of the concerns that we held.
- 13 MS SHARKEY: The last ERO report is 2015. Given the history with the school, should you
- have done further ERO reports in that time?
- MS LEE: Since 2015 we have changed our approach and we have an evaluation partner review
- officer working in an ongoing way with that school currently.
- MS SHARKEY: Okay. In terms of public accountability and having things on your website, the
- last piece of information there is 2015.
- MS LEE: Yes, we were due to visit the school. However, Covid got in the way of that, and as
- soon as we were able to, we on-boarded the school into our new approach,-- had appointed
- an evaluation partner who will in time produce a report in due course.
- 22 MS SHARKEY: But at this stage ERO don't know what the situation has been for those children
- in the school since 2015?
- 24 **MS LEE:** We are currently working in the school and we have started the board assurance
- statement, so we are already in conversation with that school, so we do know aspects of
- what's happening.
- 27 **MS SHARKEY:** When did that start?
- 28 **MS LEE:** That started at the beginning of this year.
- 29 **MS SHARKEY:** There has still been a delay?
- 30 **MS LEE:** There was a delay due to Covid and as soon as we were able to, that school was brought
- into our new model.
- 32 MS SHARKEY: If I take Covid back to 2020, 2015 to 2020 is still a long gap.
- 33 **MS LEE:** I acknowledge that.

1	MS SHARKEY: And just in your brief, Mr Pole, you talk about New Zealand's students continue
2	to experience high rates of bullying, double the OECD average, that's in your brief to the
3	incoming Minister. So this is a real issue, it's a real issue. What do you see as being
4	required to change this? Because it's a topic at the moment, it's out there in the media and
5	all sorts of places, but this is not a new issue. What needs to happen?
6	MR POLE: So in 2019 we published a major report looking into bullying in schools.
7	MS SHARKEY: Yeah, saw that.
8	MR POLE: That report confirmed amongst OECD countries that New Zealand has one of the
9	highest rates of bullying amongst students and in schools of most other OECD nations, and
10	I will reference OECD nations because there are concerns in other more developing
11	nations, that in that result around a third of New Zealand children reported that in the
12	school that they were currently attending they had experienced bullying. That bullying
13	ranged from being called names to having stories told about them around school, to cyber
14	bullying, through to physical assault, choking, being hit or kicked, which was
15	disproportionately higher for male students than female students, and extremely high for

So I think in terms of boys it was rated at about 11%, for gender diverse students being hit or kicked regularly in their school setting was about 19%.

MS SHARKEY: So in terms of the work that you're doing.

gender diverse students.

MR POLE: So in that work we highlighted a range of schools who have very good practices based on evidence and about what we identified. In those schools, the levels of reported bullying was reduced by about 30%, so quite a significant reduction.

The factors that were contributing to that were strong leadership, it was a thing that the school focused on; universal programmes, so the school collectively owned expectations around behaviour and gave everyone within that school setting the right to intervene and act; there was good training by teachers of children in knowing about bullying and what to do; having go to people to talk with; and having whole school processes and practices that I referred to before, such as restorative practices.

In saying that, within those schools even though we had very significantly lower levels of bullying, it did not eliminate this issue.

In our conclusion and our wider recommendations, we saw the consequence of this as being a broader societal issue. There is something about New Zealanders, and you only have to be on the side of a 9 year old's soccer field in even affluent areas, having been a soccer coach for many years, where parents' behaviour on the sideline is atrocious and this

has played into our schools. I think it's something that we need a national conversation 1 2 about. There are, -we have identified a range of programmes that do work,- even -go 3 further than where the practice in those good schools were. So government has for long 4 sponsored a programme Positive Behaviour For Learning which has multi--elements- to it 5 from teacher education right through to changing the whole school context. 6 MS SHARKEY: Right, so these are all new --7 MR POLE: -- PB4L has been there in the last decade, it's a long haul for a school to change their 8 culture, and programmes like that will only work where you have the conditions that I've 9 previously talked about in terms of leadership, capability and so on. 10 Schools, some of the signposts that we had through our work were classrooms that 11 were noisy, disruptive, chaotic, had disproportionate levels of bullying occurring in those 12 environments. That spoke to the whole environment in that school context, which is 13 something I've raised earlier. 14 MS SHARKEY: Yes. 15 Can we all go for that break now, Madam Chair? 16 CHAIR: Yes, we need to take another break so if we can come back at just after 12 o'clock and 17 resume again at that stage, thank you. 18 19 Adjournment from 11.48 am to 12.02 pm MS SHARKEY: All right, Mr Pole, just continuing on from where we left off. I'm just looking at 20 your recommendations. And this is 11.11, "The following are possible recommendations or 21 areas for the Royal Commission to consider" and you talk about improving the evaluating 22 of bullying prevention and response policies programmes and procedures that monitor 23 student experiences. 24 25 Is there anything you wanted to elaborate on in that respect? Or is that similar to what we have just been discussing? 26 MR POLE: I think it's similar to what we have been discussing. A critical element in that is 27 ensuring student voice and good practice, from my perspective, is using tools such as the 28 well-being at school where actually you're polling students all the time about their 29 experiences, and I think the Secretary talked about some of those yesterday. 30 MS SHARKEY: Okay. And just going back a little bit, you've got in (e) "the establishment of an 31 independent complaints and advocacy service for parent and learners", and that's so that 32 children can go somewhere and not the school. 33

1	MR POLE: That's correct and when there are breakdowns and disputes between families and the
2	school, that there is somewhere to go to get those resolved.
3	MS SHARKEY: Okay. Any ideas on that what service might look like?
4	MR POLE: No, not particularly. In 1989 it's fair to say that the Education Act actually put in
5	place a parent advocacy function, that was removed a year later after the passing of that
6	Act.
7	MS SHARKEY: Right.
8	CHAIR: Do you have international experience or evidence or understandings that might help
9	inform the creation of such an independent group?
10	MR POLE: There are examples around the world and they can go to actually having
11	representation in such things as an expulsion or a stand-down, particularly in respect of the
12	disability community.
13	CHAIR: Is that for an advocacy process where you have somebody representing, sitting beside of
14	supporting the child and the family in that process, or is it a place where you go and have
15	the exclusion resolved?
16	MR POLE: I think I've seen examples of both. I would say we probably need to consider both
17	CHAIR: Thank you.
18	MS SHARKEY: In terms of how schools are approaching complaints, especially with children,
19	have you seen any new or innovative ideas, schools using apps, for example, since our kids
20	are all in that kind of space?
21	MR POLE: One of the biggest changes over recent years has been the adoption of SchoolDocs,
22	which is a technology provider into schools, which outlines, I think very clearly, the
23	responsibilities on boards and managing their complaints. I think there is opportunities to
24	go further with social media around capturing complaints, particular issues. But what it
25	relies on is mechanisms within the school and the maturity of the school systems to actually
26	work through and resolve those. And to analyse data and look for key themes.
27	Equally, some of this technology can do horrid things, so there are examples of
28	where some of this technology has just spammed schools or spammed teachers or been
29	quite uncomfortable. I was involved in one case in Australia where the particular lobby
30	group crowd sourced responses from Malaysia and Indonesia.
31	MS SHARKEY: Right. So if a complaint is received by the school, how does it come to you, it
32	has to be shared by the school to you?
33	MR POLE: So when we go into a school we will look at the operation of the complaint system;
34	firstly, that they have a policy and that they are abiding by that policy and that policy is

available to the widest parent community, usually that it is online; when managing a 1 complaint, those procedures represent good practice, so that they allocate that complaint, 2 there's natural justice in dealing with that complaint and so on, depending on the nature of 3 the complaint. 4 We will, when we go into a school, look at those systems and processes; we will, in 5 terms of management of complaints, go into looking at committee minutes to see what the 6 discussions were about that complaint; and we will equally look at particular themes. 7 A key question when we're going and working with the school is, what complaints 8 have you had in the last 12 months or the time since you have been here -- what 9 investigations have you had in your school? And we expect that the leadership and the 10 governance of the school will bring that to our attention, and we will work through that. 11 We equally, prior to going into schools, require schools to announce that we're 12 coming, we have announced that we are coming. 13 MS SHARKEY: Are there benefits to cold calling so they don't know you're coming? 14 **MR POLE:** We've not as out of right had cold calling. 15 MS SHARKEY: What we see, I'll use the example of the school we were talking about before, 16 there were complaints to MOE, to the school, to the faith-based organisation in that 17 particular situation. So do you identify a gap as being complaints being received by so 18 many people but not everybody knows what's going on in the one place, like a central 19 nervous system where everybody knows these are the complaints that are coming in. 20 **MR POLE:** In terms of at a system level? 21 MS SHARKEY: Yes. 22 MR POLE: That does not exist. It does exist in terms of early childhood education, so the 23 Ministry of Education collects and actually publishes all of the complaints that are received, 24 25 that they receive, and the nature of those. We do share perspectives with the Ministry prior to going into a school setting, but 26 there is no national place where those complaints are sitting. 27 CHAIR: Is that the reason why you are -- one of your recommendations is for an independent 28 29 complaints service? **MR POLE:** I think it would be good. 30 **CHAIR:** So wherever the complaint enters, it ends up at that central place to be dealt with? 31 MR POLE: Yeah. In saying that, there are a myriad of dimensions to complaints. They may be 32 staff disputes, they may be about matters in the school that don't pertain to risk or safety of 33

children, and it's how you disentangle those.

1	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: It's not clear whether you think that this mechanism should be part
2	of ERO, you're not going so far as to say that, are you?
3	MR POLE: I'm not going so far as that.
4	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: But would you think there's good reason for it to be part of ERO,
5	given the relationship that your officers have, are establishing with the schools?
6	MR POLE: It's a function that I think ERO could grow and develop into.
7	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Yes. Would you like to speak to that too, either of you?
8	MS LEE: I do believe that there does need to be a function where it is independent for parents to
9	take complaints and raise those without fear of not being able to have them resolved.
10	MS PURA-WATSON: I think I would go to, you just asked us do we have a view or do we have
11	a perception. What we know, and because of our strong relationships with Māori, that
12	sometimes it's important to do with and not to, and in that regard, and in particular in
13	relation to anything in relation to the Crown now includes whānau, hapū and iwi. So what
14	I'm suggesting is, we should look to issues like this as being a co-constructed process that
15	comes from two anglesOne is about empowering whanau and the other is about
16	empowering learners and having a central body perhaps like ERO. The only reason
17	I suggested this is because coconstruction has seen absolutely benefits for children in the
18	system.
19	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Ka pai.
20	MR POLE: There is the fundamental issue, though, that once you get to the point of an
21	irrevocable tension, there are other manifestations of that which we've talked about earlier
22	today. So without a power to direct or a power to resolve these or so on.
23	CHAIR: You want a Court of Final Appeal.
24	MR POLE: Yes.
25	CHAIR: I've been involved in a number of the development of a number of these and I
26	understand the complexity. But I think if we extract from what you're saying at a high
27	level, I think the point about co-design and production is very important. But we're talking
28	here at a conceptual level, the parameters of it, the jurisdiction of it, the powers of it, are
29	matters of detail that would be dealt with by the co-design I would have thought. But I
30	think we've got the message clearly about the direction that you suggest we take.
31	MS SHARKEY: Because just bringing that back to the survivors from what we hear, they tell one
32	person, they think everybody knows, or everybody should know. So that's how important is
33	is that there is some kind of central place for them to do that and not share their story 10 or
34	20 times.

So just following on from that, you talk about "enhancing the system by obligating 1 agencies to share information", whilst taking into consideration rights of privacy of course, 2 but you believe that that's important. 3 4 MR POLE: Absolutely. So we have had situations when we are working in schools where there are investigations underway by Police or Oranga Tamariki or others that we have not been 5 aware of and have not been made aware of those by those that we've been working with. I 6 would say, and you will be hearing from Ms Hoskins later this afternoon, that we are 7 presently exploring a memorandum of agreement sanctioned by the Privacy Commissioner 8 in the case where there are cases they are dealing with while we are in a school that would 9 be of concern in terms of the health and safety of children at that school. So the Teaching 10 Council. 11 MS SHARKEY: Okay. So coming back to that recommendation and the information sharing, 12 and looking at that against the backdrop of what we were talking about before in terms of 13 training of staff, you also talk about "a mandatory requirement of all education workers to 14 report incidents, disclosure and suspicion of child abuse". The Teaching Council can do 15 teachers but there are a number of other workers that are in the schools working with 16 children. Is that where this kind of comes from? 17 MR POLE: Exactly. So what I'm suggesting the Commission consider is that for education 18 workers it is mandatory if you suspect abuse in any way, that that's recorded. So I've had 19 four years' experience in a senior leadership role in education in Victoria where mandatory 20 reporting was a core requirement. It has been an issue that has gone back and forward in 21 the New Zealand debate. 22 MS SHARKEY: Yes. 23 MR POLE: In the Australian situation it meant there was no ambiguity in your obligation. And 24 25 where I'm talking about education workers, I'm going those who are employed or working in early learning services or schools, and there are -- so we may have obligations from 26 registered teachers, but this is extending it. And it's extending it to if you have concerns 27 about peers in your school. 28 29 MS SHARKEY: And you say they're "supported with training and guidance". MR POLE: Absolutely supported with training and guidance, and protections. So in the 30 Australian context for some teachers who reported in very small communities, there was 31 huge challenges in doing that. And protections for the child or young person that you may 32 be reporting on. 33

1	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: It's not just peers, you said peers in your school, so would this
2	extend beyond that to questions about abuse in a home?
3	MR POLE: Sorry, if you have suspicions that a child is coming into your early childhood service
4	and there are bruises that look odd and there's repeated patterns, first and foremost that you
5	were reporting that suspicion, that you were recording your observations, so building up
6	that file, and that you will make a referral to Oranga Tamariki and to the Police. And that
7	the school ensures, so some of our schools do this very well and teachers are well trained,
8	but ensuring that that training is core part of those working in the system.
9	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Is that based on your experience in Victoria, do you think the
10	Victorian model might be a useful guide?
11	MR POLE: I think the Victorian model is well worth looking at but I don't want to pre-empt that
12	model over others.
13	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Okay.
14	MS SHARKEY: Thank you. Just following on from that we've got:
15	"Establishing a national registration requirement and code of practice for all early
16	learning and school employees because currently registration exists for trained teachers."
17	Do you want to speak to that?
18	MR POLE: So this is extending that registration requirement, so we have a public record of who
19	is working in the system; and secondly, through registration that as an employee or a
20	contractor working in a school, you are committed to a code of responsibility.
21	MS SHARKEY: And so for the benefit of those watching, their understanding, this is about
22	prevention, ensuring registration so that you know who is in the system and working in
23	there.
24	MR POLE: Yeah, and being explicit about your obligations working in that system, and also
25	thenextending the capacity for us to sanction behaviour that we would be concerned
26	about as we do with teachers through the Teaching Council.
27	CHAIR: That mirrors, doesn't it, the requirement for vetting, because I believe at this stage all
28	people who are working in schools must go through a vetting process; is that right?
29	MR POLE: That's correct.
30	CHAIR: So we've got the vetting at one end but we don't have the registration at the other, and
31	this might close that.
32	MR POLE: I'd just extend it a little bit. We require all employers of education workers to do the
33	safety check which goes beyond vetting, vetting is one element.
34	CHAIR: I'm glad you said that.

MR POLE: Ensuring identity is a critical second element. 1 CHAIR: That's right. When I said vetting I really meant the holistic, the whole thing, yeah. 2 3 Thank you. 4 MS SHARKEY: Thank you, Mr Pole. You talk about the development of national child protection policy guidelines, because nothing is in place at the moment. 5 MR POLE: So schools and early learning services are required in terms of the Children's Act 6 from 2014 to have those in place. What I'm suggesting is we don't want any grey space 7 between what good practice and what passable practice should look like. 8 In schools and early learning services developing their own, it is open to different 9 interpretations and practice. Now, in some respects, that is appropriate, because they are in 10 different contexts, but being clearer about what those minimum standards are and ensuring 11 that there is strong guidance around that. And I think it goes to our -- my previous 12 comments, you know, guidance around what supports do you give a child who has been 13 abused, who is in your school? How do you support that? How do you support the 14 tensions as that process is going, playing out? 15 MS SHARKEY: Because without that broad national child protection policy it's really up to the 16 17 schools how they deal with it. MR POLE: We have general requirements in terms of the Children's Act and subsequent to that. 18 I'm saying guidelines that strengthen and build on that. 19 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: So you haven't had sufficient specificity to ensure there are these 20 21 minimum standards and consistency across --MR POLE: It's building on the standards that are there. 22 MS SHARKEY: Turning to a new topic, and we heard a bit about it yesterday, and it is the 23 function of ERO within the education system looking at private schools. 24 25 And we heard a bit about that yesterday and it's in your brief of evidence. So it's limited to the assessment of whether the efficiency standard is met. 26 **MR POLE:** No, sorry, the efficiency standard sat up until 2010. 27 MS SHARKEY: Right, yes, okay. So part of ERO's mandate but not the case previously; that's 28 29 correct? **MR POLE:** That's correct. 30 MS SHARKEY: So just wondering whether you heard our discussion about private schools 31 yesterday and Commissioner -- Chair had shown some interest in it before. Is there 32

anything you wanted to follow on or -- I'm happy to take you to certain parts if you'd like

me to, but you would have been aware of what the conversation was yesterday and I just 1 wanted to know what your thoughts were about that, the role of ERO in private schools. 2 MR POLE: So, I mean, I think I outlined the changes to legislation in 2019 have extended our 3 focus to looking at a safe physical and emotional environment. In saying that, it's very 4 difficult to identify that, or to surface that. 5 CHAIR: Because I raised the issue perhaps I could frame the question a little. It became apparent 6 in the course of the evidence yesterday from the Ministry that there is, I don't want to call it 7 a line or an attitude, but the approach is that whilst the Ministry has responsibility for State 8 schools and integrated schools and can intervene, have oversight, take action, etc, within its 9 mandate, when it comes to private schools, there is a great reticence to become involved in 10 the questions of child welfare, child safety, almost anything, and the reason for that given 11 by Ms Holsted yesterday, as I recall, and I paraphrase, is that parents have chosen to 12 remove their child from the "State system" for a reason, and that is that they want their 13 child to be educated in a particular way according to particular standards and principles and 14 curriculum and the Ministry does not want to get involved in that relationship between the 15 parent and the private school. I hope I'm stating Ms Holsted's views accurately. 16 Do you recall that? 17 MR POLE: Yes, I do. 18 CHAIR: And I posed the question whether or not, understanding that approach, whether or not 19 that gave sufficient weight really to the safety of the child. So there was a question of 20 21 physical, corporal punishment, where private schools either refused to report or continued to do it almost with impunity and the Ministry is reluctant to intervene even though it's 22 illegal. And my question was, are we thinking about this the wrong way, should we start 23 not from the relationship between the parent and the school, but from the welfare of the 24 25 child? I'd be very interested in your comments on that if you feel as though you are able to. 26 MR POLE: I can comment on it, some of it -- so the current arrangements with respect to private 27 schools are decisions in statute agreed by Parliament and have been evolved over time. 28 29 And so if I go back to prior to 2010 that "efficient" definition was very much an economic paradigm. 30 MS SHARKEY: Sorry, Mr Pole, for those watching, what do you mean by that? 31 MR POLE: So it was about is this school managing their resources, their property, and so on, in 32 an efficient way. 33

MS SHARKEY: Thank you.

MR POLE: So very much driven by economics, and driven probably with a commercial lens, and that the State steps back from, given the choice that parent are making, from influence or interference with the curriculum and the delivery of teaching.

Over time the State has evolved that, and from 2010, private schools offering equivalent to the education that is found in a State setting, and 2019 going a step further.

I think, and I agree with you Commissioner, that the child should be the heart of the matter, and there are issues where the values that parents may have and the school may hold may not necessarily support the well-being and outcomes and place the child at the centre. And I think the walking through the case of the school where ERO had been back to I think four or five times around corporal punishment was where those values were absolutely in conflict with both where the law was.

It's my personal view, and I'm probably along the spectrum of more interventionist in my views, that there are things that we can consider in strengthening. So in 11.11(g), I have suggested one area for that is the definition of a fit and proper person. Presently a fit and proper person is someone who does not have criminal convictions, is healthy of mind, and is not bankrupt.

It's my view that a fit and proper person in terms of Education and Training Act and in relation to early childhood sector should be extended to probably include elements which we have of the profession under article or objective 2 in the Code of Teaching Practice.

CHAIR: So it should be a uniform definition and application across all educational sectors?

MR POLE: Absolutely. And so that talks about being inclusive and supporting the care and well-being of learners. As I said at the start, I'm not a policy maker, or policy advisor, but I'd equally look to having an ongoing and regular statutory obligation to ensure that as part of the obligations.

- MS SHARKEY: Right. 11.11(d)?
- **MR POLE:** (g).

- **MS SHARKEY:** But in (d) you talk about private schools as well.
- MR POLE: That speaks to looking at the extent to which we might have more sanctions or more powers of intervention, for instance to place a monitor focused on child well-being within that school setting. And the State presently has that intervention power in relation to State-integrated schools in terms of limited statutory managers.
- **CHAIR:** Just clarifying the (g) one, the monitoring of fit and proper persons, would you limit that to teachers in private schools or would you do all people employed by the school?
 - **MR POLE:** So this refers to the proprietor, the manager, at the governance level.

- 1 **CHAIR:** At the governance level, right.
- 2 MR POLE: And subsequent obligations to have all workers covered by some level of
- 3 arrangement.
- 4 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** Do you think that would help or stretch to the deficit in the
- 5 cultural competency of, say, the governance boards, because you mentioned that only 10%
- at the moment has that, and also the kind of bullying culture potentially?
- 7 **MR POLE:** In terms of what I refer to --
- 8 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** Under the fit and proper person.
- 9 MR POLE: Inclusivity.
- 10 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** And that's how that would be addressed potentially.
- 11 MR POLE: And health and safety and well-being.
- 12 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** Yeah, because just thinking about the example that was given
- of the school, and clearly the board-- did not see that behaviour, of that school, did not see
- it as a problem, which suggests from the top from that board level, bullying culture, fear
- was potentially there, because it comes from the top. So I'm just trying to see whether that
- would fit into that, or whether there's another way to approach that.
- 17 **MR POLE:** I think it would fit into that.
- 18 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Can I ask just a follow-up on that, you say you don't have a policy
- function, talking about the need for a complaint process and your role is monitoring and
- 20 reporting. I wonder with these research reports that you produce on bullying and other
- thematic areas, do you make recommendations?
- 22 MR POLE: Yes, we do.
- 23 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** You do.
- MR POLE: We do and we'll make recommendations to ministers, to the Ministry of Education or
- other ministries or departments, and to schools themselves.
- 26 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** So with the recommendations in 11.12 here, there's scope for you
- 27 to provide those recommendations too to the Minister, so over time have you made other
- types of recommendations?
- MR POLE: Yes, there is. Over time there have been similar recommendations.
- 30 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** This isn't the first time --
- MR POLE: But in terms of presenting this, these are notions that we are putting before the
- 32 Commission for you to consider.
- 33 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Absolutely.
- 34 **MR POLE:** They're not government policy or government presently exploring these.

1	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Is there something in this list that you've been calling for for
2	sometime more than others?
3	MR POLE: I think in previous recommendations we've highlighted the need for complaints
4	disputes resolution. Without giving you the results of the work that we will release on
5	disabilities in the next two weeks, that will be one of the recommendations that will sit in
6	that report.
7	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Is that paragraph (e), it's not independent complaints?
8	MR POLE: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: It is that (e)? Thank you.
10	MR POLE: And I would note it was there proposed in our system in at the start of Tomorrow's
11	Schools, it has been subsequently explored over many years. The last time I recall it, the
12	2009 Special Education Review highlighted that as a potential mechanism for
13	consideration.
14	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Mr Pole, just a point of clarification because we're very
15	conscious there are many who are watching. ERO does enormous work and from what
16	we've seen and heard very the depth and the breadth is there, you make
17	recommendations, but to the Minister or to the Ministry of Education, and it's up to them
18	whether they take those on board or not?
19	MR POLE: That's correct.
20	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: So your accountability as an independent entity actually stops
21	at that point.
22	MR POLE: So our usual process would be make those recommendations, the Secretary for
23	Education over the time that I've been in this role has always written back to me and
24	acknowledged or we've worked through those recommendations and it may have resulted in
25	shifts in practice within the Ministry, or them pursuing particular policy avenues for
26	ministers to then consider.
27	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you. Accountability is a very big issue for our
28	survivors and it was about understanding that in a continuum. Thank you very much.
29	MS SHARKEY: Just taking the point from the Commissioner, because we did find these
30	recommendations helpful, it's good for us to kind of see this and talk about it and explore
31	them. And yesterday Ms Holsted said she didn't know them, couldn't comment on them,
32	because we wanted to know what her views are.
33	I guess my question is, as a critical partner, you guys haven't had this conversation
34	before about these types of recommendations, which to me have been considered?

1	MR POLE: They have been considered and they have been considered by previous governments
2	over time.
3	MS SHARKEY: Right, okay.
4	MR POLE: Ms Holsted and I did not sit down and work through our briefs together, we did share
5	our briefs, but right at the last minute given the time limit.
6	MS SHARKEY: Yeah, okay. And coming back to, I think it was the very beginning, I invited
7	you to comment on whether more statutory powers would be of assistance, and I guess
8	when we explore the range of recommendations the Commission could consider, I guess
9	because it's reviewing and reporting, there is potential there, right, to put more tools in your
10	kete?
11	MR POLE: Yes.
12	MS SHARKEY: Would that be fair?
13	MR POLE: Yes.
14	MS SHARKEY: Just making sure there are no other questions.
15	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: I'll just ask, given the recommendation about complaints to
16	advocacy services especially from the disability community that's been around for so long,
17	we need to understand what's the resistance that this hasn't been put in place. Have there
18	been the conversations about that with the Ministry of Education or anyone else as to why?
19	MR POLE: I can't comment on that. I think in some respects it may be financial or fiscal. But
20	beyond that, as I said, we're about to enter into those discussions again in terms of the work
21	we will release on our look at inclusive practices in schools and early learning services in a
22	couple of weeks.
23	CHAIR: Yes, Ms Sharkey.
24	MS SHARKEY: And just finishing off that discussion on private schools, and you had mentioned
25	some of those instances ERO had faithfully gone back and you keep reporting and you talk
26	about, in NTP 449 at paragraph 6.11 you identified 29 instances of private schools being
27	non-compliant with the legal prohibition on corporal punishment then. At a minimum, that
28	would be frustrating, but very, very concerning at the other end. But again, it's just about
29	all you can do really is to report on it and try and elevate it as best you can.
30	MR POLE: That's correct.
31	MS SHARKEY: We're moving to another topic. And you have briefly touched on it before,
32	we're looking at Ruru school. That's the use of seclusion, restraint and time-out in special
33	schools. Yesterday the MOE witnesses were asked questions about the school and the

situation for the Turnbull family and I just wanted to address ERO's involvement in that

situation and also a couple of other examples of ERO's involvement in special schools 1 2 where seclusion, time-out and restraint was used. So just some general questions, looking at NTP 449, paragraph 8.1. I think we're 3 going to bring it up. 4 While we're bringing it up, it's the response that: 5 "ERO does not have the powers to directly monitor the use of seclusion, restraint 6 and punishment in education institutions, but it does through the review process, require 7 schools to attest..." 8 And that's something that we've gone through today: 9 "...and the attested information is verified on site by ERO by reference to any 10 document." 11 So the above is correct. 12 So apart from referring the school board back to non-compliant areas that we see in 13 this paragraph, what else does ERO do to ensure that the non-compliant practices cease 14 effective immediately, so as to reduce the impact and harm on the child being subjected to 15 these practices? 16 MR POLE: So, first and foremost, we will discuss with the school their behaviour management 17 practices and processes what they are doing in terms of restraint and following the restraint 18 processes, and whether or not there is -- exploring in terms of time-out, whether there are 19 any examples of time-out practices that we would say have crossed the line in terms of 20 21 being concerning. So I think as Mr Wales outlined yesterday, the core element in time-out is freedom to remove yourself from that place. 22 Now, time-out has been used for a very long time, it's sitting out in the desk outside 23 the principal's office by the team. So ensuring that the school firstly is aware of that 24 25 distinction and that there is no instance where since 2016 they are using seclusion in any way. 26 We have had cases where we in fact have gone into schools and talked with them 27 when a couple of students may have been locked in a classroom and we've seen that and 28 worked through that with the school. 29 MS SHARKEY: Locked in the classroom because? 30 MR POLE: For some behaviour reason. 31 MS SHARKEY: Punitive? 32 MR POLE: It may have been to keep a couple of kids apart, you know, between the playground 33

and the school. Even in that situation we look very dimly on it.

1	We do explore, and this goes to the point that, I think you were questioning Ms
2	Holsted yesterday, we do explore deeply, and so the guidance for our evaluation partners
3	working in schools is that they will dig and dig deep and probe into the use of restraint and
4	seclusion, particularly following on the events that you described yesterday with respect to
5	Ruru special school.
6	CHAIR: How does that accord with what you've said in your Notice to Produce, which is that you
7	have no power to monitor seclusion and restraint, but what you're describing here
8	MR POLE: We're not in there every day, we're not we can't ensure the practices of every
9	classroom teacher
10	CHAIR: You're not being the police officer sitting there watching and waving.
11	MR POLE: No, but we will go into a school and ensure that they understand the policy settings,
12	the requisite practice and those practices, from my perspective, are about how you ensure
13	that you have good behaviour management strategies, and I've talked about those earlier.
14	CHAIR: To that extent it is monitoring, isn't it?
15	MR POLE: It is monitoring, it's not
16	CHAIR: It's oversight.
17	MR POLE: It's oversight.
18	CHAIR: Yes, okay. Thank you.
19	MS SHARKEY: Just on Ruru school, you'll be well familiar with that situation. Do you accept
20	the information sharing was not accurate nor reliable?
21	MS LEE: I can answer that question, it's Jane speaking. Yes, we could consider there was a lack
22	of information sharing in a timely way at the time of the 2015 review.
23	MS SHARKEY: I think we had heard an example of that before about Police not telling you there
24	was an investigation. Well, they were telling you that there was no investigation?
25	MS LEE: Correct, we were unaware at the time of the review in 2015 that there was a Ministry
26	investigation into the use of a seclusion room, and also that there had been a Police
27	investigation. We did know that in 2016. As a result of the report coming to light and the
28	Police investigation coming to light, we put the 2015 review and report aside and
29	conducted a new review in 2016.
30	MS SHARKEY: And just before tying that part off, the Ministry of Education also didn't inform
31	you?
32	MS LEE: That is correct.
33	MS SHARKEY: Does that show this kind of,why there's that silo approach; would you agree
34	with that?

1	MS LEE: At the time the Ministry of Education, that particular investigation was being handled
2	out of another office in the Ministry as opposed to the office where the review team were
3	situated. For example, the complaint was handled out of Canterbury, or the investigation,
4	and the ERO team was from the Otago office.
5	MS SHARKEY: Okay. So there's an issue with sharing that information and it all coming into the
6	place where it needs to?
7	MS LEE: At the time, yes, there was an issue with the sharing of information, we've
8	acknowledged that.
9	MS SHARKEY: Is it my understanding that there was this ERO report done, we're talking about
10	2016 now, and a refusal to amend the report?
11	MS LEE: That's not correct. I do have to declare that I was the lead review officer into Ruru in
12	2016 and that I wrote that report along with the review team.
13	MS SHARKEY: Right, so there weren't discussions about information that was held to be
14	incorrect and a request for you to amend it or withdraw it?
15	MS LEE: At the time of the review we had followed upon site with the school and the board as
16	to how they had addressed the recommendations in the Ministry report during the 2016
17	review. We also contacted the Ministry office in relation to that particular investigation as
18	to how did they perceive that the school had addressed those recommendations and they
19	were satisfied at the time.
20	MS SHARKEY: But was it the family that were not happy about howwith the ERO report or
21	the exclusion or omission in relation to seclusion?
22	MS LEE: I believe the family were not happy with the fact that their child had been secluded, and
23	were probably not happy with the fact that we did not make mention of that in the report.
24	What we made mention of in the 2016 report that there had been an investigation around
25	seclusion. That was our acknowledgment.
26	MS SHARKEY: But you wouldn't go as far as to what the family would have liked to have seen
27	in that report?
28	MS LEE: Our reports are to report on the quality of education and care to its community, not to
29	redress specific issues for families. As I said, in the 2016 report we referred to the
30	recommendations being addressed by the school.
31	MS SHARKEY: Okay. So just on ERO reports, schools can come to you and do they see a draft,
32	they can say something about it and say, "Look, we're not happy with that"?
33	MS LEE: Correct.

1	MS SHARKEY: I'm just wondering about that process, becauseit seems to me that schools do
2	wield a bit of power in that respect then. Is the same afforded to others, or is it just the
3	school?
4	MS LEE: The board are from the parent community in relation to if you're suggesting whether
5	parents have an opportunity to respond to our report, the board are from that parent
6	community and are representatives of the parents.
7	MS PURAWATSON: I'd just like to add, the review process itself enables all participants to be a
8	part of the sense making, and by that I mean contribute their views, the evidence is gathered
9	and then the evaluative team creates the sense making around it. The report is the final
10	artifact, it's not the absolute end in terms of a community not having more than the board,
11	the community not having a contribution to the findings of an ERO report.
12	So and in our mandate, review and report, both go hand in hand and are equally
13	as strong as the other. So the contribution of all of those we interview will inform the
14	findings which will be discussed and shared and then we report on those. So I just wanted
15	to create a link between our really structured and very careful process for reviewing and the
16	report. So it's an and and, not just the final artifact that's discussed with the board.
17	MR POLE: Can I also add, the process of a board getting a draft report is one where they have
18	provided the opportunity to correct facts. It is not that we negotiate a settled position, and
19	we stay steadfast to the judgments that we make on the basis of the evidence that we have
20	collected.
21	CHAIR: Was this a case really where there was a divergence of opinion between the board and
22	the parents?
23	MR POLE: I think the Ombudsman's report into Ruru paints that picture.
24	CHAIR: That's right, and so here you have, although you consulted with the board as
25	representatives of the parents, all of the parents, the parent community, it didn't specifically
26	set out the views of the actual parents in this case. Was that really one of the reasons for
27	the grievance of the parents?
28	MR POLE: Yes, and can I say here, and to the Turnbulls, what their child experienced with
29	atrocious, and so I've got to acknowledge that and I've got to acknowledge that as an
30	organisation we did not spot it and we let that family down.
31	It has, however, resulted in substantial changes, so as I referred to before, our
32	probing in every single school in the nation, issues of seclusion and restraint came on the
33	basis of our learnings from that school.

1	Secondly, it is now our expectation that we sit down with the Ministry of Education
2	and share information at my level with Iona, at Jane's level with her counterpart right
3	through to the local office.
4	CHAIR: I'm pleased to hear that because I did get the impression yesterday that the Ministry, and
5	I hope I don't misrepresent them, had the sense that seclusion was dealt with, it was no
6	longer allowed and it wasn't happening very often and so the need, -maybe I'm going too
7	far in saying this-,- the -need for vigilance probably wasn't as great as before.
8	But it seems to me that you have got a determined stance on this question of
9	actually keeping an eye on the question of seclusion. Would that be right?
10	MR POLE: Absolutely.
11	MS LEE: Can I just say that when we're on site undertaking reviews, review officers are required
12	to ask specifically whether there is a seclusion space on site.
13	CHAIR: That answers a question that was put yesterday, so thank you, that's filled a gap for us.
14	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Can I ask, are you aware of recent NGO research on the relative
15	rates of restraint between specialist and regular schools? Or do you have information on
16	that yourselves?
17	MR POLE: I'm aware there is, I can't quote the exact outcomes or findings of the NGO work. It
18	is something we are equally aware of and we probe into in our engagements with schools.
19	It is fair to say our experience is schools are still working through their requirements, and
20	fully understanding those.
21	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: I think the figure they come up with was you are 5,000 times more
22	likely to be restrained in a special school, which I know there's a range of nuances on it, but
23	that sounds pretty alarming and it seems some need to be investigated, looked into.
24	MS LEE: I would also like to state that we will be undertaking reviews of special schools in terms
25	4 and 1 of next year.
26	MR POLE: And that will involve a systematic process of visiting every special school in
27	Aotearoa.
28	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Thanks.
29	CHAIR: I think we should leave you to finish off, if you can, where you want to go on this topic.
30	MS SHARKEY: I did have one topic left, there was some communication about Ms Anderson
31	granting another 20 minutes after the break.
32	CHAIR: Yes, she has, she's been very generous. Part of that might be for Commissioners, but I
33	want you to use your time as you can. So you've got a couple of minutes to go at this point.

1	MS SHARKEY: Okay, so just before tying it up, I just had a couple of questions I wanted to ask.
2	Does it happen often that schools will object, will come back about their reports and say,
3	"Hey, hang on a second"?
4	MS LEE: As part of the process schools will come back and ask for further clarifications or
5	changes to a report. In saying that, they must provide additional information that builds on
6	their request, otherwise we don't change the report. The report findings are our findings,
7	and it is our decision as to what we report.
8	MS SHARKEY: Right.
9	MS PURA-WATSON: In the Māori medium space it's similar, in terms of we don't have a lot of
10	return, because we ensure that the ownership of the findings happens during the process,
11	and the only time we would alter it would be, as Nick referred to earlier, areas of fact
12	evidentially.
13	MS SHARKEY: Have you ever faced the threat of litigation from any school about an ERO
14	report?
15	MR POLE: In my time not in relation to schools but definitely in relation to early childhood
16	services.
17	MS SHARKEY: Right. And that's in relation to your reviews on them?
18	MR POLE: Our judgments, yes.
19	MS SHARKEY: Okay. I have no further questions.
20	CHAIR: Yes, Ms Schmidt-McCleave.
21	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Ma'am, just before we break for lunch I just wanted to note, there
22	were a couple of points in which, Madam Chair, you referenced Iona Holsted's evidence.
23	CHAIR: And I stand to be corrected, as I said, I'm not sure how accurate I was.
24	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE-: Yes. So what I was going to offer, I think on both points, one
25	was in relation to private schools and the other on seclusion, we can follow up
26	CHAIR: Please do. I don't want to misrepresent her.
27	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE-: just to make the full position, because I think there was a little
28	bit more to it.
29	CHAIR: I'm sure there was and I'm very glad and grateful for that, thank you very much.
30	MS SCHMIDT-McCLEAVE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
31	CHAIR: So let's take the lunch adjournment. We'll resume again sharp at 2 o'clock, we will take
32	up some of Ms Anderson's valuable time finishing off this particular part, so thank you.

Lunch adjournment from 1.00 pm to 2.01 pm

1	CHAIR: Nau mai hoki mai ki a koutou katoa, welcome back everybody. Now the Commission
2	has got some limited time which we hope to make the best of, we've each got a topic that
3	we'd like to address with you. I haven't organised the question order, but maybe,
4	Commissioner Steenson, would you like to go first? Are you ready for that?
5	COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Why not? Kia ora koutou ano. So, as you're aware, we did
6	hear from the Secretary of Education yesterday and one of her comments, and again, I'm
7	not going to try and be exact, but the general gist was that monitoring could not be done to
8	such an extent across the system; it was a high trust system essentially, was effectively
9	what she was saying in terms of reporting.
10	And given our understanding of survivors' delays in how they might come forward
11	to speak about abuse, we've heard that many times from all of our survivors, it's very, very
12	hard to come forward; there's trust issues, there's a multitude of issues as to why they don't
13	come forward at the time of the abuse. My question is really around if you have any
14	comments around the Secretary of Education's views or comments on the high trust system
15	and also what's ERO's part in how it can know if there's some abuse going on in a school.
16	Big questions.
17	MR POLE: Thank you. Usually as a teacher, in the session after lunch, we have selected silent
18	reading.
19	CHAIR: A lot of people went to sleep during that time.
20	MR POLE: My general response to that is I think our system is complex, it is large, and the
21	issues that you were gripping with as a Commission, particularly in thinking about going
22	forward, do we have the appropriate layers of protection? So I'm talking about having
23	multiple layers of protection, not relying on any one, and in that case, clearly ERO. So, first
24	and foremost, are our legislative and regulatory frameworks sufficient and the default is
25	around the child at the centre and child protection.
26	The second is, as you were highlighting, monitoring, accountability and oversight.
27	And in terms of our role, and my opening this morning, having an accountability that is
28	within the community and much closer to the ground has a lot of merits. That is what we

I think next for me is around professionalisation, is ensuring that we have a workforce that is committed to protection, is well-trained, and knows what to do when they don't know.

are saying in terms of Māori representation. It is what we are saying about things that

schools should be doing to be effective, is having really strong relationships and

29

30

31

32

33

34

partnerships.

A big part of the reforms over the last 20 years, and this may be part of another 1 2 Commissioner's question, has been decommissioning institutionalisation. So if I look at some of the things we have done for blind and low vision learners, that education takes 3 place for them out in their community, in their home, in their local context, and how do we 4 get that to continue to grow and occur? And that's -equally that-- transformation is going on 5 in terms of education in depth. 6 I think practice, guidance, professional development in terms of the skills of 7 teaching we've talked about here is probably my next layer of protection, and then in 8 supporting the other agencies and supports that wrap around that learner, their whanau, and 9 their context. 10 We've also seen new layers which I think -- and yesterday the secretary highlighted 11 these, could we exploit them more, such as new technology and social media? 12 At the heart of the question you're raising is how do we ensure student agency and 13 voice, and that's the first place we go as monitors, that's the first place that boards go, that 14 teachers go, and leaders go in surfacing issues and concerns. 15 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** That's our hope but I don't know that we can make that 16 17 assumption that all children will come forward. MR POLE: And I'm equally saying that in the available time that ERO, as a monitoring agency 18 has, it is not likely that we will necessarily have people -- or children and young 19 people -- disclose to us. What we want to ensure is that those layers of protection are 20 working for those young people, and so the opportunity to be picked on or singled out or 21 abused doesn't exist. 22 **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** So the system really has to work to protect them. 23 MR POLE: So it's the system and all of those layers operating. And when it fails, and when 24 25 those elements aren't working, that we are quick to identify it. **COMMISSIONER STEENSON:** And that's the heart of my question: how do you identify that? 26 Because that is ERO's part in it, is that fair? 27 MR POLE: That's fair, and so we have learnt, we have developed guidelines, training and a 28 29 vigilance and a professionalisation in our workforce. Can we continue to grow and learn? Yes. 30 COMMISSIONER STEENSON: Thank you. I'm not quite sure I got my answer, but thank you 31 for the attempt. Kia ora. 32 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Kia ora ano. My question is I think of a scenario where a school's 33

under tremendous pressure, has a series of reports, say, and needs help, needs wrap-around

support. There's only so much that your office can do, but I know that you make a plug for Te Mahau as being something, a new initiative, and I'm wondering what it is really. I know Ms Holsted spoke about it yesterday and it showed a lot of moving beyond policy to operational. I'm just wondering if you could say in that scenario how --what supports there would be in addition to your functions and whether Te Mahau has potential to provide that support?

MR POLE: So I'll reference some work we've been doing over the last couple of years and this is going in and working with schools who have complex issues across most domains of their activity. So that work involves firstly identifying a theory of change; what are the things and the sequences and steps and the intensity that we need to focus on? And usually our work through evaluation tries to unpack that, and identifies the first order shifts that we would want to see in that institution.

For me, it always starts with leadership. Leadership isn't necessarily the principal, it is ensuring a good strong leadership team and structure focused on the right things. And then progressively working through all of the other elements that you see and the complexity of the school.

Our work in doing that, we see Te Mahau as a key partner agency with us. So we're identifying, we're looking at that theory of change and then we're saying to Te Mahau, you are part of this turnaround team with the schools' own community, and let's start building up on this. Other partners may include the New Zealand School Trustees' Association to support governance, strengthening of governance. It may also include, as a school we-- work with a school not too far from here -looking at accessing really great- calibre resources from other schools who are doing this very well. So, in that case, we accessed senior leadership around curriculum and capability building in teachers.

So we are presently piloting a shift in the way we might direct professional learning and development resources to actually say, rather than going and picking off the shelf this set of training that's available, actually, what is the bespoke response needed to this school in this context? And one of the issues in our earlier work was we would leave a school with maybe a shopping list of activities two pages long and there was never a capacity for them to engage and deliver on that and we would go back and, you know, you haven't done it.

So it's walking alongside that school and in terms of the work that I'm talking about, it's us going back every 10 weeks every term and holding everyone to account; the

1	leadership and the community and the board and, equally, the Ministry and STA and others
2	to monitor and see shifts then change.
3	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: I think Ms Holsted spoke about a "post and hope" sort of method,
4	but just for Te Mahau's role in that, does that mean that in effect you've got more bodies
5	involved in problem-solving, who are closer to the ground?
6	MR POLE: It's regionalising support services, it's bringing in specialists around curriculum,
7	around leadership, so advice to school leaders, and people who can problem-solve and I
8	would hope in terms of what we're doing, is also accessing system leadership from
9	colleague schools throughout Aotearoa who can work alongside and in the context of the
10	schools that you are referring to.
11	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Kia ora, thank you.
12	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Kia ora. I'm interested in the complaints and advocacy
13	independence and broadly thinking about structures and thinking how we've failed to
14	resolve many issues of educational neglect, cases going through the court system for
15	15 years or so. Les1sons learnt from other areas, is there a role for something like an
16	Education Commissioner to fill the gap between what happens at the ground level, filling
17	those complaints and taking something to a strategic level for change and then even if that
18	doesn't, then it goes on to a court or something like that?
19	MR POLE: I myself haven't thought or worked through that as an option. As I said earlier in my
20	recommendation, I think there is a need for advocacy and resolution of these issues. If
21	I look at the work that we've recently completed, we still have too many kids where there
22	are conditions on their enrolment, or they are not welcome in their local school, or they are
23	turfed out of their school. And that needs to change and we need a circuit breaker there.
24	Some of it is around capability, some of it is around level of the resource, and some
25	of it is around just the complexity of the support infrastructure that has evolved over time.
26	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: And is some part of it around the strength of an independent
27	voice?
28	MR POLE: I think so.
29	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Kia ora, thanks.
30	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Malo lava le soifua. My question is around bringing it back to
31	our kaupapa of abuse in care. Earlier on this week we heard from one of your colleagues,
32	the Independent Children's Monitor, and so we know about the care standards and what's
33	required. We also heard yesterday about the Oranga Tamariki action plan and all of the

children's ministries that are required to be involved to bring about a very ambitious work programme.

And then of course we've heard today about your significant investment into ensuring that child and safety well-being is very much to the fore of ERO. Are you able to help us understand the role of ERO when it comes to the children in care and what's the interplay with the ICM in terms of monitoring, given that there's a significant disproportionate number of young Māori and Pasifika and disabled actually in that cohort?

MR POLE: So the bill before the House at present is establishing a departmental agency which will have the current independent children's monitor which is under MSD transferred into a departmental agency, and the chief executive of that will have a range of powers which include, as you've mentioned, looking at the care standards, but that bill extends those to looking at the provision of health, welfare and education services for children in care and protection, or who may be at risk of being in care and protection.

And in that determination, there is an obligation on them to engage and to work through where those boundaries might sit. As you will no doubt be aware, the proposal is that they would be hosted by ERO. That is a hosting arrangement, so their strategic intentions and their focus in that is undertaken by the chief executive of that organisation.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you. Yes, so we understand the arrangements and how it will be set up, but given ERO's responsibility is to monitor all children in schools, the Independent Children's Monitor is simply under the national care standards, so the children in care.

I think the question is really around that operational level. Because we've talked about the lack of information sharing in a timely way, so wanting to understand the quality and the journey of our tamariki in care but who are also in schools, the feeding of that information back and forth so that we're really getting a real time picture of where it's at.

MR POLE: I would hope, in fulfilling their duties, the Independent Children's Monitor will have full access to as much information on the experiences of those in care as is available. But I would go a step further and say we've got woefully poor information here, and our work of a year or so back around learning in residential care, the educational experiences of those children, what they achieve, their desires, their passions, their successes, their challenges, was lost every time those children shift a location. Our systems do not support the transportability of that.

That's somewhat technical. There are also privacy considerations in that and I think it's something that we really need to address.

1	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Just as an aside, so there'll be some schools that are very
2	obvious in care, residences, but there'll be others in mainstream. Is that part of perhaps the
3	questionnaire of data that schools are required to keep that ERO might be privy to, the
4	number of children in a particular school who might be in care?
5	MS LEE: It could be something that we could request as part of the information gathering
6	exercise, yes. In relation to your question about the ICM, there is advantage of looking at
7	the life of the child in care and schooling and ensuring whether the intercepts and connects
8	and the impacts of that; I think that would answer your question.
9	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you, yes. Thank you very much.
10	CHAIR: I have three areas. The first you've already referred to, Mr Pole, and that's the residential
11	care, was it a review?
12	MR POLE: It was a nationwide study.
13	CHAIR: When was this done?
14	MR POLE: 2020, I think.
15	CHAIR: 2020?
16	MR POLE: Yes.
17	CHAIR: Was there a reason why that was done?
18	MR POLE: We have looked at residential care schools and education provision for those in
19	residential care or Youth Justice facilities previously
20	CHAIR: Sorry to interrupt you, did it include children in health institutions?
21	MR POLE: No, it didn't, it was Oranga Tamariki Care and Protection and YJ facilities.
22	CHAIR: So what were you looking what was the review about actually?
23	MR POLE: The prime review was around quality of educational provision for these young
24	people.
25	CHAIR: Was that contemporary or historic?
26	MR POLE: Contemporary, it was there and then and it looked at the quality of the providers and
27	it looked into the quality of practice generally and then how the system was working as a
28	system around this group of learners.
29	CHAIR: You will be aware that we of course have been investigating that as part of our major
30	work, and a major part of the voices of survivors who were held particularly in residential
31	care is the lack of education. In some cases none; in some cases, as we discussed
32	yesterday, coming to the school but actually not learning because of issues; some cases
33	their voices being disregarded, but a general picture of real educational neglect while
34	children were held in residences. You're aware of all of that?

1	MR POLE: Yes, I am.
2	CHAIR: That would be a backdrop to the work that you're doing now?
3	MR POLE: And our central finding in that work was these kids in those settings loved their
4	education experience. It was the first time for many of them, and we're talking about kids
5	who may have been 14 or 15, that they had had anyone who actually cared and took their
6	learning as a priority in their lives.
7	The question that we raised, though, was quite often that was for a very short spell if
8	these children or young people were on remand, or going through the YJ system. So our
9	observation
10	CHAIR: Because it was linked to the care they were in at that time?
11	MR POLE: It was linked to the placement. So our observation is how can you make that point
12	one where the system will wrap around these learners and sustain that commitment to their
13	education.
14	CHAIR: Thank you. Was there a published report on that?
15	MR POLE: Yes, there is, and I'm more than happy to give that to
16	CHAIR: I think we'd be very interested to receive that thank you.
17	MR POLE: I'll get that to the Commission.
18	CHAIR: I've got two more points and not enough time but I'm going to do it anyway because
19	they're both important. The first one relates to your interesting observations and suggestions
20	for recommendations about a complaint system, and in that light, I take it that you've read
21	the evidence of Leslie Hoskins who's coming, may be here already, to give evidence?
22	MR POLE: No, I haven't at this stage.
23	CHAIR: Can I just give this to you and it may be you need time to think about it and respond later
24	and if you do, please say so. In her brief of evidence she refers to the Education and
25	Training Act 2020 which introduced a dispute resolution scheme. Are you aware of that?
26	MR POLE: Yes, I am.
27	CHAIR: She says that it's to facilitate and promote the resolution of serious disputes between
28	students in State schools and it relate to racism, discrimination, physical emotional safety
29	etc. It seems that the Teaching Council had some reservations about this but it went ahead
30	anyway. Are you able to say how your recommendation for a complaints system would fit
31	in with would it fit in with this, would it replace this, would it be alongside this?
32	MR POLE: I think it should be absorbed in, but fulfilling a broader mandate.
33	CHAIR: So your complaints process might be part of this dispute resolution?

MR POLE: Yes.

CHAIR: You see that as a vehicle, maybe, for that to happen, so widening the scope of the dispute resolution.

MR POLE: Yes, and it's not just disputes resolution, it's how do we take what we're seeing and translate it to broader shifts in our policy settings.

CHAIR: Lessons learned, yeah. Thank you for that. The last point is this, and again, it brings it back to the people who we've heard most from and those are the survivors of historic abuse in care and I just wanted to let you know that we have a number of survivors watching on the livestream and some of them are indeed in the hearing room, who have experienced abuse through the education system. They went to schools where they were abused, and some of them were State schools, some of them were faithbased schools, and they come from a wide range of places, including [GRO-B], for example, which is a school you may well have heard of.

I just wondered if you were able to give those people who are watching now any message, and I appreciate I might have taken you by surprise here a little bit.

MR POLE: Well, firstly, as I said in my opening, I need to acknowledge that some horrific things have occurred at the hand of professionals in our institutional settings, which are abhorrent. As an educator and a professional, I'm deeply saddened by. I want to acknowledge their bravery and persistence for bringing these issues before us and out into the public. And that has involved a level of bravery.

In terms of what ERO can do and what we are doing, I hope we never see the need for a Commission again, and I look forward to your deliberations. I think it's, as a community, continuing to discuss and exchange views and ideas about how we get a stronger system.

I will equally say there are hundreds of thousands of learners at school today who are sitting in a classroom with a teacher who is passionately committed to their success, enhancing their identity and culture, who are equally ashamed by what some of those in their profession have done in our past. And so that's by way of a closing comment.

CHAIR: I think that is appreciated because it acknowledges the hurt and the impacts and, yes, and I think that's an important thing, but really importantly, and I think all the Commissioners have heard the many hundreds of people we've spoken to, the survivors all want the question, one thing, and that is for this to stop and for this to be prevented. And so all I can say is that I'm very grateful to you three for coming today to explain, first of all, your acceptance of what went on, but more importantly where we're going, the steps you're taking to hopefully make things better.

1	To you, Mr Pole, very grateful for your suggested recommendations. It's always
2	helpful when somebody else tries to do the work for you and we will take all the help that
3	we need. And we thank you two as well, wahine toa, for your reflections particularly on
4	the kaupapa Māori areas. Very important for us to hear the journey of that, the differences
5	in that and the way in which those different ways of working can be used for the bettermen
6	of all children in New Zealand. So thank you all very much for your evidence. The bell
7	has rung, you're let out, it's interval.
8	Shall we take a break while we change over or would you like to be seamless?
9	MS ANDERSON: I think we can be seamless.