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Executive Summary

Evaluation Evidence for Kaupapa Māori Teams

1. Literature review: A review of the relevant international and national literature on kaupapa Māori philosophy, the Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism, culture, and cultural competency, and whanaungatanga/engagement provides evidence of the theoretical grounding, credibility and validity of these approaches for the evaluation design and methodology, data analysis, and resulting recommendations for repositioning and strengthening the Kaupapa Māori Teams approach to service delivery.

2. Focus Groups and Interviews: Interviews capturing experiences, insights, and reflections of key persons (managers and team members) responsible for the design, development, and implementation of the four Kaupapa Māori Teams. Focus group interviews undertaken with the Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers; the non-Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers; the kaitakawaenga; Kaupapa Māori Team staff; family / whānau; Regional and District managers. Individual interviews undertaken with a school leader; two separate whānau members. All interviews were based around the research questions below.


Evidence emerging from the Evaluation Questions

Question 1. What have been the positive outcomes?

There have been positive outcomes from the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams. Although the implementation of the teams is in its infancy and requires significantly more support, the participants reported a developing team culture, in some instances a more culturally responsive service, and a strong desire to make the Kaupapa Māori Teams work for Māori, and non-Māori. However, a large majority of the participants across the interview groups felt that it was too early to tell if there had been positive outcomes for tamariki and whānau. The evaluation identified significant goodwill and commitment from the staff to achieve a culturally responsive service for Māori that transforms outcomes for whānau and tamariki.

Question 2. What is the underlying theory of action or logic model of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

From the analysis of the Kaupapa Māori Team documents, it is clear that among the upper management of SE, there existed a defined focus on initiating a change from the current state of delivery to a model predicted to result in more desirable outcomes for the organisation. This is
evidenced across the three key Kaupapa Māori Team documents. Moreover, the documents evidence aspects of both an explicit theory of action (how the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy will result in a change in practice) and a set of different desired outcomes: “Delivering our services in a way that encapsulates Māori values, principles, and beliefs” (p. 6). Though there was no evidence of a written, formal logic model for the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, it does appear that a number of resources and activities, as well as staff behaviours, skills, and dispositions, were identified as being critical underpinnings to the implementation. These are outlined in strategy documents as “critical success indicators”.

Question 3. How have SE staff gone about the design, development and implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

The Kaupapa Māori Team design, development and implementation appeared to be still in stages of initiation. Participants described a lack of understanding regarding the philosophy underpinning the implementation. This philosophy was more clearly articulated in the management interviews and became less evident in the data gathered from the field staff. Field staff were however able to articulate aspects of design and development that they believed should have been included, or were fundamental to success, such as increasing ownership through collaborative design and a clear communication strategy to the schools, services and whānau.

Question 4. How have the actual implementation strategies aligned with the original goals and objectives of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

Within the evaluation, this question serves as a gap analysis between the espoused theory of action, and the actual theory in practice. A gap analysis often serves to highlight the “knowing-doing gap” in an innovation, and in this way provides insights into next steps for managing the change initiative. This gap analysis was framed around the implicit logical model represented by the six critical success factors in order to examine the current status of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy implementation. Several gaps between intended implementation and actual implementation were noted, though the recently released Operational Plan includes the identification of these gaps, and recommendations to for next steps in bridging these gaps in implementation. In the evaluation gap analysis, consistent area to address were identified, including: coordinated and job-embedded professional development for staff; enhancing the role and status of kaitakawaenga; the use of the Poutama-Service Pathway as a resource; professional development and support of Māori leaders and leadership within SE and Kaupapa Māori Teams; and development of appropriate Māori assessment and specialist services tools and protocols.

Question 5. What are features that have supported or inhibited implementation?

Across the participants there was a strong support for the intent of the Kaupapa Māori Teams but clear indication that there were several features that inhibited implementation including a
lack of collaboration with Māori regarding the development of the teams. It appears that sharing
the implementation and operational plan may have supported a clear definition of the teams and
their purpose. The appropriation of staff into the teams appears to have weakened
implementation through a lack of culturally responsive capability to support the development of
the kaupapa (philosophy) being apparent in some teams. Participants report a need for
coordinated professional development and a consideration of time constraints that impact on
practice.

Question 6. What are the aspirations of whānau for the services delivered through a Kaupapa
Māori Team strategy, and the recommendations of SE and Kaupapa Māori Team staff for
meeting those aspirations?

A key consistent message was universal support for the intent of the Kaupapa Māori Teams and
the desire to improve cultural responsiveness to suit whānau needs. Although the concept is
still in its infancy, initiating the four teams and the review process has provided an opportunity
for involved parties to clarify what a successful Kaupapa Māori Team would look like. Whānau
interviewed had not been part of the Kaupapa Māori Teams but had received on-going service
from SE with a variety of field workers. The evidence demonstrates consistent themes regarding
the need for a philosophical base grounded in tikanga Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi, the
need for Māori leadership from the top, the inclusion of kaitakawaenga into the teams and
kaupapa Māori tools and assessment models to enable kaupapa Māori practice.

Recommendations

1. Model: Reconsider some elements of Kaupapa Māori Team model in consultation with
Māori staff, in order to solidify the intent of the strategy, give the opportunity for success
and avoid reinforcing deficit perceptions. Specifically, in view of the stated intent to enhance
“mainstream performance in the delivery of services to Māori”:
   a. Give increased value to cultural expertise and knowledge within the organisations’
      structure, and place experts within positions where they have a recognised role to
      support changed practice, particularly kaitakawaenga.
   b. Shift from an implicit expectation on individual Māori and non-Māori staff to bring
      organisational changes to an emphasis on staff acting as communities of learning and
      change within the wider organisation.
   c. Equitably resource the communities of learning and change initiative.
   d. Ensure children and whānau do receive improved services as result of the strategy to
      “encourage and support non-Māori staff in raising their performance and competence”.

2. Implementation: Within ongoing implementation, consolidate the wisdom and
aspirations of the original formation documents and of the wider Kaupapa Māori
Team staff, specifically:
   a. Revisit and enact the intentions of the Scoping Paper and Operational, Implementation
      Plans, including details that describe inherent elements of kaupapa Māori delivery,
b. Capture the knowledge and aspirations of all staff by:
   i. sharing report and recommendations with all Kaupapa Māori Team staff
   ii. holding a wānanga (or series of wānanga) with staff from Kaupapa Māori Team and wider regional Māori staff, to synthesise findings and consolidate aspirations
   iii. making collaborative decisions for the model and for next stages of implementation.

c. Align teams with the strategic intention of the Kaupapa Māori Teams by:
   i. implementing the earlier intention for Kaupapa Māori Team to rename themselves (avoiding confusion with the current name)
   ii. ensuring teams include a valid mixture of Māori and non-Māori field staff who are physically located together
   iii. allowing current team members to self-assess their current desire to engage in the kaupapa Māori service delivery in an enhanced form, and providing exit pathways for staff who wish to move
   iv. supporting the Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers to re-staff any resulting vacancies with best fit for kaupapa Māori aspirations and team synergies.

d. Give a clear voice to the Treaty of Waitangi and Ka Hikitia philosophies as underpinning all processes and practices for staff and wider audiences.

e. Communicate across wider staff groups and stakeholder communities on the role and responsibilities of Kaupapa Māori Team and responsibility of wider staff for whānau.

3. Leadership and resourcing: Position kaupapa Māori as core business and create communities of learning and resources to bring about the practice and organisational change discussed in formation documents, specifically:

   a. Continue to ensure that the leadership of the Kaupapa Māori Teams is held by Service Managers who are Māori.

   b. Create a Service Manager-led pool of kaitakawaenga across teams and, recognising the significance of positional roles with the larger organisation, give kaitakawaenga a recognised organisational role which allows them to give leadership and support to practice change.

   c. Develop communities of learning (eg based on the multidisciplinary health model, where hierarchical power is flattened and holders of many types of expertise, (such as ‘culture bearers’) have roles of influence, equal status, and “shared problem solving” is the expected norm for practice.

   d. Provide a mandate for the four Kaupapa Māori Teams to hold regular team reflection and question time so that the communities of learning can actively work as such.

   e. Use existing SE resources (such as the Poutama-Service Pathway) and develop further resources that support kaupapa Māori practices, including:
      i. understanding the importance of taking a fundamentally strengths-based, rather than deficit-based, approach with whānau members
ii. recognising that whanaungatanga within service delivery is not a step in an intervention process, but is an ongoing relational process through-out; sometimes whanaungatanga is the intervention; whanaungatanga needs to be developed internally within the Kaupapa Māori Teams and time is required for this

iii. implementing professional service delivery in a way that is not simply a translation of a western-based intervention. This will require the development, piloting and refinement of Māori protocols and intervention strategies and te reo Māori assessments for language and speech pathology services.

4. Professional development: Target a workforce development strategy to recruit, retain and up-skill Kaupapa Māori Team staff as teams, using a communities of learning approach and including:
   a. Cultivating ownership of this workforce strategy at all levels of SE.
   b. Shifting emphasis from self-selected, individually-focused professional development that occurs on own time, to team-focused, job-embedded, and ongoing professional development, and include training in the kaitakawaenga model of practice and use of Te Hikoitanga, Ka Hikitia and Tataiako frameworks. Establishing, resourcing, and self-assessment/monitoring of team time to ensure
      i. regular reflection engagements to make the communities of learning real
      ii. noho marae, waiata, karakia and other te ao Māori activities are undertaken as appropriate.
   c. Provide for two-way learning processes, eg enable kaitakawaenga to attend psychological or other training events to strengthen co-working and the clinical-cultural interface; providing opportunities for specialist service providers to participate in cultural learning opportunities with kaitakawaenga.

5. Evaluation: Prioritise use and development of culturally appropriate and responsive kaupapa Māori assessment tools to support practice, including:
   a. Ensuring cultural appropriateness of assessments (eg assessments in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Te Kōhanga Reo be undertaken in te reo Māori):
      i. actively resource the development of new culturally responsive tools.
      ii. actively resource the cultural enhancement and adaptation of current tools.
   b. Ongoing evaluation to assess:
      i. service delivery – how culturally responsive are our services?
      ii. outcomes for staff (non-Māori and Māori) – is there increased cultural competency amongst our staff?
      iii. outcomes for children and whānau including cultural safety – are we actively seeking the voice of whānau about our services?
Synthesis

The undertaking of this project called for systematic attention to the acquisition of existing knowledge and practice within the Kaupapa Māori Teams, understanding and acting upon the research findings, and giving reasoned attention to interpreting the findings. When all was done, three constructs of reflection, reaffirmation and repositioning, synthesised for the research team, the overall picture. While the recommendations are summative in nature, it is a formative approach that is being promoted here within ongoing implementation. We want to improve as we move forward – a marker of whakapapa.
Section 1: Background and Purpose of the Evaluation

This is the draft final report of the evaluation of Kaupapa Māori Teams, conducted in response to the Ministry of Education’s RFP for Research and Evaluation of Kaupapa Māori Teams Special Education to provide an initial evidential base of their effectiveness, efficacy and appropriateness for Māori students with special education needs. The report covers key aspects of the evaluation methodology and findings, and provides evidence-based recommendations for refining and strengthening the Kaupapa Māori Team programme as an innovation in the delivery of special education services in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The purpose of the evaluation was to carefully examine the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team programme as a case study of an educational innovation within its real-life context.

Context

This evaluative project supports the Ministry of Education in planning to meet its goals for Māori education. These are set out in Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008–2012 (Ministry of Education, 2008), (Ka Hikitia). This strategic document outlines the need for the education sector to lift its performance in the area of Māori education, by ensuring that Māori are able to enjoy education success ‘as Māori’, the overarching strategic intent of Ka Hikitia is “Managing for Success”. As documented in the RFP, the Ministry of Education, Special Education (SE), has developed a responsivity framework - Te Hikoitanga - to guide organisational efforts to providing culturally responsive services to Māori; services that take a Māori potential approach by acknowledging the right of tamariki and whānau to help determine the best service outcomes for them. Such services are required to be accessible of high quality, culturally relevant, and flexible enough to meet the diverse realities of tamariki and whānau. This has required SE to look at different and more effective ways of structuring and delivering special education services to Māori. One initiative that has emanated out of Te Hikoitanga has been the setting up of Kaupapa Māori Teams within the northern region. The development of Kaupapa Māori Teams is intended to draw from the evidence about what works best for and with Māori. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine how kaupapa Māori philosophy and pedagogy influences the structure (team systems), the staffing (capacity, capability, teaming) and the operationalisation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams, and is therefore able to support and contribute to achieving the MOEs strategic goals for Māori.

Evaluation Research Questions

In the RFP for this contract, SE’s stated desire for the evaluation was to focus “specifically on understanding the effectiveness of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in the Northern Region within the context of the Auckland Strategy.” Therefore, our research design centred on the question of the Strategy’s intended benefits to students as the entry point to more fully understanding how each of the four Kaupapa Māori Teams had undertaken their work to
enhance service provision for Māori children, and their whānau. With this purpose in mind, we proposed a multi-site case study with the guiding research question:

What have been the specific benefits to Māori children and their whānau from the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in each of the four teams?

The individual Kaupapa Māori Team site investigations were to then be guided by the following focus questions:

1. What have been the positive outcomes for children and whānau at each Kaupapa Māori Team site?
2. What are unique features of the context that have supported the positive outcomes for children and whānau?
3. How has each of the specific Kaupapa Māori Team contexts gone about the design, development and implementation of the strategy?
4. What has been the inferred or explicit theory of action or logic model of each of the sites?
5. How have the implementation strategies and outcomes from each site aligned with the original goals and objectives of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

The initial phase of the evaluation research was guided by this central research question and sought evidence of processes and outcomes to address these issues. However, from our initial site visit with SE personnel and subsequent data analysis, it became evident that the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy was still in the initial implementation stage. It thus seemed premature to turn our focus to examining the outcomes and effectiveness of an innovation at that early stage. Therefore, we recast the evaluation framework as a case study of the larger Kaupapa Māori Team programme rather than each of the sites, as to better reflect the actual level of implementation within the existing context.

The revised evaluation question that subsequently guided the second phase of data collection and the final data analysis was as follows:

How have SE staff gone about the design, development and implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

What have been the positive outcomes?

Our final analysis of the data was then guided by the following focus questions:

1. What is the underlying theory of action or logic model of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?
2. What are the features that have supported or inhibited the implementation?
3. How have the actual implementation strategies aligned with the original goals and objectives of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

4. What are the aspirations of whānau for the services delivered through a Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, and the recommendations of SE and Kaupapa Māori Team staff for meeting those aspirations?
Section 2: Literature Review

In a scoping paper entitled ‘The development of Special Education teams working within Kaupapa Māori philosophies’ (Ministry of Education, 2010, p. 6), it is recommended that the Kaupapa Māori Teams be referred to as “teams working under a kaupapa Māori framework.” Kaupapa Māori is further defined in ‘The Kaupapa Māori Teams Operational Plan’ (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 4) as “Delivering our services in a way that encapsulates Māori values, principles and beliefs.” This description encompasses the notion that the implementation of ‘te ao Māori’ (a Māori worldview) in any context is synonymous with working within a kaupapa Māori framework. A Vision Statement, and a Mission Statement are also provided in the Operational Plan. These are respectively stated as:

“Providing quality support services in a kaupapa Māori way that allows children and young people to address their educational needs.”

“We will provide specialist support for children and young people in a kaupapa Māori way as a response to client identified needs that enable access to high quality special education services.”

The purpose of this Literature Review is to report on the literature specific to kaupapa Māori philosophy, the Treaty of Waitangi, culture, cultural competency, and whanaungatanga/engagement. The review draws from a range of key imperatives that are relevant to culturally responsive special education service delivery.

Kaupapa Māori

According to Pihama, Cram and Walker (2002), kaupapa Māori is about “being Māori” and the implicit understanding that Māori have a distinct way of viewing and interpreting the world. This standpoint positions Māori at the centre, with explorations of deeds, thoughts and events being undertaken from within a Māori perspective; ‘from the inside out, not from the outside in’ (Penehira, Cram & Pipi, 2003, p.5). Adopting a stance that is kaupapa Māori purports that a unique epistemological tradition shapes the ways in which Māori view the world, how Māori are organised within the world, the questions that Māori pose, and the solutions that Māori seek (L. Smith, 2000). This is in tandem with Nepe (1991), who describes kaupapa Māori as a conceptualisation of Māori knowledge that derives from distinctive cultural epistemology and metaphysical foundations, and implies a way of framing and structuring how people think about ideas and practices. In essence, these authors maintain that kaupapa Māori represents a way of doing based on a way of knowing.

In more recent times, the term is used by Māori to affirm any plan of action that is essentially created by Māori, and which expresses and reflects Māori aspirations, ideals, values and perspectives (Royal, 2006). It encompasses Māori-preferred ways of undertaking initiatives and
activities by defining the processes through which plans of action are made evident. The expression is commonly used as a way of distinguishing Māori values, principles and approaches from those held by non-Māori. Linda Smith (2005) contends that kaupapa Māori is a synthesis of foundational principles that enable Māori to undertake work that is intended to make a positive difference for Māori. Graham Smith (1997) asserts that in order to effect positive intervention and transformation for Māori, kaupapa Māori initiatives must impact at the levels of both ‘institution’ (policy, ideology, power, resourcing and leadership) and ‘mode’ (practice, pedagogy, curriculum, monitoring and evaluation). Embedding kaupapa Māori in an existing organisation thus has the potential to challenge and critique expressions of dominant hegemony at both the policy and practice levels across a range of social domains as it seeks to ensure that cultural values, expertise and aspirations are equitably endorsed and resourced. (Pihama, 2001).

Bishop and Glynn (1999) state that any initiative or project that involves and impacts on Māori, needs to be guided by members of the Māori community, with the opportunity to determine - from the outset - if benefits will accrue for Māori should the initiative proceed. To that end, Bishop’s (1996) ‘Initiation, Benefits, Representation, Legitimation, Accountability’ (IBRLA) Framework is able to guide how power-sharing relationships are established, even before the initiative begins. Table 1 (below) outlines how the framework is able to guide the planning of activities involving Māori.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Considerations to reflect upon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Initiation</td>
<td>• Who will initiate the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will Māori be involved in initiating this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will initiation happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Benefits</td>
<td>• Who will benefit from this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will there be any benefits for Māori?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the benefits that will accrue for Māori?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Representation</td>
<td>• Whose perspectives and aspirations are represented in and driving this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will Māori perspectives and aspirations be represented in this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who will attest to this – and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Legitimation</td>
<td>• How will Māori perspectives and aspirations be legitimated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who will determine this – and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will Māori be involved in this process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Accountability</td>
<td>• How will we ensure accountability to Māori?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will we store and share our information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will we ensure that our original vision and aspirations remain on track?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bishop (1996) maintains that kaupapa Māori approaches to social change initiatives must include Māori thinking and Māori voice. According to Smith and Cram (1997), kaupapa Māori can be seen as reflecting the elements of social change that are common to both revitalisation initiatives and resistance initiatives for Māori, and further assert that there is a need for change initiatives that are targeted towards Māori to be based within distinctly Māori frameworks. They declare that the Treaty of Waitangi has (particularly in the past three decades) provided a great deal of moral, ethical and strategic impetus for enabling kaupapa Māori philosophy to become more widely premised.

The Treaty of Waitangi

As the founding document of this country, the Treaty of Waitangi signifies a bicultural partnership which requires each of the partners to act respectfully, reasonably, and in good faith towards the other. The concept of 'biculturalism', as a treaty-based notion, was first introduced by Dr Ranginui Walker in 1973, to highlight the growing educational under-achievement of Māori children, and to enunciate the importance of Māori becoming familiar with their own culture and identity (Tooley, 2000). Being 'bicultural', according to Walker (1996) means understanding the values and norms of both treaty partners, being comfortable in either Māori or Pākehā culture, and ensuring that there is power sharing in decision making processes at all political and organisational levels. In order to operate within a position that is consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi, there is a need to relate to a bicultural and bilingual 'centre' or 'core' - as well as to be cognisant of the multicultural nature of the New Zealand population (Macfarlane, Blampied & Macfarlane, 2011). Herbert (2010) contends that the Treaty of Waitangi is surely the strongest rationale and most robust framework for guiding practitioners’ professional learning and development, and effecting organisational responsibility to Māori.

A plethora of strategic and legislative education documents espouse the importance of the treaty in shaping policy and practice, specifically:

- **Te Urunga Mai o te Rā: Special Education Māori Strategy** (Ministry of Education, 2002)
- **The Specialist Service Standards** (Ministry of Education, 2006)
- **Te Whāriki: The Early Childhood Curriculum** (Ministry of Education, 1996)
- **The New Zealand Curriculum** (Ministry of Education, 2007)
- **Te Marautanga o Aotearoa** (Ministry of Education, 2008b)

The Treaty of Waitangi has particular significance in SE, as it is concerned with matters of social justice through the concepts of inclusion, equity, and power sharing.
Listening to culture

The notion of ‘listening to culture’ has generated much interest at a national level over the past two decades (Clark, Smith & Pomare, 1996; Glynn, 1997; Glynn & Macfarlane, 2000; Glynn et al., 1998; M. Hohepa, 1993, 1999; Macfarlane, 2000a, 2000b, 2004, 2007; Penetito, 1996; G. Smith, 1992; L. Smith, 1999). These researchers have reiterated the importance of professionals, across a range of societal disciplines, being models for the expression of respect for cultural difference, and for power-sharing, equity and inclusion. An inclusive education system, according to Hardman, Drew and Egan (1999), must draw from indigenous culture in shaping knowledge bases and pedagogies within and across educational programmes, while fostering attitudes of respect and appreciation for all cultures.

Durie (2003, p. 2) declares that “Culture is a convenient way of describing the ways members of a group understand each other and communicate that understanding.” Culture is described by Winzer and Mazurek (1998) as something that grows out of the past, but functions in the present, inferring that culture has a history, and that this history influences current realities for people. According to Zion (2005, p. 3), culture is “....the system of shared beliefs, values, customs, behaviours, and artefacts that the members of society use to interact with their world and with one another.” The sentiments inherent in all of the above statements are also reflected by Quest Rapuara (1992, p. 7):

“Culture is what holds a community together, giving a common framework of meaning. It includes how people communicate with each other, how we make decisions, how we structure our families and who we think is important. It expresses our values towards land and time and our attitudes towards work and play, good and evil, reward and punishment.

Connolly, Crichton-Hill and Ward (2005) align with the above statement, and also touch on aspects specific to group decision-making, group management, and group behaviour. They declare that ‘culture’ relates to particular elements which are commonly shared by a group of people, thereby connecting them in terms of how they experience and perceive the world around them. These perceptions, they suggest, guide day-to-day living, influence how decisions are made and by whom, and determine what is perceived to be appropriate and inappropriate behaviour within any given context. Culture is therefore related to behaviour and environment (and how these are collectively managed), and the shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterise a particular group. These views also resonate with those espoused by Phinney and Rotheram (1987), who maintain that there are culturally-linked ways of thinking, feeling and acting that are acquired through group membership socialisation.

The Māori Education Strategy, Ka Hikitia (Ministry of Education, 2008a) focuses on the significance of culture, and states that it is the responsibility of the entire education sector to
draw from Māori evidences and cultural imperatives, and tailor provision in order to ensure that Māori are enjoying educational success – as Māori.

Cultural competency

The term ‘cultural competency’ first emerged in the health care literature in a 1989 article penned by Cross, Bazron, Dennis and Isaacs (Thomson, 2005). These authors declare that cultural competency is about the congruency of behaviour, attitudes and policies that converge in an organisation or amongst professionals, that enable the organisation and the professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations. According to Berryman (2008) cultural competency refers to the ability to learn from, relate to, and interact respectfully with people from one’s own and other cultures. This is expanded on further by Durie (2003, p. 2) who states that:

“Cultural competence is the acquisition of skills so that we are better able to understand members of other cultures in order to achieve best outcomes….it is about being able to understand the people who we are going to deal with, as practitioners…

Sue (2001, p. 802) contends that cultural competency is about practitioners having the “….awareness, knowledge and skills needed to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society”, and therefore to develop the “ability to communicate, interact, negotiate, and intervene on behalf of clients from diverse backgrounds.” Sue asserts that organisations must support this concept by engaging in actions and creating conditions that maximise the development of inclusive, equitable and culturally safe systems for clients and professionals.

Cultural safety centres on the relationship between the ‘client and the service provider / professional, and promotes the notion of safeguarding client care by ‘doing no harm’. It is defined as the state of being in which a child or young person experiences that their personal wellbeing (including their social and cultural frames of reference), is acknowledged by the professionals who are engaged to help, and that her or his needs and those of her or his whānau will be treated with dignity and respect (Ramsden, 1997). This latter point includes the right of whānau to participate collaboratively in decisions-making with professionals / service providers. Ramsden (2002, p. 6) declares that:

“Cultural Safety is a mechanism which allows the recipient of care to say whether or not the service is safe for them to approach and use. Safety is a subjective word deliberately chosen to give the power to the consumer.”
Culturally responsive services

Over the past decade throughout numerous countries worldwide, the term ‘culturally responsive’ has gathered impetus as a means of prescribing and describing services that are provided to diverse clients within the social service sectors, including health, welfare, justice and education. From an organisational perspective, cultural responsiveness embodies both cultural competency and cultural safety (Macfarlane, 2011), however the latter two need to remain discrete sub-groups by virtue of the fact that their parameters are determined by different cohorts (practitioner and client respectively). Given that this is the case, then cultural responsibility is (in part) dependent on both of the other two components being actualised, with evidence specific to both being available to validate that claim. In determining if a particular service or practice is culturally responsive, then the voice of the whānau (the client) must lead this discussion. A further issue that emanates out of the literature is that fact that cultural competency is an endeavour that is able to be (indeed needs to be) planned for so that cultural safety (client care) is more likely to ensue (Ramsden, 2002). It could therefore be argued that any organisation that ensures that their professional representatives are culturally competent values the cultural safety of their clients. As Sue (2001, p. 801) reminds us, the delivery of culturally responsive services “....must be about social justice”.

As an organisational responsibility, planning for and developing professionals’ cultural competency is an endeavour that encapsulates the process of deconstructing kaupapa Māori theory and prevailing ideas into new modes of thinking that inform practice skills, and further enable and contribute to ongoing reflection. The dialectic between theory and practice, and thought and action - which develop themselves mutually – is defined by Pedretti (1996) as a critical reflective culture, known as praxis. Carr and Kemmis (1986, p. 33) describe praxis as:

“Informed action which by reflection on its character and consequences reflexively changes the knowledge-base which informs it. In praxis the ideas that guide action are just as subject to change as the action itself. Therefore, only through a fundamental shift in our beliefs, values and feelings about teaching and learning will we be effective in bringing about significant change in our practice. Creating a culture of critical reflection enhances our educative potential, and provides practitioners with opportunities to deconstruct conventional academic practices, whilst effectively participating in genuine school/university collaboration.”

Paul Freire (1997) builds on the notion of praxis by introducing the concept of conscientisation, which is described as decreasing the distance between what one says and what one does. Freire argues that conscientisation means becoming critically aware of the world around us and the relationships that we have with it; becoming more conscious of one's own thinking about - and actions within - that environment. He states that it involves analysing and then seeing the world in a more precise way; of seeing how society works and adopting a better way of understanding problems. Freire maintains that conscientisation is also about aspects of power.
(including understanding what it means not having power), and also involves having a deeper reading of reality, common sense and beyond.

McKinley, Brayboy and Castagno (2008) contend that culturally responsive education services comprise several important elements, specifically:

- pedagogy;
- policy;
- programmes;
- practitioner competency, and;
- community involvement.

These authors also insist that any discussion on the topic of culturally responsive pedagogy must take into account issues of sovereignty and prejudice, as well as the worldviews and epistemologies of the indigenous people. This view aligns with Macfarlane (2011) who reminds us that for special education services, bringing effect to the notion of cultural responsibility is contingent on such things as culturally targeted resourcing, culturally congruent policies, culturally relevant literature and research evidence, culturally compatible systems, and culturally competent professionals.

Dorie (2007, p.11) talks about the “cultural-clinical interface” in professional practice, and discusses the risks associated with professionals undervaluing and/or dismissing cultural practice as the “lesser practice”. Durie insists that when working with Māori, a Māori worldview must shape and drive the parameters of practice, and that the underlying methodological base depends on Māori-preferred approaches to relationships and notions of influence that retain a spiritual element. Concepts of connectedness, associated with an ecological approach to understanding issues and challenges, create a framework for responding to need whereby external (rather than internal psychological or biological) factors are afforded priority. In contrast many conventional service approaches derive legitimacy and credibility solely from scientific method and evidence-based conclusions. Despite the differences, Durie declares that the two ‘practices’ need to be reconciled, as jointly they lead to innovative responses. The practice of blending clinical and cultural streams is illustrated by way of the concept of Tō Tātou Waka (Macfarlane, Blampied & Macfarlane, 2011). ‘Tō tātou waka’ literally translates as ‘our canoe’, indicating that paddling (moving forward) needs to be carried out in collaboration and in partnership by those who are wanting to advance best outcomes. Tō Tātou Waka demonstrates how the cultural-clinical interface needs to be aligned, ensuring that both practice components are accorded due status and respect (see Figure 1 Below).
Whanaungatanga

Whanaungatanga, as a core Māori construct, can be seen as the process of engagement through and by which relationships, connections, obligations and responsibilities between people are strengthened. According to Durie (1997), whanaungatanga is an intergenerational support process that is fundamental to all professional interactions with Māori, and is something which can rarely be passive. From an organisational perspective, it necessitates active planning, adequate time allocation and resourcing, and full acknowledgement for the influence that it has on the enablement of meaningful Māori development. Whanaungatanga, when done well, engenders collective responsibility amongst Māori for each other’s well-being, especially through a commitment to sharing knowledge freely among members of a group. Macfarlane (2004) reports on a kuia (senior Māori woman) who was describing a positive special education service that her mokopuna had received; she declared that ‘whanaungatanga itself was the intervention’.
Literature review summary

According to Bevan-Brown (2002), and Bishop and Glynn (1999), culturally responsive special education service provision for Māori will not emerge from revisiting current (and oftentimes inadequate and unsuccessful) approaches. It is also suggested that the answers to these pursuits lie within the sense-making and knowledge-generating processes that emanate from Māori (G. Smith, 1995; Bishop, 1996). These authors all argue that most of the answers that will benefit Māori students in mainstream education (including special education) are to be found within te ao Māori (Māori settings and contexts that are premised on kaupapa Māori philosophy; Māori specialists with cultural expertise), and that these settings and people are a source of untapped strength and potential.

Conventional approaches and interventions in special education continue to be driven by western psychology and educational theories. Kagitcibasi (1996) offers an integrated approach, one in which the traditions of psychology (which continue to inform special education practice) pay due cognisance to indigenous cultural imperatives specific to content and context without wholly forfeiting sound strategies and competencies. The above messages highlight the significance of personal beliefs, values, theory and practice approaches, and how they must be cognisant of kaupapa Māori perspectives if they are to be biculturally and culturally responsive.
Section 3: Evaluation Method

Overview of the Evaluation Methodology

The methodology for the evaluation was designed using a kaupapa Māori research approach as described by Penetito (2005): the agenda is Māori, Māori drive the project, Māori are the significant participants as are members of the research team; the control and analysis of the project is in Māori hands; and the knowledge produced is likely to provide evidence that will improve educational outcomes for Māori students.

Our approach to the evaluation design was guided by the Ministry of Education's stated desire to focus “specifically on understanding the effectiveness” of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in the Northern Region within the context of the Auckland Strategy.” Therefore, our entry point in this evaluation was “benefits to students.” Our initial methodology was thus framed as a cross-site-case study in order to examine the implementation and outcomes across the four Kaupapa Māori Team sites.

However, after our initial site visit and data collection, our phase one findings suggested that the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy was still at the initial stages of implementation. We therefore reframed the evaluation as a single case study design focused on the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy more broadly, rather than on each site. The guiding questions were also recast in order to ensure that the resulting evaluation and recommendations serve to guide the refinement and continuous improvement of the Kaupapa Māori Team project.

The evaluation encompassed three major sources of data and evidence: Literature Review; Focus groups and interviews; and Kaupapa Māori Team documents. Data analysis was completed using constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and inductive analysis (Patton, 1990) to identify patterns, themes, and categories that “emerge out of the data” (p. 390).

Bicultural Approach to the Evaluation

Any study in education, especially evaluation projects which seek to better understand the implementation of innovative programmes to support teaching and learning, will best be achieved by researchers who are themselves positioned within the communities being researched. In this way, the research is linked to community and is accountable to community – kura, whānau, hapū and iwi. Kaupapa Māori research is about the advancement of the people whose lives are directly affected by the research, Māori communities, with benefits for the wider communities.

Our evaluation design was guided by a set of principles that reflect beliefs in Māori rangatiratanga or empowerment to define research parameters and outcomes. Therefore the design sought to operationalise the rangatiratanga of those involved in the Kaupapa Māori
Team project—both Māori and non-Māori staff—and the local communities, whānau, and students affected by the programme.

The research team used Māori cultural protocols when there was opportunity during the site visit with the Kaupapa Māori Team staff at the Ministry, which included the less formal elements of mihimihi, hongi me te hariru, karakia, sharing of kai, and poroporoaki. A fluent speaker of te reo Māori attended all data collection focus groups where Māori staff members were participating. Though some participants did occasionally use te reo Māori phrases or sentences to capture a key idea or concept, none of the focus groups were conducted fully in te reo.

**Evaluation Methodology: Co-construction and Evidence-based Revision**

As previously noted, in designing our initial research plan we have been guided by a commitment to kaupapa Māori research design. In this way, we have been guided by a set of principles that reflect beliefs in Māori rangatiratanga or empowerment to define research parameters and outcomes, and co-construct the evaluation in ways that will best serve the local community. Therefore, throughout the evaluation we have maintained on-going engagement with SE and Kaupapa Māori Team staff to refine and adapt the evaluation design and data collection processes to ensure a final report and recommendations that will be useful for identifying existing strengths of this strategy and to inform continuous improvement toward the aspirational goals of SE and their clients.

Our ongoing approach to the research design has been guided by SE’s stated desire to focus “specifically on understanding the effectiveness of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in the Northern Region within the context of the Auckland Strategy.” Therefore, we initially framed the evaluation to examine both the outcomes from and implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy across the four team site - three teams in Manukau (two Early and Ongoing Support teams and one 8-Plus team) and one team in Auckland City (Early and Ongoing Support team). The initial central research question was:

What have been the specific benefits to Māori children and their whānau from the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in each of the four teams?

To address this question, we proposed conducting site-investigations (case studies) in each Kaupapa Māori Team setting. Using site-based cases would allow identification of the beneficial outcomes for children and whānau in relation to the unique, context-specific ways that each Kaupapa Māori Team had implemented. This would enable the identification of common constructs and practices across the sites that were suggestive of the key features necessary for taking the innovation to scale. The focus questions for the site-investigations were:

- What are unique features of the context that have supported the positive outcomes for children and whānau?
• How have each of the specific Kaupapa Māori Team contexts gone about the design, development and implementation of the strategy?
• What has been the inferred or explicit theory of action or logic model of each of the sites?
• How have the implementation strategies and outcomes from each site aligned with the original goals and objectives of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

This evaluation design guided our planning with SE staff for initiating the data collection in September 2011. The result of that site visit and initial data analysis, indicated that the Kaupapa Māori Teams strategy was still at an initial level of implementation. Therefore, a multi-site case study design was unlikely to continue to be informative to SE and Kaupapa Māori Team staff regarding continued refinement and continuous improvement of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy.

Consequently, using this evidence-base we reframed the evaluation design. We retained the case study as our overarching evaluative research model. We shifted our unit of analysis from a focus on the individual sites (micro level implementation) to the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy as a whole (macro level implementation). Maintaining the overarching case study approach continued to allow us to carefully examine the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy as an educational innovation within its real-life context. To guide the revised evaluation approach, we also recast the overarching research questions:

How have SE staff gone about the design, development and implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

What have been the positive outcomes?

Our final analysis of the data was then guided by the following focus questions:

• What is the underlying theory of action or logic model of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?
• What are the features that have supported or inhibited the implementation?
• How have the actual implementation strategies aligned with the original goals and objectives of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?
• What are the aspirations of whānau for the services delivered through a Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, and the recommendations of SE and Kaupapa Māori Team staff for meeting those aspirations?

Ethics Review and Approval

The evaluation proposal was reviewed and approved by the Canterbury University Education Ethics Committee, including review of all data collection processes, interview protocols and questions, communications and consent forms for research participants, and procedures to
protect the confidentiality of the data and participants. Full approval was granted by the committee on 9 September 2011.

All participants in the evaluation were provided with a personal copy of the information sheet about the project and agreed voluntarily to participation; we have assured the confidentiality of their individual responses and that names will not be reported in the research. Signed consents will be kept on file as required by our ethics approval process for a period of years until all data are eventually destroyed.

Although we have revised the evaluation design, the interviews and focus groups were conducted in alignment with the original protocols approved by the committee.

**Data Collection and Evidence**

The evaluation encompassed three major sources of data and evidence:

1. Literature review: A review of the relevant international and national literature on kaupapa Māori philosophy, the Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism, culture, and cultural competency, and whanaungatanga/engagement provides evidence of the theoretical grounding, credibility and validity of these approaches for the evaluation design and methodology, data analysis, and resulting recommendations for repositioning and strengthening the Kaupapa Māori Teams approach to service delivery.

2. Focus Groups and Interviews: Interviews capturing experiences, insights, and reflections of key persons (managers and team members) responsible for the design, development, and implementation of the four Kaupapa Māori Teams. Focus group interviews undertaken with the Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers; the non-Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers; the kaitakawaenga; Kaupapa Māori Team staff; family / whānau; Regional and District managers. Individual interviews undertaken with a school leader; two separate whānau members. All interviews were based around the research questions below.


**Focus Groups & Interviews**

With the support of Wiremu Manaia (Pouwhakarewa: Northern Region), the research team was able to arrange for the initial site visit on 22 September 2011. The site visit began with a pōwhiri and the research team was invited to share an overview of the research plan and process with SE staff. The research team was very appreciative of this opportunity, as it reflected a kaupapa
Māori approach to building relationships within which the evaluation and research could be co-constructed.

In consultation with the research team, SE was able to arrange interviews on that day with Kaupapa Māori Team members and other SE employees who were identified as being relevant to the research and evaluation of this project. These groups included:

- Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers - as one focus group
- Two staff from each Kaupapa Māori Team - as 2 focus groups
- Service Managers (SMs) from other (general) teams (the non-Kaupapa Māori Team SMs) - as one focus group
- The kaitakawaenga – as one focus group.

The focus group interview schedules for each of these groups is attached (Appendix 2).

Due to unforeseen circumstances, we were unable to conduct the interviews with whānau, school leaders, and the regional and district managers which had been scheduled for 1 November 2011. In consultation with Wiremu Manaia, we arranged for the second round of site visit interviews to be undertaken on 18 November 2011.

One of the evaluation team members conducted a focus group interview via teleconference with the regional and district managers on 14 November 2011. Two of the evaluation team members conducted the second site visit to Auckland (18 November 2011) and held two interviews: one which included two whānau/caregivers, and another with a school leader. Members of two further whānau were interviewed at separate times via teleconference (25 November 2011 and 28 November 2011, respectively). The purpose of these interviews was to capture Māori aspirational perspectives regarding their views of what they would want from a kaupapa Māori service in terms of process, responsibility, and outcomes for their tamaiti/tamariki.

The evaluation team were supported by the Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers and the kaitakawaenga in identifying particular whānau for the interviews, and for setting up the interview times. We believed it was more appropriate and expeditious to use the expertise and networks of the Service Managers and the kaitakawaenga in identifying and engaging the four whānau/caregivers for the focus group and telephone interviews. We felt that this process would best support the whanaungatanga process where the Service Managers and the kaitakawaenga already had established relationships.

All focus groups and interviews were transcribed in full. For the purposes of the presentation of the data within the findings section, we have removed names and any identifying information in order to maintain the confidentiality of the interviewees.

All participants were voluntary, therefore there is no focus group or interview data reflecting the voice of those who choose not to participate.
Data Analysis

Data analysis was completed using constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and inductive analysis (Patton, 1990) to identify patterns, themes, and categories that "emerge out of the data" (p. 390).

Patton (1990, p. 376) has argued, "The first decision to be made in analysing interviews is whether to begin with case analysis or cross-case analysis." We elected to initially analyse the focus group interviews of Kaupapa Māori Team staff, Kaupapa Māori Team and non- Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers and kaitakawaenga as individual cases. The focus groups were arranged as "role alike" groups, and as such there were likely to be multiple and differing perspectives among the group members. Therefore, we wanted first to understand both the common themes and perspectives among the participants within each role group, as well as identify any divergent or outlying experiences. Once themes and patterns were identified within each of the “role groups” we were then able to engage in cross-case analysis of five focus groups, using the constant comparison method to identify patterns in responses to common questions and “analyze different perspectives on central issues” (Patton, 1990, p. 376), and thus illuminate how different role groups were engaging with and experiencing the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy.

We applied a similar analysis process to the focus group with the district and regional managers - treating it first as a case analysis, and then building it into our cross-case analysis of the Kaupapa Māori Team role-alike groups. For the individual interviews with whānau, we also began with each interview as its own story or narrative of aspiration before looking across the interviews for common patterns and perspectives. This further allowed us to ensure all facets of the evaluation process were aligned with the principles of the kaupapa Māori research approach, in particular the maintenance of the mana of the participants.

A content analysis was also conducted on the three key Kaupapa Māori Team documents: Kaupapa Māori Team Draft Operational Plan (May 2011), Implementation Plan (2010), and Scoping Paper (Feb 2010). The analysis also followed an inductive process in order to identify patterns and themes across the historical progression of documents.

Once we had identified patterns and categories from the interview data and the document analysis, we then examined these findings in relation to the research question and focus questions. The resulting Findings (Section 4) are presented with these questions as the analytic framework, and interview data and data from the analysis of the Kaupapa Māori Team documents is summarised for each question.
Section Summary

The methodology for the evaluation was designed using a kaupapa Māori research approach as described by Penetito (2005) where the agenda is Māori, Māori drive and control the project and the knowledge produced is likely to provide evidence that will improve educational outcomes for Māori students.

The evaluation encompassed three major sources of data and evidence: Literature Review; Focus groups and interviews; and Kaupapa Māori Team documents. Data analysis was completed using constant comparative methods and inductive analysis to identify patterns, themes, and categories.

The evaluation design was guided by SE’s focus “specifically on understanding the effectiveness” of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in the Northern Region within the context of the Auckland Strategy.” Therefore, our entry point in this evaluation was the Strategy’s intended “benefits to students.” However, the initial site visit and phase one findings suggested that the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy was still at the initial stages of implementation. The evaluation was therefore reframed as a single case study design focused on the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy more broadly. The guiding questions were also recast in order to ensure that the resulting evaluation and recommendations serve to guide the refinement and continuous improvement of the Kaupapa Māori Teams.
Section 4: Findings

This section summarises key findings from all data sources for each of the five original research questions underpinning the evaluation and an additional question six which was added after the initial interview round.

Question 1: What have been the positive outcomes?

A large majority of the participants across the interview groups felt that it was too early to tell if there had been positive outcomes for tamariki and whānau. However there was an indication in the data that there had been some positive outcomes from the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams including: the development of a team culture; a more culturally responsive service; and a strong desire to make the Kaupapa Māori Teams work for Māori.

Developing a culture of Kaupapa Māori Team

Working collaboratively in the Kaupapa Māori Teams has bought about a developing culture which with sustenance might provide a foundation for future development. Staff within the Kaupapa Māori Teams acknowledged that they have seen change in their colleagues’ views and practices since being in the team. Leadership within the Kaupapa Māori Teams is clearly a feature which contributes to the developing culture, as does the input of the kaitakawaenga. The skills bought by the Kaupapa Māori Team Service managers and kaitakawaenga are valued by the field workers. In some interviews the collaborative stories of case work between Māori and non-Māori were evidence of the benefits of collaborative partnerships.

We’re starting to create a common culture in the office you know. It may not be moving fast enough for a lot of us, but I believe there’s movement you know, little movement. So you know as opposed to saying you know or recognising all the deficits. I think we really need to acknowledge the little steps that have been taken as well.

Time spent developing the culture through waiata practice and professional learning had contributed to the development of the team culture. The participants indicated that the development of the team culture is likely to be enhanced by seating the team together, developing collaborative working relationships and ensuring the team had professional learning and development (PLD) opportunities together.

A more culturally responsive service

With focused development there is clearly the potential to cultivate a more culturally responsive service. The field staff particularly noted that having Māori Service Managers means more responsive service for all, non-Māori staff describe staff as having empathy for the kaupapa and report that they are growing in confidence when working with whānau. For some staff, the
Kaupapa Māori Team represented working within a treaty model, as this staff member explained;

> What’s unique about it is that from my own perspective there’s an expectation for my staff to be responding in a more culturally appropriate manner. That’s underpinned by the korowai of the Treaty of Waitangi or even the concepts of what kaupapa Māori is, which should be embracing Māori philosophy, Māori values, Māori principles and Māori beliefs. That should be actually underpinning their mahi with our kids.

There were however, contradictory feelings about the extent to which the philosophy could be implemented. Staff supported the Kaupapa Māori Team in theory but felt that staff required specific skills to enact the philosophy. In essence the cultural responsiveness of the service depended on the staff knowledge of tikanga, waiata, karakia and te reo. It appeared from the interviews that professional learning in these areas needs to be valued by the organisation and leadership.

> I support the philosophy of a Kaupapa Māori Team but the Kaupapa Māori Teams will only work if there is the support from above and if the makeup of the teams have at least a basic understanding of te reo, tikanga, waiata, working with whānau Māori

One staff member commented that the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team has led to a waitlist reduction according to field staff.

> I guess it’s reduced our waitlist hugely, that’s been one of the positive things about working in the team. We have access to you know special education, psychologist, so we have a lot more speech language therapists because that’s been the area of main you know where children are waiting for service has been around communication and language.

**A strong desire to make it work**

Despite the reported lack of progress articulated by many of the participants throughout the interviews there was a strong desire to implement the Kaupapa Māori Teams and make it work. The staff articulated a strong commitment to provide a more appropriate service for Māori.

> There seems to be lots of goodwill on the part of some of the team members that do really want to engage in that space.

> There’s a desire there, I think it can be made much more tangible you know then perhaps they could be there to grab hold of.

Furthermore the regional responsibility and buy in was evident as both field staff and managers talked about the potential benefits of the Kaupapa Māori Teams. Several staff countered criticisms of the implementation by stating that they supported the idea of the Kaupapa Māori Team and did not want to lose them. While the Kaupapa Māori Teams are not at the stage
where staff can clearly articulate positive outcomes, several acknowledged that they were taking baby steps forward and making small gains.

*But see for me now that we have three Kaupapa Māori Teams in place I’d still hate to lose them.*

**Summary of Question 1 findings**

There have been positive outcomes from the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams. Although the implementation of the teams is in its infancy and requires significantly more support the participants reported a developing team culture, and in some instances a more culturally responsive service and a strong desire to make the Kaupapa Māori Teams work for Māori. However, a large majority of the participants across the interview groups felt that it was too early to tell if there had been positive outcomes for tamariki and whānau. The research evaluation identified significant goodwill and commitment from the staff to achieve a culturally responsive service for Māori that transforms outcomes for whānau and tamariki.
Question 2: What is the underlying theory of action or logic model of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

A theory of action is the set of underlying assumptions about how to move or change an organisation from its current state of practice to a new desired future. It also reflects the assumed causal relationship between what the organisation does and what constitutes a “good result” or high-quality outcome for the organisation. Therefore, in an evaluation of a change strategy where the focus is on trying to figure out what is working and why, it is helpful to have a thorough understanding of how the strategy was intended to work. Often in a change strategy a logic model will be developed to provide a systematic and visual way to represent the relationships among the expected changes or results, the planned activities for achieving the results, the resources available to initiate and then operate the strategy and resulting changed structures of the organisation.

From the analysis of the Kaupapa Māori Team documents, it is clear that among the upper management of SE, there existed a defined focus on initiating a change from the current state of delivery to a model predicted to result in more desirable outcomes for the organisation. This is evidenced across the three key Kaupapa Māori Team documents. Moreover, the documents evidence of aspects of both an explicit theory of action, as well as implicit assumptions underpinning the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy.

In Scoping Paper (Feb 2010), the change in the SE delivery for the Northern Region is referred to as “The Auckland Strategy — Resetting the Agenda: Sharpening our Focus” (p. 3). This clearly signals a change in delivery, and an assumption that the resulting change will bring about a different desired result and outcome. The definition of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in the Implementation Plan (Aug 2010) reflects the explicit statement of the theory of action; that is, how the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy will result in a change in practice and a different set of desired outcomes: “Delivering our services in a way that encapsulates Māori values, principles, and beliefs” (p. 6). Moreover, in the Scoping Paper a kaupapa Māori framework was provided to explicitly outline the philosophical underpinnings of this envisioned practice (pp. 8-9).

The Kaupapa Māori Team theory of action is even more clearly and fully articulated in the subsequent Operational Plan (May 2011):

“...these teams are led by Māori Managers, mostly staffed by non-Māori specialist but they operate in accordance with Māori values and beliefs. This structure is deliberate and has been created ‘to encourage and support non-Māori staff in raising their performance and competence’ with addressing the specific needs of Māori clients and their whānau and consequently, producing better outcomes for Māori overall. Delivering better services to Māori is the responsibility of all SE staff, not just Māori, and the Kaupapa Māori Teams are another mechanism for developing this area of the organisations performance. In many ways, the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy is actually
a strategy for enhancing mainstream performance in the delivery of services to Maori." (p. 6. emphasis in original).

In other words, the assumed causal relationship undergirding this change strategy is that if the organisation increases the “performance and competence” of non-Māori staff to deliver their specialist services in more culturally responsive ways, the result will be enhanced performance in the delivery of service to Māori children and whānau and produce better outcomes.

Though there was no evidence of a written, formal logic model for the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, it does appear that within upper management of SE a number of resources and activities, as well as staff behaviours, skills, and dispositions, were identified as being critical underpinnings to the implementation. The Implementation Plan outlines six “Critical Success Factors” (p. 8-9) as follows:

1. A level of proficiency in te reo and tikanga Māori with the resources available to ensure this can be addressed.
2. A willingness amongst all staff to work in a kaupapa Māori way and to understand and appreciate what that means.
3. The appropriate placement of Māori staff within the Kaupapa Māori Teams.
4. Māori input and involvement in workforce development in particular recruitment, induction, training, development and retention.
5. The acceptance and inclusion of kaupapa Māori as a strategic component of core business in particular Ka Hikitia and Te Hikoitanga.
6. Sufficient and equitable resourcing of strategies for the successful delivery of kaupapa Māori services and the effective delivery of quality services to Maori.

These critical success factors reflect the management-identified implementation strategies, resources and activities needed to support the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy’s theory of action. In this way they serve as an implied logic model in that they represent the implicit assumptions regarding the relationships among the desired changes or outcomes, the activities required to achieve those results and the necessary resources to enact the change.

Professional development for staff appears to be seen by SE management to be a key driver of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy’s theory of action. The Scoping Paper highlighted the professional development for staff as an “imperative” resource and activity within the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy in order to achieve the desired change in delivery of services (p. 10). The following necessary basic skills and knowledge were identified as a focus of the professional development, though it was indicated that this was not an exhaustive list and would need to be continuously built on:

1. **Te Ao Māori** – A strong understanding of a Māori world view i.e. Whare Tapa Whā.
2. **Mana Tangata** – A secure sense of personal identity. The first step in understanding a Māori world view is understanding and accepting your own world view. Before staff can understand, appreciate and respect Māori culture they must have a sound knowledge and respect for their own culture.
3. **Te Reo Māori** – A level of proficiency in Māori language.
4. **Karakia and Himene** – Know some basic Māori prayers and hymns.
5. **Waiata Māori** – A selection of Māori songs for participating in ceremonies.
6. **Tikanga Māori** – An understanding of Māori customs and protocols.
7. **Māturanga Māori** - An understanding of Māori history & Māori education.
8. **Wānanga Māori** – Active participation in Māori learning processes i.e. Marae based mātauranga Māori workshops.
9. **Tiriti of Waitangi** – Knowledge of the articles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and what they mean and/or completion of a Treaty of Waitangi Workshop.
10. **Hapū and Iwi** – Knowledge of Māori history within their region i.e. local hapū, Iwi, Māori organisations & communities.
11. **Māori Hui** – Active participation in Māori hui and consultation with whānau, hapū and Iwi.
12. **Te Ao Tawhito** – A willingness to accept traditional Māori beliefs and to apply them in a contemporary setting.

**Summary of Question 2 findings**

From the analysis of the Kaupapa Māori Team documents, it is clear that among the upper management of SE, there existed a defined focus on initiating a change from the current state of delivery to a model predicted to result in more desirable outcomes for the organisation. This is evidenced across the three key Kaupapa Māori Team documents. Moreover, within the documents evidence of aspects of both an explicit theory of action; that is, how the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy will result in a change in practice and a different set of desired outcomes: “Delivering our services in a way that encapsulates Māori values, principles, and beliefs” (p. 6). Though there was no evidence of a written, formal logic model for the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, it does appear that a number of resources and activities, as well as staff behaviours, skills, and dispositions, were identified as being critical underpinnings to the implementation. These are outlined in strategy documents as “critical success indicators.”
Question 3: How have SE staff gone about the design, development and implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

The Kaupapa Māori Team design, development and implementation appeared to be still in the stages of initiation. Participants described a lack of understanding regarding the philosophy underpinning the implementation. This philosophy was more clearly articulated in the management interviews and became less evident in the data gathered from the field staff. Field staff were however able to articulate aspects of design and development that they believed should have been included, or were fundamental to success, such as increasing ownership through collaborative design and a clear communication strategy to the schools, services and whānau.

**Philosophy underpinning the design, development and implementation**

Across the field staff interview groups participants were concerned at the lack of articulated philosophy from within the framework. *Ka Hikitia* and the Treaty of Waitangi were often referred as the foundation of the intervention, but there was a call for a stronger philosophical approach to underpin the service. For some staff in particular they felt that the lack of philosophy had led to the Kaupapa Māori Team becoming an ‘add on’ to normal practice. They described the dominant ‘ways of working’ as still very much ingrained in the Kaupapa Māori Team and the additional ‘add ons’ were expected such as additional cultural competencies.

> What they’ve done is they’ve come up with this idealistic way of looking at working a cultural model, but utilising a western perspective on that and not going back into the community, back into the iwi, into the hapū to see what’s successful….. If we’re writing a kaupapa Māori team …. if it was in the true sense then we would be led by those that with the expertise within that role.

While there was acknowledgement of the Kaupapa Māori Team framework and operational plan, it appeared not to have been used to guide practice. The senior managers were able to articulate the rationale behind the design and development of the team and refer to the implied action. However many field staff were unaware of the documents until very recently and felt that they had not been led by a philosophical movement but rather a practical implementation. There was agreement that the foundation documents should be *Ka Hikitia* and The Treaty of Waitangi, but many staff discussed a deeper te ao Māori worldview potentially informing practice.

**Involvement of field staff both non-Māori and Māori in development**

The design and development of the plan appeared to be come from the SE management. From the data it is clear that both Māori and non-Māori staff felt that they could have contributed to the design and development of an appropriate service. It became apparent through the analysis that the field staff did not have ownership over the Kaupapa Māori Teams as they considered it had not come from Māori, or was not informed by the field staff practice.
Furthermore there was concern that the lack of detail in the design and development had led to inconsistencies across the provision, due in part by the variety of skills amongst the field workers and their interpretation of what it meant to be in a Kaupapa Māori Team. There was a definite sense however that the staff wanted to move forward, to bring consistency to the service and ensure the design and development prefaced a national implementation.

So how can we roll this out and make it happen with our whānau; though we’ve got our own ways of working with our teams I think it would be good for us to get some consistency in terms of right across the district and if they want to roll this out nationally then let’s get a strong foundation to work from.

Communication to communities

The design and development of the team appears to require a comprehensive communications plan to accompany the implementation. While the participants felt that schools and whānau wanted a kaupapa Māori approach, they were not entirely clear about what that would mean in practice.

I think also some of the challenges have come from, it’s okay for us to be set up as Kaupapa Māori Teams but the communication plan around that out to the communities, particularly Māori communities, well we’re still waiting for the catch up around that. And working with schools, yes you know, acknowledging that we’re Kaupapa Māori Teams but what does that mean for them, principals are saying. So what does that mean for me when I’ve got a child with severe and challenging behaviours who is Māori, you know what are you doing differently for that child.

Māori staff in particular noted the potential resource of the Māori community to support both whānau and practitioners. Clear communication to schools, principals and the community would ensure clarity around the purpose of Kaupapa Māori Teams and support a different way of working in the community.

Summary of Question 3 findings

The Kaupapa Māori Team design, development and implementation appeared to be still in the stages of initiation. Participants described a lack of understanding regarding the philosophy underpinning the implementation. This philosophy was more clearly articulated in the management interviews and became less evident in the data gathered from the field staff. Field staff were however able to articulate aspects of design and development that they believed should have been included, or were fundamental to success, such as increasing ownership through collaborative design, and a clear communication strategy to the schools, services and whānau.
Question 4: How have the actual implementation strategies and outcomes aligned with the original goals and objectives of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy?

Within the evaluation, this question serves as a gap analysis between the espoused theory of action, and the actual theory in practice. A gap analysis often serves to highlight the “knowing-doing gap” in an innovation, and in this way provides insights into next steps for managing the change strategy.

The Kaupapa Māori Team Implementation Plan (Aug 2010) outlines six strategic goals and objectives for the strategy, and further indicates that these strategy goals are grounded in the SE strategic goals. Accordingly, the strategic goals and objectives established by SE management for the Kaupapa Māori Teams are listed as follows:

1. To provide quality services to tamariki and rangatahi with special education needs, their whānau and kaiako in early childhood and school sectors with a specific focus on Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Kura.

2. Networking with people across the wider Ministry of Education, other agencies, Māori and Iwi organisations’ to improve the quality of services.

3. To build confidence and expertise in supporting tamariki and rangatahi with special education needs through the provision of kaupapa Māori quality services.

4. To manage and allocate a range of kaiako (teacher) aide and support worker services i.e. Education Support Workers.

5. To provide advice on the network of services and facilities within the wider education sector, for tamariki and rangatahi with special education needs in a kaupapa Māori way.

6. To work with a kura, whānau, hapū, iwi, resource teachers and kaitakawaenga to provide integrated services to Māori.

To meet these goals, six “critical success factors” were identified. As discussed previously, these six factors can be understood as the implicit logic model of Kaupapa Māori Team strategy. As an evaluation tool, a logic model supports evidence-based feedback for conducting a gap analysis of an innovation. Therefore, these six critical success factors are used here to examine the current status of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy implementation. The data for the desired implementation activities and resources are drawn from the document analysis, particularly from the Scoping Paper and the Implementation Plan. The staff interviews serve as the data source for the actual implementation activities and resources.
**A level of proficiency in te reo and tikanga Māori with the resources available to ensure this can be addressed.**

**Desired implementation:**

1. Hire Māori Service Managers in each Kaupapa Māori Team with the skills and ability to lead a specialist service team, fluency in te reo Māori, strong skills in tikanga and credibility with iwi.
2. Support services staff to develop a level of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori knowledge to ensure our interactions with Māori clients who contact us are responsive.
3. Te reo and tikanga Māori is a standard part of how the teams operate.

**Actual implementation:**

All teams have Māori Service Managers who are fluent in te reo Maori, have strong skills in tikanga, and have built relationships with iwi. However, the recruitment and staffing of these teams, and the subsequent consolidation of leadership within these positions and personnel was not complete until well into implementation phase. At least one team had experienced a series of changes in leadership which had consequences for their team development and service delivery.

Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers reported feeling confident in their knowledge of kaupapa Māori and tikanga, though they reported receiving little formal leadership development for their roles, nor with respect to leading a specialist team within the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy framework. They also noted that they did not receive dedicated time for their own leadership team-building or for wānanga for reflecting and sharing insights into implementation barriers and successes.

Team members reported that they have been encouraged to access a variety of resources to support their individual learning of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori, and many of those who were interviewed have taken these opportunities. This has included self-initiated engagement with the kaitakawaenga. They noted that the te reo Māori learning has been done in their own time, and additional to their work day. They reported there has been no job-embedded, organised professional development provided specifically for the teams with respect to te reo Māori and tikanga, or the kaupapa Māori framework of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy. From the participant data, it does not appear that the teams were provided with a cohesive and planned induction into the kaupapa Māori philosophy and appropriate corresponding tikanga.

Team members in some teams reported the use of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori in some of their team activities. Most often cited were the use of karakia and waiata. This was not consistent across, or within, teams. Some staff noted that, in their team, the use of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori seemed inhibited by the lack of full participation from all team members.
A willingness amongst all staff to work in a kaupapa Māori way and to understand and appreciate what that means.

**Desired implementation activities and resources:**

1. Provide specialist services that follow the Poutama–Service Pathway ensuring that explicit emphasis is placed on identifying and using Māori indicators.
2. Māori models of practice are actively promoted and used.
3. Ensure staff within the teams who are committed to delivering in a culturally responsive way.
4. Encourage the development of a learning community to ensure that staff grow, develop and carry out services in ways that get better outcomes and are more responsive.

**Actual implementation activities and resources:**

Staff did not voluntarily mention the Poutama-Service Pathway as a resource. However, many staff did express a desire for a clear set of expectations for a framework of practice for the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy and Māori models of practice, and felt that such resources would assist them in their learning toward more culturally responsive practice. They were open to and seeking this guidance from the organisation.

The staff who participated in the interviews were supportive of and committed to the delivery of services in a culturally responsive way and working within a kaupapa Māori philosophy in their specialist practice. However, the sample in the interview was small and may not be fully representative of the wider team members. During the interview, those present expressed this concern, and noted that they had team members who were not as engaged.

Across all the role-groups, a consistent concern raised was the establishment of the teams. They all noted that staff were “placed” into the Kaupapa Māori Teams, being notified via email of this change in their location and assignment. This meant that some staff now in the Kaupapa Māori Teams were not predisposed to work within a kaupapa Māori framework, and have displayed some resistance. Non-Kaupapa Māori Team managers noted that other staff in SE, who would have been eager to be part of the teams, are dismayed at not having the opportunity to opt in.

The Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers also expressed concern that they were not provided with the opportunity to select staff into their teams so as to assure the team members had the initial disposition toward understanding and appreciating working in a kaupapa Māori way and a commitment to their own learning and development in culturally responsive service delivery.

Staff and managers both reported that there was significant potential benefit in having the Kaupapa Māori Teams arranged as multidisciplinary specialist teams. They expressed a positive sense of the possibilities of coordinating their services. In order to leverage these
benefits they felt that more organisational support was needed in team-building and collaboration among and across the teams. Not all of the members of some teams are actually co-located, and there has yet to be a coordinated, employer-organised and supported joint forum for all four Kaupapa Māori Teams to meet together. Presently there is no indication that individual teams, or the wider Kaupapa Māori Team membership, are forming the desired ethos and patterns of engagement reflective of a learning community.

The appropriate placement of Māori staff within the Kaupapa Māori Teams.

Desired implementation activities and resources:

1. Establish four Service Manager positions, with Managers able to manage in a kaupapa Māori way, and to ensure the teams are Māori led.
2. Have a full complement of professional skills located within the teams and both Māori and non-Māori staff within the teams.
3. The kaitakawaenga will report to the Service Manager of the team in which they are located, but will work to a virtual team concept, meeting together regularly to reflect, and supported by the Pouwhakarewa and Practice Advisor Māori.
4. Kaitakawaenga will be used to assist the Māori teams in performing their role and to support them in understanding how to work under kaupapa Māori philosophies.

Actual implementation activities and resources:

As noted previously, all Kaupapa Māori Teams now have Māori leadership. Kaupapa Māori Team staff and managers expressed support for the teams being representative of a bicultural approach of having both Māori and non-Māori staff. However, at present the teams are heavily tilted toward non-Māori staffing ratios, with some teams having no Māori field staff. This disproportionality in staffing was noted as a concern by all role-groups, including the kaitakawaenga and the non-Kaupapa Māori Team managers. There was agreement that within each team and across the teams there needed to be more Māori staff within the teams to fully support the implementation and development of the strategy.

Kaupapa Māori Team staff and managers strongly expressed supportive views of the critical role that the kaitakawaenga play (and need to play) in the teams, and in ensuring positive outcomes in service delivery. Field staff shared numerous examples of how working closely with the kaitakawaenga supported them in enhancing their practice, and assisted them in developing more culturally responsive practice. It is clear from their comments that the present arrangement of the kaitakawaenga not being a member of a designated Kaupapa Māori Team has resulted in limiting field staffs’ ability to fully develop their cultural competency skills for responding to the needs of children and whānau. The Kaupapa Māori Team managers and kaitakawaenga also expressed concerns with this arrangement, as well as the current lack of on-going, planned wānanga for the kaitakawaenga.
Māori input and involvement in workforce development in particular recruitment, induction, training, development and retention.

Desired implementation activities and resources:

1. Provide specialist services that follow the Poutama–Service Pathway to support more culturally responsive service delivery.
2. Continue to develop SE workforce so that each person begins/continues their Te Hikoitanga journey developing their cultural responsivity skills.
3. Kaupapa Māori Teams will develop their own pathways for professional development based on their specific needs.
4. Kaitakawaenga are used to assist the Māori teams in performing their role and to support them in understanding how to work under kaupapa Māori philosophies.
5. Kaitakawaenga will receive awhi and be given opportunities to reflect on their practice and learn from each other.

Actual implementation activities and resources:

Across all the role-groups, there was expressed desire to ensure a high-quality, ongoing programme of professional development and training was available for all staff, managers and for kaitakawaenga. They felt that the focus of this professional development and training needed to focus on enhancing the culturally responsive practices in service delivery and on supporting the development of Māori into specialist fields. They noted that many of the specialist roles were filled mainly by non-Māori staff, and this was a long-term barrier to the SE goal of having kaupapa Māori philosophy and culturally responsive practice normalised within the service delivery.

Examples of issues and concerns with induction, professional learning and development and the recruitment of staff into the Kaupapa Māori Teams have been outlined in previous sections. However, a significant issue in this area appears to be the structure of and expectation for professional learning and development. While teams and individual team members have been afforded some latitude in identifying their own learning needs and pathways for professional development, some staff and Kaupapa Māori Team managers felt that a more coordinated, organised, and fully resourced induction programme, as well as on-going, focused learning opportunities were needed. Also, staff were strong in the opinion that the kaitakawaenga had to be at the centre of the learning support, and they indicated that if that was to happen then they needed to have organisational status and recognition of their cultural expertise and their leadership in professional learning. The kaitakawaenga equally felt strongly about wanting to be engaged in supporting the team members’ learning, however they also shared some examples of having their guidance and knowledge refused or ignored by some of the field team members.
The acceptance and inclusion of kaupapa Māori as a strategic component of core business in particular Ka Hikitia and Te Hikoitanga.

Desired implementation activities and resources:

1. All remaining teams will work within a bicultural team model working towards enhancing their service provision to Māori children and young people and their whānau.
2. Staff will have input into the naming of the Kaupapa Māori Teams. Naming is an important function in te ao Māori.
3. Continue to develop SE workforce so that each person begins/continues their Te Hikoitanga journey developing their cultural responsivity skills. Ultimately we want all practitioners to be able to transform Māori focussed theory into action in their own practice.

Actual implementation activities and resources:

All role-groups expressed support for the need for culturally responsive practices and kaupapa Māori philosophies and practices to become the way that ‘business as usual’ is done. They shared SE management’s expectation that this goal was necessary and much needed in order to enhance delivery of services and outcomes for Māori children and whānau. They frequently expressed the view that culturally responsive practice should be the norm and expectation of professional behaviour and actions for all staff in all roles within SE. So, they were concerned that by having four designated “Kaupapa Māori Teams” could thus lead to other staff in non-Kaupapa Māori Teams believing that they were not accountable for practicing in a bicultural and culturally responsive way.

The Kaupapa Māori Team and non-Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers spoke about the need to clarify the name of the Kaupapa Māori Teams, as they felt it was causing issues of confusion within and among the staff. This echoed the concerns expressed by participants in the scoping process, as evidenced in the Scoping Paper. At present, the Kaupapa Māori Teams have not begun the process of naming themselves, and so this remains an ongoing issue in the implementation.

This element again raises and highlights the need for professional development as previously addressed.

Sufficient and equitable resourcing of strategies for the successful delivery of kaupapa Māori services and the effective delivery of quality services to Māori.

Desired implementation activities and resources:

1. Provide specialist services that follow the Poutama – Service Pathway
2. Ensure explicit emphasis is placed on identifying and using Māori indicators.
3. Share Māori indicators through the wider teams and bicultural communities of practice and learning.
4. Support changes through the leadership of Practice Advisor Māori, Pouwhakarewa and Service Managers.
5. A learning community will be encouraged.
6. Kaitakawaenga will receive awhi and be given opportunities to reflect on their practice and learn from each other.
7. Professional development is imperative and needs to support staff in developing skills aligned with Māori values and beliefs, these have been identified as Kaupapa Māori Professional Development Skills in the Scoping Paper.
8. A working party should be developed to manage and monitor the development of a kaupapa Māori framework in collaboration with the recently appointed Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers.
9. Māori assessment tools with staff fully trained in their implementation and use.

**Actual implementation activities and resources:**

It is evident that the SE management team continues to examine and reflect on the implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, as the recently developed Operational Plan (May 2011) includes both a practices framework and other recommendations that have been identified to adjust and enhance the strategy implementation.

Included in the plan is the He Taura Tikanga: The Kaupapa Māori Practice Framework, a set of guidelines and examples of culturally responsive practices. They are intended to "provide staff with guidelines for applying internal team processes in a kaupapa Māori way" and “information on how to deliver specialist support services in a kaupapa Māori way” (p. 6). The Operational Plan also outlines six recommendations that SE management team has identified in response to “problems and issues identifies as potential difficulties” if not addressed. These include:

1. Kaupapa Māori Team staff should either know or have a commitment to learn Māori philosophical beliefs and Māori worldview.
2. Kaupapa Māori Team staff should engage in kaupapa Māori professional development and training.
3. Kaupapa Māori Team staff should have access to, or the ability to develop, appropriate resources, tools and assessment mechanisms that will allow them to practice and deliver services in a kaupapa Māori way.
4. Kaupapa Māori Team staff should have easy and timely access to kaitakawaenga in order to receive practical support and advice on kaupapa Māori service delivery practices.
5. Kaitakawaenga should be line managed within the Kaupapa Māori Teams by the Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers so that they are able to model kaupapa Māori philosophy - what the Kaupapa Māori Team staff need to know. They would still be
available to other staff in their districts but their direct line manager should be a KMT Service Manager.

6. Kaupapa Māori Team staff should be enrolled for Māori Language Attestation: Poipoia Te Reo Māori, and for Māori Cultural Supervision: He Kaiwhakahaere Ahurea, as part of professional development in te reo Māori and tikanga Māori.

Many of the key resources issues will be addressed through the enactment of responses to these recommendations. Other implementation resourcing issues have been addressed throughout this section in response to prior “critical elements.” Among these, some of the key resources outlined include:

- the imperative of professional development for all staff
- enhancing the role and status of kaitakawaenga
- the use of the Poutama-Service Pathway as a resource
- professional development and support of Māori leaders and leadership within SE and Kaupapa Māori Teams.

Summary of Question 4 findings

Within the evaluation, this question serves as a gap analysis between the espoused theory of action, and the actual theory in practice. A gap analysis often serves to highlight the “knowing-doing gap” in an innovation, and in this way provides insights into next steps for managing the change strategy. This gap analysis was framed around the implicit logical model represented by the six critical success factors in order to examine the current status of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy implementation. Several gaps between intended implementation and actual implementation were noted, though the recently released Operational Plan includes the identification of these gaps, and recommendations to for next steps in bridging these gaps in implementation. In the evaluation gap analysis, consistent area to address were identified, including: coordinated and job-embedded professional development for staff; enhancing the role and status of kaitakawaenga; the use of the Poutama-Service Pathway as a resource; professional development and support of Māori leaders and leadership within SE and Kaupapa Māori Teams; and development of appropriate Māori assessment and specialist services tools and protocols.
Question 5: What are features that have supported or inhibited the implementation?

Across the participants there was a strong support for the intent of Kaupapa Māori Teams but clear indication that there were several features that inhibited its implementation including; a lack of collaboration with Māori, the lack of a clear definition and implementation plan, staff capability, the need for coordinated professional development and time constraints that impact on practice.

**Collaboration with Māori**

Despite strong support for the intent across respondents there was a low level of ownership in programme development from most staff. Many respondents felt there was a lack of collaboration with Māori in both the design and implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams concept.

> At the moment I’ve got an absolute disconnect with this document because I haven’t been a part of forming it. I’ve been told about it after the fact.

> Reiterating that in terms of the scheme of the, the conception of kaupapa Māori within Special Education was not Māori driven and consultation with us has been just about nothing and it’s all been based by non-Māori.

Among the staff, lack of input into the initial scope of establishing the three teams was also seen as inhibiting successful implementation by trialling and thereby stretching human resources across multiple centres.

> …the ideal would have been one team so we would trial that you know. And when they said three teams we were like oh god and we were all scratching our heads wondering how we’re going to do that. Yes and I’d still support the Kaupapa Māori Team. I think it can work, we need to trial it, develop it before we even go and increase the team.

The disbanding of the Te Rōpu Rātonga caused discord amongst some groups as this went hand-in-hand with the introduction of the Kaupapa Māori Teams, which in turn had some bearing on how it was received by Māori staff in particular. Several groups highlighted the strengths of the Rōpū but felt there had not been the opportunity for these successes to inform the development of the Kaupapa Māori Teams.

> Before the strategy came along and the Kaupapa Māori Teams were, were spoken about when you think about it we actually had a Kaupapa Māori Team in place. It was called Te Rōpu Ratonga. It was comprised of Māori in their different fields of expertise with a manager there as well.

The importance of Kaupapa Māori Teams delivering to Māori was seen as critical to success by several groups but had not appeared to inform or be reflected in implementation. In particular, the omission of the kaitakawaenga in the development, implementation and membership of the
teams was evident in the data and their involvement was widely viewed as a key factor in achieving success. The development and implementation was widely viewed as being ‘top-down’ and not including internal Māori voices which could have contributed greatly to the level of ownership and implementation.

Need for Clear Definition of the Concept and Implementation Plan

Although there was not great universal clarity regarding the vision or model for the Kaupapa Māori Teams concept there was universal support for its intent and a strong desire for it to succeed. Some articulated the vision of Kaupapa Māori Teams as providing quality services in a kaupapa Māori way to meet the needs of Māori children and young people in a culturally responsive manner. There was strong support for this vision but confusion surrounding how this was to be translated into better provision for Māori.

A key theme was there was no clearly defined articulation of the concept or its implementation across multiple sites. Without a visible implementation plan the three teams were largely left to their own devices resulting in an inconsistent and ad hoc approach to implementation. There was a strong desire across the groups to develop better models of practice to meet whānau needs but staff needed a clear articulation of the kaupapa Māori philosophy and how this translated into practice to better embody and implement a kaupapa Māori method.

You know if field staff in a Māori Kaupapa Team actually had a manual that says, this is the Māori Kaupapa Team it is our philosophy and this is how we are going to work it. This is what we’re going to do, Yeah, Field staff. Or service manager it would be good to have one of those as well. All the service Management want to need to know.

Despite universal support for practicing in a more culturally responsive manner, there was a noticeable difference between Māori and non-Māori staff in understanding how practice could better meet whānau needs. There was agreement that clearly establishing the philosophy, an implementation plan and articulating culturally responsive best practice for all staff is needed.

The Formation and Management of the Kaupapa Māori Teams

The implementation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams appears to be highly influenced by the attribution of staff. A recurring theme across the groups was the lack of consultation and thought given to the construction of the staff within the teams. Some staff commented that they felt the teams were ‘set up to fail’ as staff who were not culturally competent, and some who were not interested in working in a kaupapa Māori way were placed into the Kaupapa Māori Teams by managers. While staff understood that the optimal make-up of the Kaupapa Māori Teams was constrained by the numbers of suitably qualified and skilled Māori staff, from the perspective of the participants this resulted in reduced staff cultural competency which impeded successful implementation.
At the outset we had hoped for a 50/50 mix of staff (Māori/non-Māori) but that did not happen – hence where we are now.

I guess from a Māori perspective I see our team as just mainstream really. ….We don’t have you know SLTs with fluency in te reo so that’s where our team breaks down I think. So of my, my feeling is that I, I work mainstream really. Our team is mainstream.

There was agreement the underlying challenge of recruiting and retaining Māori in SE was an important factor.  Not including kaitakawaenga in the teams was also seen to compound the problem as there was limited cultural competency amongst team members and those most culturally competent (kaitakawaenga) were not utilised.

The rationale around that thinking was that there was an assumption that those members in the Kaupapa Māori Team are capable of carrying out kaitakawaenga duties as because we know today that’s not quite the case.

There was tension in how the teams had been formed as selection did not appear to be based on competency or willingness to be involved.

Some of the team people wanted to be in the teams, some of them had no choice, so with that we’ve work with the team members to bring them up to a platform of okay I feel comfortable with this to move forward.

The biggest thing is developing and influencing staff who actually didn’t by choice did not want to be in this team you know. So I had seven staff, I think only three of them selected to be in my team out of the seven. So I had four staff that I needed to convince over time.

The ad hoc nature of selection appears to have jeopardised the success of the initial implementation. It appears that this process could have been improved through stronger input from the Kaupapa Māori Team Managers and the inclusion of kaitakawaenga as central to team development.

Professional Development

There appeared to be a diverse range of cultural capability within the teams, originally it was assumed Kaupapa Māori Team staff were to be culturally competent but participants reported that this did not eventuate. Team members without a strong Māori background expected a robust induction programme would accompany their selection with several commenting on the need for structured professional development and the pressure they felt to instantly ‘become Māori’ overnight without adequate resourcing.

You get the impression sometimes it’s totally my responsibility to suddenly become Māori. And okay it is part my responsibility but I’m sure it’s partly their responsibility
to provide the resources for it. The resources are there. And that clarity wasn’t there when the Kaupapa Māori Teams were put into place.

All agreed the ad hoc nature of the initial approach to professional development had inhibited the ability of teams to deliver a more culturally responsive service to Māori. There was strong emphasis on the need for a coordinated and comprehensive induction/training package to build cultural competency and support the implementation of culturally responsive practices accompanied with ongoing staff appraisal and an evaluation of professional learning and development.

I think initially for the first twelve months we had quite a high level of PD that came in to support te tangata who were in the Kaupapa Māori Teams. But that was all we got…So I think it was done with the best of intentions by the practice team, but there wasn’t analysis following that PD to say okay so you’ve had all of this you should be now at this level of competency to work alongside of Māori and there wasn’t any of that joining up.

Time

All agreed on the importance of having the time to build relationships with whānau. There appeared to be inconsistencies in the teams regarding the amount of time allotted to each whānau which had significant bearing on their ability to deliver a kaupapa Māori service.

The thing I’ve been watching the Kaupapa Māori Team is that the hours that we’re given to work in it’s not enough. It takes longer to get through to a Māori or an Islander than the Pākehā. It takes longer. Everybody knows that…To create that Whanaungatanga what they talk about…. It takes more than two hours to create that.

I was just going to say that part of being Māori is if you’re going to work with whānau you shouldn’t really watch the clock and yet as practitioners they do watch the clock. They allocate one hour for a visit, one hour it is. Te ao Māori an hour, two hours whatever it takes.

Whilst time constraints were detrimental to some groups this was not reflected across all Kaupapa Māori Teams. Some teams felt they had the provision to operate differently and spend more time establishing a relationship with whānau.

One of the things that we have been espousing with our team in particular is don’t worry about the hours. You know don’t worry about hours the important thing is you make a good relationship, that relationship that will bring the whole intervention forward. The relationship the connection, don’t worry about what the hours are.

I think one of the successful things you know about being part of a Kaupapa Māori Team is that when we are asked questions about you’re running over time, we say
but we’re a kaupapa Māori team and we’re working in a kaupapa Māori way. That’s why I’m taking this time. And we’re sort of not questioned too much there.

This aspect was seen a hugely beneficial and a good example of how kaupapa Māori philosophies can be implemented into practice resulting in an improved services for whānau needs.

**Summary of findings for Question 5**

Across the participants there was a strong support for the intent of Kaupapa Māori Teams but clear indication that there were several features that inhibited implementation including a lack of collaboration with Māori regarding the development of the teams. It appears that sharing the implementation and operational plan may have supported a clear definition of the teams and their purpose. The appropriation of staff into the teams appears to have inhibited implementation with a lack of culturally responsive capability to support the development of the kaupapa Māori philosophy apparent in some teams. Participants report a need for coordinated professional development and a consideration of time constraints that impact on practice.
Question 6: What are the aspirations of whānau for the services delivered through a Kaupapa Māori Team strategy, and the recommendations of SE and Kaupapa Māori Team staff for meeting those aspirations?

A key consistent message was universal support for the intent of the Kaupapa Māori Teams and the desire to improve cultural responsiveness to suit whānau needs. Although the concept is still in its infancy, initiating the four teams and the review process has provided an opportunity for involved parties to clarify what a successful Kaupapa Māori Team would look like. The data for this question was derived from all of the SE staff interviews and additional whānau interviews. The whānau interviewed had not been part of the Kaupapa Māori Teams but had received on-going service from SE with a variety of field workers. The evidence in this section demonstrates consistent themes regarding the need for a philosophical base grounded in tikanga Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi, the need for leadership from the top, inclusion of kaitakawaenga into the teams and kaupapa Māori tools and assessment models to enable kaupapa Māori practice.

**Tikanga Māori-based**

A philosophy underpinned by tikanga Māori was seen as critical to both the further development of the Kaupapa Māori Team model and its successful implementation. For some staff groups this meant fully engaging resident Māori in the future evolution and implementation of the model. For non-Māori staff, building cultural competency was a key priority to enable services to be delivered in a 'kaupapa Māori way'. Despite still being in the early days, all saw the potential for this model to be an exemplar of culturally responsive best practice that could be exported to other areas in time. Thus the value proposition of a culturally responsive model grounded in tikanga Māori was very high.

**Treaty of Waitangi-based**

In seeking to define 'kaupapa Māori', conversation always arrived at the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi as the basis for kaupapa Māori practice.

*My interpretation of a kaupapa Māori team and that it is working with our whānau is in line with the three the three Treaties, the three articles of the Treaty. And that explains what a Kaupapa Māori Team is. It talks about participation ensuring that our families are engaged in the decision making...See so if we were, if we were to work with those three principles then at least we’re starting to work in the kaupapa Māori way eh.*

Developing an understanding of the Treaty was seen as an integral part of the induction and on-going professional development of staff. This theme of partnership, as expressed in the Treaty, also reflected the aspired relationships whānau sought.

*We need people who work in partnership with us - alongside us. (whānau)*
People who give us hope and who do not judge us. (whānau)

Whānau clearly sought to be the solution, not to be the problem needing to be fixed and thereby preferred partnership with whānau based on strong relationships to be the foundation for a kaupapa Māori approach.

**Leadership from the Top**

The importance of the Kaupapa Māori Team concept being led by Māori, while supported by senior staff within SE, was a reoccurring theme. The gains made were attributed to the strong Kaupapa Māori Team Māori Service Managers who needed greater influence over staff selection, professional development and practice in addition to more support and leadership from the top. The evidence validated the importance of the teams being led by Māori.

So in terms of an ideal, how you’d like to see a Kaupapa Māori Team first and foremost it has to be led by Māori.

A recurring theme in the data was the description of management as ‘coming from upstairs, up top’ and so on, implying that the organisation is hierarchical in nature and implementation models eventuate from the top down. It appears that the success of this strategy is as an implementation and change model that is initiated from Māori staff regardless of their position within a hierarchy.

If we had consulted with Māori in the beginning the makeup of the Kaupapa Māori Teams would be different if we had used the model from our community, from our hapū, from our Marae. And, and that in a nutshell is why it’s not working because it’s not Māori run. It’s run by non-Māori. And I’m not talking about the people in the team, I’m talking about the people who pull the strings for the strategies.

Furthermore several staff noted that they would like to see cultural protocols extended to include expert cultural advice and guidance from kaumātua and significant Māori academics.

I’d also like to see a kaumātua sit alongside that team to sort of give that you know that expert advice and guidance in terms of cultural competence and how you know we should be delivering our services to Māori in our communities and our hapū and our iwi out there.

I think you know with anything you need a good foundation to work from so I’d like to see something at a national level in terms of some involvement there, whether it be (name) and them sitting down you know with us and planning on how we can, you know the foundation’s there.

The design of the organisation including the leadership and positioning of the staff may need to be examined if the Kaupapa Māori Teams are to be successful within an organisation which appears to be infused with dominant cultural values. In particular, the positioning of staff and the ability of Māori staff to influence specialist staff and support practice changes to be more
culturally responsive. This Māori staff member describes the frustration that some staff feel when they are working from opposing cultural paradigms within an organisation that clearly has attributed power, in terms of decision making, within the service roles,

One other thing I need to bring up where my position with kaitakawaenga is supposed to be cultural safety of the child, the whānau and the work colleagues. That was my, that was the position I carried. And yet when we get into a meeting I'm not allowed to practice the first and the second. The cultural safety of the child and the whānau. ….. In the health system it's something they call multidisciplinary team where each one of those team members have a right to speak. In education you haven't. That's where the kaitakawaenga role rights have been taken away because the lead worker takes over. If only we can bring that right to call ourselves as a multidisciplinary team we can work well together, guaranteed.

Whanaungatanga and kaitakawaenga are essential to success

With a focus on whanaungatanga there is the potential to cultivate a stronger team culture even through simple measures like team staff sitting together. Whanaungatanga was considered not only a key platform for successful interventions but also a concept which the staff saw as enabling a more culturally responsive service for both non-Māori and Māori. One kaitakawaenga describes the impact of whanaungatanga on the relationships between staff, and the benefits of sharing their culture with one another,

I believe that if only those people come with a teaching from home they don't need us to guide them all the way because your culture started from home not on the Marae. And your mother is the tutor for your culture and the culture, the Pākehā culture or whatever culture and the Māori culture are similar. It's just that we're Māori and they're not and I notice all the workers I work with, I have no problems with working overseas people. I have no problems.

Kaitakawaenga clearly provide a highly valued culturally responsive service that was not initially implemented in the Kaupapa Māori Teams. Across all the participants it appears that the kaitakawaenga are the cultural backbone of the service and any extension of Māori services would have to be built from this foundation. Whānau in particular pointed to the attributes of the kaitakawaenga when describing their ideal Māori service. The whānau interviews described the qualities of the kaitakawaenga that had assisted the whānau to make change in their own lives;

I like the way they did things, they included my family and they didn't make me feel like it's my fault, which it was but I never felt that way. That made it a team effort instead of just individual and at the time I needed that. So to feel good I had to see a way, I had to see with my own eyes but they, they brought a lot out of me. I'm just grateful for their support and their help.

You can't just focus on a negative and I was the negative, I didn't want to hear that. I wanted to hear how can I help myself to help and they showed me, they told me
your actions affect your kids, so try and work with them. Do things together instead of doing this, do that. Get in there and work with the kids. I didn’t know that. Just little basic things like that and he taught me, yeah. My way was just to, out of line beat them up. That doesn’t work. And it never will. So yeah I needed their help. Others wouldn’t do that you know all they see is oh he’s an abuser, he’s in a gang, it all fits, the profile of this person. So they tried to exclude me and just focus on my wife and kids. I felt left out. They didn’t want to help me sort out my problems and (the kaitakawaenga) did. Yeah.

Whānau had also worked with staff that they felt did not understand their needs. They described staff that were problem-focused instead of working toward a solution that transformed whānau. Key to these descriptions were underlying deficit approaches to intervention and assessment.

I knew that’s they were doing. They were singling me out. That’s, that’s their way, that’s how they knew things you know. Remove the problem, carry on, but my kids still loved me and I still loved my kids and my wife and they couldn’t cut that. That bond. So yeah they just kept doing it that way

I’ve had other people come but I couldn’t, I couldn’t understand. I didn’t like them. Yeah they just reminded me of government officials, officers, yes sir, no sir bullshit. I didn’t want to go there with them so I sent them away and told them not to come any more, told them (kaitakawaenga) would come and see me. They are the only ones that could deal with it because I suppose you’ve got to know our walk line, I walk a line you walk a line too eh until you understand the situation and they have. Make it easier for me to open up to them.

There was strong agreement across all participants, most particularly whānau, that kaitakawaenga are integral to a service that is kaupapa Māori. In some of the staff interviews, it was apparent that kaitakawaenga contributions were not valued internally alongside those of other practitioners, however whānau expressed that most skilled and valued service came from kaitakawaenga. One whānau in particular described how intervention from the kaitakawaenga changed his own life and the life his children profoundly.

I didn’t like him when I first saw him I thought ‘oh here we go’. He’s part of the government, this and that but as the days went through he actually did help me and we got to the bottom of you know what was my son’s problem. And it’s just neglect I suppose, a bit of time out with Dad and Mum and he found the dead wall, not till (kaitakawaenga) brought that out and showed me and he showed me how to deal with it. I got to respect him over the years I’ve known him. So he, he’s taken me a long way. Me and my wife, you know we’ve got a lot of time for (kaitakawaenga) he’s done a lot for our kids. I don’t know if I would have got through without him. So his services are pretty, pretty massive. If anyone else would have come to me I probably would still be in that rut and then just told him to get lost I’m not interested
but he showed me a way you know just being himself, straight up. He reminded me of my uncle, dad, grandfather when you need a growling you need a growling he was, he showed me that way and it was out of love, so I appreciate what he did for us and my family.

Yep he gave me options and I felt like an individual, he made me, be me. Yeah I felt like a person. Like I wasn’t just you know the trouble and the causer or abuser or whatever. He made me feel like someone. He was like man up bro. And those little words were powerful and yeah I have changed because of (the kaitakawaenga) they’re massive.

Need for Culturally Responsive Tools

The need for a planned and coordinated programme of professional development across all teams to build cultural competency was echoed by all staff groups. However, this needed to be accompanied by the development of culturally responsive tools, assessment models and protocols to ensure Māori knowledge was also translated into Māori delivery. Rather than equipping Māori with Western tools, or at best translating western tools, participants expressed a desire to develop kaupapa Māori based tools/assessments.

Unless we get colleagues like the likes of (SLT) and the ones that have got the heart for it and like what you’ve done in making the translated the books. Your assessment tools into te reo and stuff. ... So you know like to be able to move into kaupapa Māori and if we’re looking at (SLT) particular field of speech English therapy she can’t engage with the kura kaupapa Māori and kōhanga because we haven’t got the assessment basis to do it in te reo Māori.

A similar discussion was had in another interview regarding the appropriate assessment and intervention for students with behavioural challenges. While assessment tools had been constructed, the interventions were still primarily western-based with the exception of a few kaupapa interventions, such as Te Mana Tikitiki, that were highly valued by staff. It was apparent from the data that a culturally responsive service requires both culturally competent staff and culturally responsive tools originating from a Māori worldview.

Finally it is evident from the data that the participants want a Māori model of special education service delivery and they need this to be successful. To some extent messages in the data indicated that some staff felt the Kaupapa Māori Teams were set up fail and this could potential reinforce deficit-based attitudes to Māori service provision. The interview data demonstrated significant support for a successful Māori model that would led the way for Māori service provision.

In terms of it being a home for things Māori, like putting that po in the sand and saying no more. This is the example, this will be the exemplar.
It would be a role model and for the rest of the organisation to achieve those goals. I mean the thing is how do you put, how do you lead something without everyone seeing what it is. I mean you lead by example, you show the way and then others will follow. … If you want to move the Kaupapa Māori Team we’ve talked about a variety of strategies you need to put in place in effort to make that team be a leadership team and move it forward. That will influence all the other teams and then enhance the organisation as a whole.

The passion from the staff to improve outcomes for Māori tamariki and whānau was evident throughout all of the interviews; the participants described their vision of successful Kaupapa Māori Team.

I guess I’m really passionate about this stuff, you know like this is not just about work, this is about my life’s work and around Māori and services to Māori. I guess for me it would be that this would be an organisation that having now entrusted us to these roles. Having now entrusted at least regionally that we have kaupapa teams that they would reduce if not remove the barriers to us doing what we do best in delivering a service to tamariki Māori. That will increase their ability to achieve.

The data demonstrated that the service has the basis of a developing Kaupapa Māori Team but that a planned and staged implementation plan including incorporating kaitakawaenga, developing appropriate tools and developing a solutions-based intervention process that strengthens whānau capability is essential to success.

**Summary of Question 6 findings**

A key consistent message was universal support for the intent of the Kaupapa Māori Teams and the desire to improve cultural responsiveness to suit whānau needs. Although the concept is still in its infancy, initiating the three teams and the review process has provided an opportunity for involved parties to qualify what a successful Kaupapa Māori team would look like. Whānau interviewed had not been part of the Kaupapa Māori teams but had received on-going service from SE with a variety of field workers. The evidence demonstrates consistent themes regarding the need for a philosophical base grounded in tikanga Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi, the need for leadership from the top, inclusion of kaitakawaenga into the teams and kaupapa Māori tools and assessment models to enable kaupapa Māori practice.
Summary of findings

This section summarises the opportunities and challenges for the development of Kaupapa Māori Teams. There have been some positive outcomes from the implementation of the kaupapa Māori teams including: the development of a team culture, a more culturally responsive service and a strong desire to make the kaupapa Māori teams work for Māori. The data also revealed barriers which had inhibited the implementation of the teams including; a lack of collaboration with Māori, the lack of a clear definition and implementation plan, staff capability, the need for coordinated professional development and time constraints when working with whānau.

The data revealed that although there was a clear theory of action for SE managers to guide this strategy, it needs to be more clearly articulated with team members. The critical elements for success have been identified in formation documents, but are not yet fully realised. Staff have a need for a more developed philosophical base grounded in tikanga Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi to embed tikanga Māori in practice. The future development of the Kaupapa Māori Team is dependent on the need for: leadership from the top; engagement and consultation with staff; the inclusion of kaitakawaenga into the teams; and the development of kaupapa Māori tools and assessment models to enable kaupapa Māori practice.

There is significant desire and commitment from the staff for a successful model for whānau. The process of implementation requires further input as the framework is not embedded in practice. Further collaborative development of the model would enhance the sense of ownership for field staff. Whānau interviewed described the impact of a culturally responsive service and the potential for a solution focused strengths based intervention to transform outcomes for whānau and tamariki. All of the staff interviewed from all levels of SE expressed a desire for a successful kaupapa Māori model. The data revealed how important the future development of the team is, the alternative being that the teams will fail to be responsive and potentially reinforce deficit theorising about Māori - kaupapa Māori, Māori intervention approaches and Māori knowledge. Answers to the specific research questions are summarised below.
Section 5: Recommendations

The staff interviewed for this evaluation expressed a unanimous desire for development of the Kaupapa Māori Teams to be continued, indicating the validity of the intent and overall concept of the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy.

1. **Model:** Reconsider some elements of Kaupapa Māori Team model in consultation with Māori staff, in order to solidify the intent of the strategy, give the opportunity for success and avoid reinforcing deficit perceptions. Specifically, in view of the stated intent to enhance "mainstream performance in the delivery of services to Māori":
   a. Give increased value to cultural expertise and knowledge within the organisations’ structure, and place experts within positions where they have a recognised role to support changed practice, particularly kaitakawaenga.
   b. Shift from an implicit expectation on individual Māori and non-Māori staff to bring organisational changes to an emphasis on staff acting as communities of learning and change within the wider organisation.
   c. Equitably resource the communities of learning and change initiative.
   d. Ensure children and whānau do receive improved services as result of the strategy to “encourage and support non-Māori staff in raising their performance and competence”.

2. **Implementation:** Within ongoing implementation, consolidate the wisdom and aspirations of the original formation documents and of the wider Kaupapa Māori Team staff, specifically:
   a. Revisit and enact the intentions of the Scoping Paper and Operational, Implementation Plans, including details that describe inherent elements of kaupapa Māori delivery, support and professional development for Kaupapa Māori Team staff and the placement, and leadership role of kaitakawaenga.
   b. Capture the knowledge and aspirations of all staff by:
      i. sharing report and recommendations with all Kaupapa Māori Team staff
      ii. holding a wānanga (or series of wānanga) with staff from Kaupapa Māori Team and wider regional Māori staff, to synthesise findings and consolidate aspirations
      iii. making collaborative decisions for the model and for next stages of implementation.
   c. Align teams with the strategic intention of the Kaupapa Māori Teams by:
      i. implementing the earlier intention for Kaupapa Māori Team to rename themselves (avoiding confusion with the current name)
      ii. ensuring teams include a valid mixture of Māori and non-Māori field staff who are physically located together
      iii. allowing current team members to self-assess their current desire to engage in the kaupapa Māori service delivery in an enhanced form, and providing exit pathways for staff who wish to move
      iv. supporting the Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers to re-staff any resulting vacancies with best fit for kaupapa Māori aspirations and team synergies.
d. Give a clear voice to the Treaty of Waitangi and Ka Hikitia philosophies as underpinning all processes and practices for staff and wider audiences.
e. Communicate across wider staff groups and stakeholder communities on the role and responsibilities of Kaupapa Māori Team and responsibility of wider staff for whānau.

3. **Leadership and resourcing**: Position kaupapa Māori as core business and create communities of learning and resources to bring about the practice and organisational change discussed in formation documents, specifically:
   a. Continue to ensure that the leadership of the Kaupapa Māori Teams is held by Service Managers who are Māori.
   b. Create a Service Manager-led pool of kaitakawaenga across teams and, recognising the significance of positional roles with the larger organisation, give kaitakawaenga a recognised organisational role which allows them to give leadership and support to practice change.
   c. Develop communities of learning (eg based on the multidisciplinary health model, where hierarchical power is flattened and holders of many types of expertise, (such as ‘culture bearers’) have roles of influence, equal status, and “shared problem solving” is the expected norm for practice.
   d. Provide a mandate for the four Kaupapa Māori Teams to hold regular team reflection and question time so that the communities of learning can actively work as such.
   e. Use existing SE resources (such as the Poutama-Service Pathway) and develop further resources that support kaupapa Māori practices, including:
      i. understanding the importance of taking a fundamentally strengths-based, rather than deficit-based, approach with whānau members
      ii. recognising that whanaungatanga within service delivery is not a step in an intervention process, but is an ongoing relational process through-out; sometimes whanaungatanga is the intervention; whanaungatanga needs to be developed internally within the Kaupapa Māori Teams and time is required for this
      iii. implementing professional service delivery in a way that is not simply a translation of a western-based intervention. This will require the development, piloting and refinement of Māori protocols and intervention strategies and te reo Māori assessments for language and speech pathology services.

4. **Professional development**: Target a workforce development strategy to recruit, retain and up-skill Kaupapa Māori Team staff as teams, using a communities of learning approach and including:
   a. Cultivating ownership of this workforce strategy at all levels of SE.
   b. Shifting emphasis from self-selected, individually-focused professional development that occurs on own time, to team-focused, job-embedded, and ongoing professional development, and include training in the kaitakawaenga model of practice and use of
Te Hikoitanga, Ka Hikitia and Tataiako frameworks. Establishing, resourcing, and self-assessment/monitoring of team time to ensure

i. regular reflection engagements to make the communities of learning real
ii. noho marae, waiata, karakia and other te ao Māori activities are undertaken as appropriate.

c. Provide for two-way learning processes, eg enable kaitakawaenga to attend psychological or other training events to strengthen co-working and the clinical-cultural interface; providing opportunities for specialist service providers to participate in cultural learning opportunities with kaitakawaenga.

5. Evaluation: Prioritise use and development of culturally appropriate and responsive kaupapa Māori assessment tools to support practice, including:

a. Ensuring cultural appropriateness of assessments (eg assessments in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Te Kōhanga Reo be undertaken in te reo Māori):
   i. actively resource the development of new culturally responsive tools.
   ii. actively resource the cultural enhancement and adaptation of current tools.

b. Ongoing evaluation to assess:
   i. service delivery – how culturally responsive are our services?
   ii. outcomes for staff (non-Māori and Māori) – is there increased cultural competency amongst our staff?
   iii. outcomes for children and whānau including cultural safety – are we actively seeking the voice of whānau about our services?
Section 6: Synthesis

There is a whakapapa (traced legacy) of practical and theoretical demands and suggestions for evaluation of organisational activities and programmes. Part of this whakapapa is in relation to the rationality and logic of determining if what organisations do is effective in achieving what they believe they are engaged in accomplishing. Another part is in relation to the cultural and social necessity for providing evidence that what organisations do justifies the expenditure of human and material resources. Evaluation of programmes, whether at the local or national level, has been a persistent thread in discourse about educational organisations for decades. The recent emphasis upon accountability for people and their activities is only one more piece of this pattern. It is an important piece. Working on this particular piece has been a privilege for the research team from the University of Canterbury.

One of the requirements of the education profession is that educators somehow continue to learn, to grow, to renew themselves, so that their interactions with ideas and with the people with whom and for whom they work are reflective of the best knowledge and skills available to them. Good reflection involves thinking about our assumptions and becoming conscious of what values, attitudes and concerns we bring to a certain project.

As for this project, what was documented in the RFP were statements relating to SE development of a range of responsivity frameworks to guide organisational efforts in providing culturally responsive services to Māori. Central to these services is to take a Māori potential approach to help determine the best service outcomes for tamariki and whānau. This has required SE to look at different and more effective ways of structuring and delivering special education services to Māori. One such initiative has been the setting up of Kaupapa Māori Teams within the northern region. The development of Kaupapa Māori Teams is intended to draw from the evidence about what works best for and with Māori. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine how kaupapa Māori philosophy and pedagogy influences the structure (team systems), the staffing (capacity, capability, teaming) and the operationalisation of the Kaupapa Māori Teams, and is therefore able to support and contribute to achieving the SE’s strategic goals for Māori.

The undertaking of this project called for systematic attention to the acquisition of existing knowledge and practice within the Kaupapa Māori Teams, understanding and acting upon the research findings, and giving reasoned attention to interpreting the findings. When all was done, three constructs, or structural properties, helped the research team in getting closure: reflection, reaffirmation and repositioning (see Table 2).
These three structural properties have as their complementary points of attention a set of desirable information that may help decision-makers when they make considerations as to whether to continue, or to modify a programme. These structural properties are not additional to the report; rather they should be seen simply as ideas that serve to consolidate the conclusion of this unit of study. The evaluation literature makes a distinction between summative evaluation (judgments made at the conclusion of a period of study) and formative evaluation (judgments drawn periodically to help redesign or modify a course of action). While the recommendations (see pp 53-55) are summative in nature, it is the latter, formative evaluation, that is being promoted here as an important ongoing procedure. We want to improve as we move forward – another veritable marker of whakapapa.
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Professor Letitia Fickel – Head of School
School of Māori, Social & Cultural studies in Education
Tel +64 3 345 8460 ext 44460; Fax +64 3 343

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION: Kaupapa Māori Teams
INFORMATION SHEET

Tēnā koe
Ngā mihi nui tonu ki a koe i roto i ngā tini ahuatanga o te wā.
In February 2010, the Northern Region launched four new Special Education teams, three in Manukau and one in Auckland City. The Kaupapa Māori Teams are managed by Māori Service Managers and the staff, both Māori and Pākehā, work within kaupapa Māori philosophies, values, principles and beliefs, or a kaupapa Māori framework. The evaluation team from the University of Canterbury will be conducting interviews and analysing data gathered on Kaupapa Māori Teams in order to understand the effectiveness of the approach for Māori, and how the service might further meet the needs of tamariki, whānau and kura. Our research team comprises five members:

· Professor Angus Macfarlane – University of Canterbury, Christchurch
· Professor Letitia Fickel – University of Canterbury, Christchurch
· Sonja Macfarlane – University of Canterbury, Christchurch
· Dr Catherine Savage – Te Tapuae o Rehua, Christchurch
· Eruera Prendergast-Tarena – Te Tapuae o Rehua, Christchurch

You have been identified as a key contributor to the Kaupapa Māori Teams and we would like to interview you. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes and will be conducted at your venue. To assist with the interviewing process a recording device will be used to capture your responses. All interviews will be transcribed and if requested, we will send back your transcript to confirm the accuracy.

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation to participate in this research. However should you choose to participate, you have the right to:

· decline to answer any particular question/s;
· withdraw from the project at any time without penalty. If you choose to withdraw, I will use my best endeavours to remove any of the information relating to you from the project, including any final publication, provided that this remains practically achievable;
· ask any questions about the study at any time during the participation;
· provide any information on the understanding that your name will not be used.
· complain if you have any concerns about the conduct of any of the research team.

Complaints may be addressed to The Chair, Educational Research Human Ethics
All information provided is confidential. It will be read by only the evaluation team and in accordance with the University of Canterbury research procedures, securely locked in a filing cabinet or a password protected file for a period of 5 years then destroyed. The information provided by participants will be analysed and included in a non-identifiable way into the final report. Upon completion and confirmation from the Ministry of Education, a copy of the report will be provided to participants. In consultation with the Ministry of Education data from this project, and/or components of the report may become part of manuscripts submitted for publication in national or international journals or presented at international conferences. In such cases, we will ensure that confidentiality is maintained.

This research has been assessed and approved by the University of Canterbury; Educational Research Human Ethics Committee.

We appreciate your time and consideration in participating in this research. We look forward to your response and should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Naku noa, nā

Professor Angus Macfarlane
Professor of Māori Research
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
Christchurch

Ph: 03-364-2987; Ext 6593
I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the research explained to me. I am aware that participation in this research is voluntary and I understand the information will be kept confidential. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time. All information will be in a password protected file and stored for a period of 5 years and will then be destroyed. Upon completion of the report and conformation by the Ministry of Education, a summary of the findings will be sent to you if requested below.

Please tick the boxes to indicate your agreement.
- I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the information sheet.
- I give consent for my interview to be audio taped.
- I give consent for my comments to be included in the research.
- My identity will not be revealed in any part of the research.
- I would like my transcript returned to me for confirmation

Please sign and date this consent form, and return (in the self addressed envelope enclosed) to:

Professor Letitia Fickel  
Head of School  
School of Māori, Social & Cultural Studies in Education  
University of Canterbury  
Private Bag 4800  
Christchurch 8140

Signature: __________________________________________________

Date: _____________________

Full name – Printed:  
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please provide an address/e-mail for a copy of the report to be sent to you:
Appendix 2: Participant interview questions

Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers Schedule

Context
Can you describe your role and the context in which you work?
1. What are the unique features of the Kaupapa Māori Teams?
2. How does it differ from a mainstream /regular team?
3. Describe the service I might get if I had my child referred to the Kaupapa Māori Team? (from referral to closure)

Outcomes
1. What positive outcomes have you seen for tamariki and whānau involved in the Kaupapa Māori Team?
2. What is it uniquely about the Kaupapa Māori Teams that influences these positive outcomes?
3. How are transitions managed between Kaupapa Māori Teams – what happens?
4. Is the service here similar to other Kaupapa Māori Team sites?
5. How are referrals received / prioritised / allocated?
6. How are wait-lists managed?
7. Describe the ‘culture’ of the Kaupapa Māori Teams – what is unique about it?

Implementation
1. Can you describe how you implemented the Kaupapa Māori Team strategy
2. What specific supports did you put in place for staff?
3. What would have assisted you to implement the strategy?
4. How have you developed and evolved the model since implementation?
5. What aspects of the Kaupapa Māori Team model do you consider most effective/important?
6. What theoretical models / approaches have you used to support/inform your leadership and the work of the Kaupapa Māori Team staff?
7. In what ways are they helpful/how are they relevant?
8. Do you share information across Kaupapa Māori Teams? If so, how?
9. How do the Kaupapa Māori Team service managers support each other?
10. Is there a consistent Kaupapa Māori Team approach or is it dependant on context / community?
11. What would it take to ‘scale up’ the Kaupapa Māori Teams approach?

Strategic
1. What level of proficiency in te reo or tikanga Māori do staff have, is this essential? How do you ensure staff are culturally competent (e.g. Tataiako competencies)? What PD do staff require to work in this team?
2. What is the place of Māori staff within the model? Is this satisfactory?
3. Do Māori have input in recruitment, induction and staff development?
4. Is the team resourced sufficiently?
Kaupapa Māori Team Practitioners / Staff

**Context**
1. Can you describe your role and the context in which you work?
2. What is different / unique about working in the Kaupapa Māori Team as opposed to working in a mainstream / regular team?
3. How and why do you think the Kaupapa Māori Team service is appropriate and responsive for Māori?
4. What is unique about your area / community and the way your Kaupapa Māori Team operates?
5. How does the community influence how you work – individually and as a team?

**Outcomes**
1. Based on your experience, can you describe the outcomes for tamariki and whānau involved in the Kaupapa Māori Team service?
2. How are transitions managed between Kaupapa Māori Teams – what happens?
3. How are case closures managed – what happens?
4. Describe the culture of the Kaupapa Māori Team – How do team members work together / ‘teaming’?

**Implementation**
1. Did you participate in the design, development or implementation, if so in what way?
2. What additional training or supports did you receive to be part of the Kaupapa Māori Team?
3. What PD would you see as being of value to you in your role in the Kaupapa Māori Team?
4. What theoretical models / approaches do you draw on to support your mahi in the Kaupapa Māori Team?
5. How do you think they are evident in (influence) your practice?
6. Do you think the Kaupapa Māori Teams have set out to achieve what they intended?
7. How have they changed -or how do you think they should change - from the strategy?
8. What would support the Kaupapa Māori Team to achieve their ‘vision’ (resourcing, systemic...)?

**Strategic**
1. Is knowledge of te reo Māori or tikanga Māori essential to work in the team? What level of proficiency in te reo Māori or tikanga Māori do you have?
2. In what ways do you work with Māori staff within the model? Is this satisfactory?
3. Do you believe the team is resourced sufficiently?
Non- Kaupapa Māori Team Service Managers

**Context**
1. Can you describe your role and the context in which you work?
2. What positive outcomes have you seen for tamariki and whānau involved in your team?
3. What is unique about the team that influences these positive outcomes?
4. What are the unique features of the team?
5. Describe how your team operates? How does this different from the Kaupapa Māori Team?
6. Describe the service I might get if I had my child referred to your team? (from referral to closure)

**Outcomes**
1. How are referrals received / prioritised / allocated?
2. How are transitions managed between other teams – what happens?
3. How are case closures managed – what happens?
4. How are wait-lists managed?
5. Describe the ‘culture’ of your team – what is unique about it?

**Implementation**
1. What plan / strategy drives your team? How does it influence the team operation?
2. What specific supports are in place for staff?
3. What would have assisted you to implement the plan / strategy?
4. How have you developed and evolved the working model since implementation?
5. What aspects of the model do you consider most effective/important?
6. What theoretical models / approaches have you used to support/inform your leadership and the work of your team staff?
7. In what ways are they helpful/how are they relevant?
8. Do you share information across other service teams – including the Kaupapa Māori Team? If so – how?
9. How do the service managers in this region support each other?
10. Is there a consistent team approach or is it dependant on context / community?
11. In your opinion how is strategic planning apparent in the work of teams?
12. What would it take to ‘scale up’ your team’s approach?

**Strategic**
1. What level of proficiency in te reo Māori or tikanga Māori do staff have, is this essential? How do you ensure staff are culturally competent (e.g. Tataiako competencies)? What PD do staff require to work in this team?
2. What is the place of Māori staff within the model? Is this satisfactory?
3. Do Māori have input in recruitment, induction and staff development?
4. Is the team resourced sufficiently?
Kaitakawaenga

Context
1. Can you describe your role and the context in which you work?
2. What is different / unique about working with staff in the Kaupapa Māori Team as opposed to working in a mainstream / regular team?
3. How and why do you think the Kaupapa Māori Team service is appropriate and responsive for Māori?
4. What is unique about your area / community and the way your Kaupapa Māori Team operates?
5. How does the community influence how you work – individually and in supporting other staff?

Outcomes
1. Based on your experience, can you describe the outcomes for tamariki and whānau involved in the Kaupapa Māori Team service?
2. How are transitions managed between Kaupapa Māori Teams – what happens?
3. How are case closures managed – what happens?
4. Describe the culture of the Kaupapa Māori Team – How do team members work together / ‘teaming’?

Implementation
1. Did you participate in the design, development or implementation, if so in what way?
2. What additional training or supports did you receive to be part of the Kaupapa Māori Team?
3. What PD would you see as being of value to you in your role as kaitakawaenga in a Kaupapa Māori Team?
4. What theoretical models / approaches do you draw on to support your mahi in the Kaupapa Māori Team?
5. How do you think they are evident in (influence) your practice?
6. Do you think the Kaupapa Māori Teams have set out to achieve what they intended?
7. How have they changed -or how do you think they should change - from the strategy?
8. What would support the Kaupapa Māori Teams to achieve their ‘vision’ (resourcing, systemic...)?

Strategic
1. Is knowledge of te reo Māori or tikanga Māori essential to work in the team?
2. In your opinion, what skills do the staff requires to work in the Kaupapa Māori Team?
3. Do you believe the Kaupapa Māori Teams are resourced sufficiently?
Regional and District Managers

1. What were your original aspirations for the Kaupapa Māori Teams prior to them starting?
2. What did the setting up process entail, in terms of the philosophy, leadership and staffing?
3. The original aspirations – the original philosophy – is that still the same now as it was in the beginning?
4. What is unique about the Kaupapa Māori Teams as opposed to the other service teams that are sitting parallel?
5. What does Kaupapa Māori Team functioning look like – the nuts and bolts....how is it unique?
6. What are your views around specific needs of the staff who comprise those teams in terms of pushing that kaupapa Māori philosophy? How are their needs different, specific, unique?
7. How are Kaitakawaenga currently involved in, or able to support the Kaupapa Māori teams?
8. In terms of the impact on outcomes for students, are you aware of any anecdotal or written feedback from the community around outcomes that can be attributed to the Kaupapa Māori Teams?
9. In terms of achieving the initial vision, what are your next steps? What is now necessary to help you to achieve that original vision, those original aspirations?

Whānau

1. Can you give some background as to your involvement with MoE: Special Education:
2. As whānau, can you describe your immediate needs regarding a special education service?
3. What have been the positive experiences for you as whānau when working with special education?
4. What qualities, skills and knowledge do you expect the person to have who is working with your whānau?
5. As whānau, can you describe what the ideal special education service would look like? What components would be there for you?
6. In what ways could we enhance/ improve special education services for Māori whānau?
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