

# Child Youth and Family Residential Schools National Summary Report

November 2016



## Contents

Overview .....	1
Next steps.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Previous ERO reports .....	4
Methodology .....	4
Findings.....	6
Entry transitions .....	6
Programme .....	8
Outcomes .....	10
Relationships.....	11
Exit transitions .....	12
Internal evaluation .....	13
Conclusion .....	14
Appendix 1: Evaluation framework.....	16

## Overview

ERO evaluated the quality of education at the Child Youth and Family (CYF) residential schools. CYF residential schools provide education for young people in Youth Justice and Care and Protection services. There are four Youth Justice residences, four Care and Protection residences, and one residential treatment facility across the country.

Students in CYF residential schools are among the most vulnerable in New Zealand, and present with multiple high and complex needs. The specialised knowledge, skills and practice of teachers and leaders in residential schools needs to be of a very high standard to support student engagement and achievement.

This evaluation follows two previous ERO reports, published in [2010](#) and [2013](#).<sup>1</sup> In this evaluation, four schools were found to be effective, and the remaining five needed to make moderate to significant improvements. This represents an improvement compared with the findings of the 2013 report, although significant areas for development remain.

ERO found respectful relationships between staff and students were a feature of all of the schools. Teachers created calm environments and de-escalated challenging behaviours in a non-confrontational way.

A key strength in the effective schools was that curriculum planning and teaching were both highly specific and catered to students' individual strengths, needs and interests. Favourable staffing ratios and a high calibre of teaching staff made this individualised attention possible. Another key strength of the effective schools was cultural responsiveness. Māori students are greatly over-represented in CYF residential schools, relative to the general population. Successfully engaging these students in learning required a high degree of cultural competence along with the individualised teaching approaches.

In the schools needing to make moderate improvements, ERO found many good aspects of practice, but one or two areas for development. These schools could become more effective by improving individual and cultural responsiveness in their curriculum and pedagogy, or by extending effective teaching practice across all staff.

Schools needing to make significant improvements had multiple areas for development. Relationships between educational and residential staff were of concern, and teachers required support to implement more engaging pedagogical approaches.

As noted in previous ERO evaluations, exit transitions remain a weakness. Some of the schools had good formal and informal processes that mitigated some of these systemic weaknesses for transitioning students, particularly when students were

---

<sup>1</sup> Education Review Office, (2013). *Child Youth and Family Residential Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.ero.govt.nz>; Education Review Office, (2010). *Child Youth and Family Residential Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.ero.govt.nz>

transitioning to a living situation geographically near the school. However, many teachers and leaders expressed frustration they weren't able to have more influence on student placement, or consistently provide follow-up monitoring or support. Longer term monitoring of the outcomes of student transitions by the Ministry of Education is also needed. The benefits gained by students attending CYF residential schools provide an opportunity for improved longer-term outcomes if agencies can work together effectively to support transitions into the wider community.

## Next steps

ERO recommends:

- the staff of the CYF residential schools:
  - use the findings of their institutional reports, this report and their own internal evaluation to identify priorities for improving the quality of education they provide
  - explore more systematic ways of assessing students' progress in relation to the key competencies<sup>2</sup>
- the Ministry of Education investigates ways to:
  - enable greater sharing of effective practice between the different CYF residential schools
  - develop feedback processes about student progress after transition out of CYF residential schools
  - provide access to ENROL and NZQA data for all CYF residential school staff
- the Ministry of Education work with Child Youth and Family to review the transition process, particularly exit transitions, to investigate how they can work together to support better transition outcomes for students.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> This could include exploring the use of CYF's Tuituia framework alongside the key competencies of *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Available at: <http://www.practicecentre.cyf.govt.nz/documents/policy/assessment-and-decision-making/tuituia-assessment-framework.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Child, Youth and Family will be replaced by the Ministry for Vulnerable Children, Oranga Tamariki, which comes into effect on 1 April 2017. See <https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/investing-in-children/index.html>

## Introduction

Child Youth and Family (CYF) residential facilities are home to some of the most at-risk students in New Zealand. Young people are placed in these facilities due to serious criminal or welfare issues. Many have been disengaged from formal education for a prolonged period prior to their arrival at a CYF residential school. These schools provide an opportunity for students to become re-engaged in learning, develop their literacy and numeracy skills, and develop the wellbeing and social competencies they will need to have a chance of building a brighter future.

This report discusses three types of CYF residence: Youth Justice facilities, which house young people who have offended; Care and Protection residences, which are for young people who were at serious risk in their previous living arrangements; and a residential treatment facility for young men who have harmful sexual behaviours. There are four Youth Justice residences, four Care & Protection residences, and one residential treatment facility throughout New Zealand.

While staying in the residences, students are educated by one of four different providers. [Central Regional Health School](#) (CRHS) and [Kingslea School](#) are special schools governed by Boards of Trustees. [Creative Learning Scheme](#) (CLS) and [Barnardos](#) are private providers. All four providers have a variety of agreements in place with the Ministry of Education (the Ministry).

The duration of students' stays at the residential schools varies significantly. Young people who are on remand may be in Youth Justice residences for as little as a few days or weeks. Arrivals and departures often take place with very little notice. Students in Care and Protection and the treatment facility residences are generally there for longer periods.

Table 1: Name and type of residence, roll and location

Residence Name and Type	Nominal Roll	Location
<b>Whakatakapokai</b> Care and Protection	20	Auckland
<b>Epuni</b> Care and Protection	20	Lower Hutt
<b>Te Oranga</b> Care and Protection	10	Christchurch
<b>Puketai</b> Care and Protection	8	Dunedin
<b>Korowai Manaaki</b> Youth Justice	40	Auckland
<b>Te Maioha o Parekarangi</b> Youth Justice	30	Rotorua
<b>Te Au Rere a te Tonga</b> Youth Justice	30	Palmerston North
<b>Te Puna Wai o Tuhinapo</b> Youth Justice	40	Christchurch
<b>Te Poutama Arahi Rangatahi</b> Harmful sexual behaviour treatment facility	12	Christchurch

## Previous ERO reports

ERO has published two previous reports on CYF residential schools. The first was published in September 2010, and found that although the quality of education provided was generally good, more could be done to manage students' exit transitions.

ERO's second report, published in November 2013, found the quality of education was not of a consistently high standard across the schools. The report specifically recommended schools link their programme design more closely to student interests and strengths, and improve the quality of teaching. It also found exit transitions remained a weakness and that collaborative relationships between CYF staff and education staff needed to be strengthened.

## Methodology

The information for this national report was gathered through institutional ERO reviews of each CYF school. Reviewers spent time onsite, meeting with school and residential staff, talking to students, reviewing school documents and conducting classroom observations. Each of the schools received an individual review report, and these have been published on ERO's website.

ERO reviewers focused on six key questions:

- How effectively managed are the transitions students make into the residence?

- How responsive is the programme to the strengths, needs and interests of each student?
- How effectively is the programme improving students' engagement and educational achievement?
- How effectively do internal and external relationships support the programme for each student?
- How effectively managed are the transitions that students make out of the residence?
- How effectively do programme leaders conduct internal evaluation?

A set of the indicators guided reviewers in their data collection, analysis and synthesis. These indicators are provided in Appendix One.



# Findings

## Entry transitions

Most schools had sound processes for students' entry transitions into the schools. Making the transition as smooth as possible was key to making the most productive use of students' time in the school. For many students, the transition itself was traumatic and unsettling with little certainty of how long the student would be in the school. This challenge was felt particularly in the Youth Justice residences, as students are on remand and their future is subject to decisions made in court. Schools often had very little warning before a student arrived, and this unpredictability put pressure on school transition procedures. Evidence of this occurred in the week prior to ERO visiting, when ten students arrived.

## Relationships

Each school had a strong focus on developing positive relationships with and between students. Staff demonstrated genuine empathy, care, and concern for their students. Teachers and leaders were skilled at building rapport with students, and in most cases worked alongside the CYF residential staff to initiate this process as soon as possible. Many enrolling students had suffered from trauma. In most cases, both teaching and residential staff were trained in trauma-informed approaches, which emphasised physical, psychological and emotional safety, and provided opportunities for students to rebuild a sense of control and empowerment.

At the transition stage, teachers and leaders used a range of methods to help develop positive relationships, including:

- treating students with courtesy and respect
- getting to know individual students' interests and needs
- discussing feeling safe and secure
- modelling calm and non-confrontational behaviour
- introducing students to behavioural expectations and class culture
- presenting themselves authentically, as trustworthy adults.

## Gathering information

Accessing reliable existing information about students was a challenge in most cases. Many of the schools had sound processes in place for gathering information from a variety of sources, but the availability of information nevertheless varied from student to student. Schools had access to the case history information CYF social workers had collected, and leaders also accessed (where possible) education-specific data from the Ministry of Education's ENROL system and the New Zealand Qualification Authority (NZQA) record of learning for older students. Where possible, leaders made contact with students' previous schools to gain more information, but this was often difficult. Students may have been disengaged from education for some time prior to arriving in a CYF residence, may be arriving from another part of New Zealand, and often arrived with little notice.

As soon as possible after enrolment, staff used a variety of tools to conduct baseline assessments of students' literacy and numeracy. In addition to these formal literacy and numeracy assessments, staff gathered information about students' mental and physical health and social and cultural needs, as well as their strengths and interests. One school had a very thorough process that took place over three days in a dedicated assessment unit. The assessment unit teacher, and various other specialists worked together to form a comprehensive picture of the student. Where possible the CYF whānau engagement coordinator contacted whānau to learn more about the student and establish an ongoing connection.

Teachers and leaders in many of the schools recognised threats to the validity and reliability of these initial assessments. There was a tension between the need to conduct assessment early to inform individual planning, and making sure students were settled enough to complete the assessments in a manner that reflected their true abilities. Student anxiety around transitions (both entry and exit) may have had a negative impact on assessment results.

### **Individual planning**

Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)<sup>4</sup> were also generally created as soon as possible. The effective practice ERO found involved setting both broad, specific individual goals that were closely linked to the information teachers and leaders had about student strengths, needs and interests. In these instances, ILPs included both social and wellbeing goals as well as specific educational goals in literacy or numeracy. Where relevant, older students also had goals relating to achieving NCEA credits. Effective ILPs were also closely linked to students' Individual Care Plans (ICPs) and informed by the school's values. They were regularly reviewed and updated to reflect student progress. Weekly and day-to-day planning demonstrated a clear link to students' ILP goals.

Where practice was less effective, the link between ILPs and the classroom programme was limited. When students were only in the residence for a short time, and the exact duration of their stay was not known, by the time an ILP was created, the student had already transitioned out of the school, resulting in ad hoc and unplanned teaching.

### **Responsive professional learning and development**

All staff had some degree of access to ongoing professional learning and development (PLD). In effective schools the choice of PLD was responsive to the needs of students, and the capabilities that teachers required to meet these needs. In the less effective schools, there was not as strong a link between PLD and student needs. In these schools, decisions about PLD generally reflected the broader priorities of the education providers.

---

<sup>4</sup> The terminology used was sometimes Individual Education Plans. This report uses Individual Learning Plans to cover both. These are distinct from, but usually aligned with, the Individual Care Plans which are the responsibility of CYF staff.

Staff had accessed specific PLD in a variety of areas including:

- trauma-informed practice
- speech and language therapy
- assessment with e-asTTle
- teacher inquiry
- te reo Māori
- non-violent conflict training
- mindfulness
- cultural responsiveness.

## Programme

### Environment

In the effective schools, classrooms were bright, spacious and engaging. Students' work appeared on the walls, along with other displays. Furniture was set out to enable flexibility for both group and independent learning. Students had access to laptops, tablets, and a variety of appropriate and interesting books and other resources. One school was establishing a model farm to give students opportunities for contextual learning in agriculture, horticulture and using machinery and vehicles.

In the less effective schools, some classrooms were cramped, limiting the use of engaging pedagogies and raising the likelihood of students becoming distracted. Other classrooms were less well resourced in terms of information and communications technology (ICT) and, particularly, reading material.

### Engaging curriculum and pedagogy

In the most effective schools, teachers provided a broad and engaging curriculum, with relevant topics and activities carefully chosen to appeal to students. In the best examples, students were given significant opportunities to choose their own activities. The learning contexts were relevant, and students had the opportunity to develop real life skills such as health, parenting, safety, employment skills and life skills. Students had opportunities to engage in hands-on learning in relevant contexts across the breadth of the curriculum, including technology, music and arts. In one school, music was used as a form of therapy, as well as a curriculum area. We observed an occasion where a student had become very agitated and went to the music room with the guitar to 'reset'. Some schools were able to offer outdoor education experiences, with careful planning around safety. These experiences included mountain biking, tramping, gymnastics, and surfing.

Teachers and leaders in effective schools continually adapted the curriculum to make sure it remained relevant as students with different strengths, needs and interests transitioned in and out of the school. Some schools provided a cohesive curriculum across the school and residential contexts. [Te Kura](http://www.tekura.school.nz/)<sup>5</sup> was used to give wider

---

<sup>5</sup> Te Aho o te Kura Pounamu – The Correspondence School. <http://www.tekura.school.nz/>

curriculum choices, but only when there was a clear link to students' individual needs and interests.

Teachers in the most effective schools took advantage of favourable staffing ratios to provide a mix of one-to-one and group learning. They were also able to use a variety of evidence-informed pedagogical approaches for engaging students who have experienced significant trauma. They used encouragement, questioning and gentle prompting to keep students engaged. ERO observed young people in these classrooms engaging quickly in their work and valuing the opportunity to improve their skills.

In the less effective schools, teachers did not display the same variety of pedagogical approaches. We observed students in these classrooms frequently disengaged and off-task.

Orderly classrooms with few interruptions were evident in all schools. Teachers made sure they used praise and incentives to acknowledge and reward students' positive behaviours. Some schools operated a points system to formalise this process. In some schools, we observed teachers personally greeting each student at the beginning of the day. Most interactions were respectful and courteous, showing students had a clear understanding of teacher expectations.

When students did display challenging behaviour, teachers and residential staff were highly attuned to early signs a student was becoming unsettled. They swiftly moved to de-escalate these situations, which usually involved short-term withdrawal from the environment and one-on-one counselling. These interventions were done in a calm, non-confrontational manner, modelling positive ways of dealing with behavioural issues and minimising disruption for other students.

## **Individual responsiveness**

Programmes in the effective schools were individually responsive. Weekly and day-to-day planning was strongly informed by student strengths, needs and interests as set out in their ILPs. At one school, students had a learning map, which set out their learning goals and how they would achieve them for each week. These were reviewed weekly with teachers. Another school provided students with an 'IEP box', which contained a variety of activities for learning across the curriculum to support their learning plan. These activities changed daily.

Students in the effective schools were working at their own level, towards their own specific goals. They were aware of their progress and taking ownership of their learning. As mentioned above, teachers made every effort to relate the programme to students' interests. One school had a three day programme once per month, which was tailored to meet specific student needs such as cooking on a budget, first aid, and sexuality education.

In the less effective schools, individual responsiveness was not a strong feature. There was a greater degree of whole-class teaching. In the schools needing to make significant improvements, an over-reliance on worksheets was evident rather than engaging pedagogies that helped students to learn by building on their strengths and interests.

## **Cultural responsiveness**

Although all the schools recognised the importance of implementing a culturally responsive curriculum and pedagogy, the capability to do this was variable. In most schools, one or more staff members with expertise in this area helped build overall teacher capability. Cultural opportunities included te reo Māori, kapa haka, Māori art, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Matariki, and student inquiry into aspects of their own background. Classroom protocols included karakia, waiata, mihi and the natural integration of te reo Māori. In a few schools, students participated in pōwhiri, or mihi whakatau for visitors. Artefacts such as murals or other artworks were also visible in classrooms. One school had a whare and marae which students had helped decorate, and these contributed to their sense of belonging.

Staff at some of the schools recognised they did not currently have the knowledge and expertise to provide a culturally responsive curriculum and pedagogy, and were working on strengthening their cultural responsiveness through PLD.

## **Outcomes**

Effective schools engaged students in learning, often after a sustained period of educational disengagement. Once students were engaged, they were able to pursue and achieve their specific learning goals. Effective schools had an appropriate focus on improving student wellbeing and social-emotional outcomes, raising achievement in literacy and numeracy, building students' key competencies, and equipping them as much as possible for their exit transition. Overall, student progress was variable, but effective schools had a clear sense of the impact they had.

In some of the other schools, staff were less able to demonstrate student progress in educational achievement. There were a number of challenges in measuring the progress of students. The validity and reliability of assessment information could be influenced by student factors such as trauma. After exit transitions, schools often lost contact with students, which limited the knowledge schools had of long-term outcomes. Additionally, the less effective schools did not always have a clear purpose for using particular assessment tools, or using the information they collected.

## **Social and wellbeing outcomes**

All schools aimed to support and improve the social and emotional wellbeing of students. This was seen as desirable in and of itself, but also a necessary precursor to engagement in learning and achievement of educational goals. In one of the schools, students' progress with the key competencies was reviewed every four weeks. Another school had recently developed a new curriculum with a more specific focus on wellbeing.

Students made uneven progress towards greater wellbeing and social competence. The respectful and courteous relationships observed in classrooms provided some evidence of improved social competence outcomes. Staff recognised it was not always a linear progression for students, but occasionally a process of 'two steps forward, and

one step back'. Teachers therefore had to be flexible and responsive to cater for non-linear progress. In one school we observed many students unable to express an idea as they had little confidence in their own abilities when invited to say something positive about themselves. One student suggested it would be easier to say something positive about a peer instead, and they did this successfully.

## **Literacy and numeracy**

In the more effective schools, achievement data showed students made accelerated progress in literacy and numeracy. All students had baseline assessments done as part of their entry transition process. However, the short duration of many students' stays meant there was sometimes no time for retesting. In these cases, staff did not have formal assessment data to demonstrate their impact on short-stay students. It would be more useful for schools to measure progress more informally against students' individual short-term goals.

One school's particular focus on the teaching of writing resulted in some outstanding student poetry. The writing was honest, personal and polished. The students were expressing emotions and writing about their experiences in a mature and convincing way. Their teacher was planning to publish a book of the students' best poetry.

## **NCEA**

Schools had an appropriate focus on supporting older students to earn NCEA credits. In one school where 90 percent of students enter without any credits, some students gained up to 46 credits in 12/13 weeks at the school. Gaining NCEA credits was both a desired outcome in and of itself, and also worked as a motivating factor for further engagement in learning as students experienced success.

## **Key competencies**

In many of the schools, developing students' key competencies was a particular focus. Education staff considered managing self, relating to others, and participating and contributing as key to a successful transition back into mainstream education, and then training and employment. Students in effective schools increasingly set goals relating to the key competencies and education staff focused on integrating the competencies into the everyday programme, with some assessing students' progress.

## **Relationships**

### **School staff and residential staff**

In some of the schools, relationships between education and CYF residential staff have improved since ERO's previous evaluation. In one school this was largely attributable to a change in education provider, in whom residential staff had greater confidence. In another school, relationships improved following a change in CYF residential staff and the implementation of a more collaborative approach, with daily debriefs and joint management meetings.

Where the relationships were operating well, education and CYF staff had mutual trust and respect for each other and co-operated closely with a clear focus on the

students. Staff worked together to support one another in the classroom. Information was shared freely and there was good alignment of students' individual education plans and CYF planning. In the best cases, there was a coherent set of behavioural expectations for students in both residential and school contexts.

Relationships in the less effective schools were occasionally strained, with school staff and residential staff having different philosophies on students' education. This lack of cohesion limited the learning opportunities for students. Effective working relationships between staff are of crucial importance in creating a stable and consistent environment for students. There was also a lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities, particularly at transition time. Some education staff expressed frustration they did not get a lot of notice about changes that affect their work with students.

### **Other relationships**

Effective schools also built relationships with people or agencies outside the residence to access ancillary services for their students, such as music tuition, or mental health assessments. Other relationships were aimed at pursuing PLD opportunities for teachers. Schools also worked with NZQA for moderation purposes and to increase internal capability in assessment.

### **Exit transitions**

As reported in previous ERO evaluations, exit transitions remain a challenge across all of the schools. Student placements are ultimately the responsibility of CYF, not the school. The arrangements for students' future residential placements have to be in place prior to any education planning, which often compresses the transition timeframe significantly. Transitions out of Youth Justice residences were particularly likely to happen at short notice.

Some of the schools had good formal and informal processes that mitigated systemic weaknesses for transitioning students. These were most successful when students were transitioning geographically near to the school. However, many teachers and leaders expressed frustration they were unable to have more of an influence on student placement, or consistently provide follow-up monitoring or support. They considered the Ministry of Education could put in place better feedback processes about student transition outcomes, and this was confirmed by the Ministry.

Students had various stated destinations. Some transitioned back into mainstream schooling, alternative education, tertiary education or training, and employment. School staff attempted to remain in contact with students after their transition, but this was not always possible. The lack of reliable follow-up monitoring meant schools were not usually in a position to know about the success or otherwise of exit transitions unless they were aware more informally through their networks. One leader used anecdotal information to estimate that 20 to 25 percent of their students were successful in the longer term. In another school, teachers had identified monitoring of transition outcomes as a next step, but faced the challenges of unpredictable exit times, and losing contact with students when they came from, or were moving to, a different part of New Zealand.

Education staff provided information about the student to the team in charge of transition. They shared student strengths, needs and interests, and how they had progressed in their time at the school. In many cases, teachers and leaders told ERO they had stepped outside of their specified roles to contact students' agreed destinations directly, undertaking visits and meeting with staff at the destination school or provider. They felt 'education talking to education' supported better outcomes for students.

One school provided a comprehensive 'discharge portfolio' for transitioning students, including entry and exit assessments in literacy and numeracy, a record of achievement, individual learning plans, NZQA assessments, and a communications passport. However, school staff reported to ERO they thought the destination schools or other education providers did not make good use of this information, and students were often re-assessed on arriving. As many of these young people have been out of education for a long time, it is critically important systems support any education successes or gains made while at the residential school. Information about teaching practices that were effective for students, and progress they made needs to be fully shared when students are transitioning into another educational setting.

## **Internal evaluation**

All of the schools had formal school-wide internal evaluation processes in place. However, the quality of the processes and the extent to which teachers and leaders used this information to improve their performance was variable.

In the effective schools, leaders sought the views of all stakeholders, including students, whānau, the Ministry of Education, CYF, other relevant education or social agencies, and iwi. They identified benefits and risks, key messages, and links to other work and strategic priorities. One school had analysed and used collated student achievement data linked to specific action plans for reading, writing and mathematics. They also used the number of significant incidents (use of force, secure admissions etc.) as a negative indicator of school improvement. Leaders shared data with ERO showing a trend of fewer significant incidents over the last six years.

In some of the effective schools, ERO also observed evidence of informal evaluation that complemented the more formal processes. Informal evaluation occurred on a day-to-day basis, as teachers noticed emerging student needs. They regularly reflected as a group on what they do well, and what they could do better. This enabled them to respond and improve rapidly.

In the less effective schools, by contrast, school-wide internal evaluation processes were not as well embedded. Internal evaluation was more compliance focused than improvement focused. The data collected was not used well to evaluate effectiveness of teaching practices and make changes accordingly. The connection between data and decision making needed to be strengthened.



All schools had formal appraisal processes, but the usefulness of these to improve practices varied. In effective schools, teachers linked their reflections to standards such as the [Practising Teachers Criteria](#) and [Tātaiako](#).<sup>6</sup>

Appraisal processes included aspects such as:

- formal appraisal meetings
- goal setting
- reflective journals
- peer review
- formal and informal observations.

Teacher self-reflection and teaching as inquiry was often superficial and an area for development in many of the schools. More emphasis is needed on using appraisal and assessment information to identify which teaching approaches are successful and which need to be improved or discontinued.

## Conclusion

Overall the quality of education in CYF residential schools has improved since ERO's [2013](#) evaluation. One school was more effective since being managed by a new provider, and another school had, as of recently, benefited from much improved relationships between residential and education staff after a period of significant disruption.

In the most effective schools, teachers catered well to the individual strengths, needs and interests of students, provided a culturally responsive and engaging curriculum and pedagogy, and regularly and robustly evaluated their own practice to inform ongoing improvements.

However, five of the nine schools needed to make moderate to significant improvements in order to provide the best possible education for these at-risk young people. Teachers and leaders could benefit from considering and observing effective practice in other CYF residential schools, and, in some cases, having greater exposure to teaching approaches used in mainstream education. Strengthening internal evaluation should also help schools to focus their activities on what is working well, and address areas of poor performance.

Exit transitions remain a systemic weakness that should be an improvement priority for the Ministry of Education and CYF. While some of the schools have supported transitioning students well, this is to some extent reliant on the personal and professional networks of the principals. For some students, outcomes were better when the education staff worked outside of their specified roles in the transition process.

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://educationcouncil.org.nz/content/registered-teacher-criteria-1;>  
[https://educationcouncil.org.nz/sites/default/files/Tataiako\\_0.pdf](https://educationcouncil.org.nz/sites/default/files/Tataiako_0.pdf)

ERO recommends the Ministry of Education take a more active role in monitoring and feeding back the outcomes of student transitions, and the Ministry of Education and CYF review the roles and responsibilities of education, residential and other CYF staff during transition.

## Appendix 1: Evaluation framework

<b>Q1. How effectively managed are the transitions students make into the residence?</b>	
<b>Induction to a CYF residential school</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a well-planned and implemented process for inducting students</li> <li>• There is a well-planned and implemented process for welcoming students' families/whānau/aiga</li> <li>• Staff provide a welcoming environment for new students</li> <li>• There are processes in place for students to welcome new students</li> <li>• The induction programme allows students to build positive relationships with their peers</li> <li>• The induction programme works well at all times of the year (i.e. during 'school holidays')</li> <li>• There are processes to convey to students expectations about behaviour and learning</li> <li>• New students report that they have a sense of belonging</li> <li>• Appropriate multi-disciplinary and/or special educational support is identified and made available as early as possible</li> <li>• There are coordinated linkages between school, family and social service agencies that promotes students' successful transition into the school</li> </ul>
<b>Initial identification of students' strengths, interests and learning needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers and leaders use valid and reliable processes to identify the educational strengths, interests, and next steps of new students</li> <li>• Teachers/leaders have sought, and used, the student's point of view with regard inclusive practice and learning</li> <li>• The school has processes in place for identifying and supporting the needs of students in relation to their physical, sensory, psychological, neurological, behavioural or intellectual needs</li> <li>• The school has culturally responsive processes to identify and support the needs and aspirations of Māori and Pacific students and their whānau/families/aiga</li> <li>• Diagnostic assessments describe each young person's ability in reading (especially in decoding and comprehension), writing and mathematics</li> </ul>
<b>Planning for the success of students including</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are high quality processes used to identify and remove the barriers to achievement faced by students</li> <li>• ILPs have clear goals for learning or development</li> </ul>

<p><b>Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILPs explain the processes to be used to support students to reach their goals</li> <li>• ILPs are integrated into the exit transition of the student</li> <li>• ILPs are regularly reviewed and revised in line with student progress and needs</li> <li>• ILPs contain a well-structured and clearly conveyed plan for each student’s future education/employment</li> <li>• ILPs contain an understanding of the student’s exit transition and what has to happen to support that transition</li> <li>• ILPs include an indication of what the young person wants to achieve in the school to prepare them for their future; education/employment</li> <li>• The daily programme has a focus on achieving the goals identified in each student’s ILP</li> <li>• Planning reflects the need to identify and develop the interests and strengths of students (i.e. has good links to ILPs and the overall CYF goals for students)</li> <li>• ILPs take into account the goals CYF staff have facilitated or coordinated to support the development of students</li> <li>• Teaching staff adapt the learning programme based on the identified needs of students via their CYF-based goals or information</li> <li>• Education and CYF staff meet regularly to review the progress of students</li> <li>• The education and CYF staff develop joint strategies to support the learning and development of students</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q2. How responsive is the programme to the strengths needs and interests of each student?</b></p>	
<p><b>School culture and environment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall culture of the school and the classrooms is supportive of students learning and development</li> <li>• There is a warm, nurturing and safe atmosphere for all students</li> <li>• Humour is used to support the development of positive relationships between staff and students</li> <li>• Staff show enthusiasm about improving outcomes (educational, social, emotional) for students</li> <li>• Staff demonstrate the importance of social and pastoral care as a pathway to support the achievement of students</li> <li>• The school has highly responsive systems and personnel that are focussed on the social and educational needs of students</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are non-authoritarian and non-coercive classroom structures where power is shared between the student and teacher, e.g. classroom rules are co-constructed</li> <li>• Staff are compassionate, actively listening to students and reflecting their points of view</li> <li>• Staff display understanding (sensitivity) in responding to student needs</li> <li>• Staff correctly pronounce the names of students</li> <li>• Staff support the development of student self-management (see bullet point one in students engagement)</li> <li>• Staff apply strategies to limit negative behaviour</li> <li>• Staff model that learning is important</li> <li>• Adult educators operate as role models to students</li> <li>• Staff have a good understanding of, and affirm the cultural backgrounds of the students (i.e. they observe and promote students' culture, identities, language)</li> <li>• Students express a sense of security and comfort with the environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pedagogy for at risk students</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a significant focus on accelerating the learning of all students</li> <li>• The progress, achievement and engagement of all students is regularly monitored so that they experience success as individuals</li> <li>• Classroom programmes address the individual needs of students (as described in students' ILPs)</li> <li>• Students receive high quality individualised attention in their classroom programmes</li> <li>• There are clearly stated expectations for classroom activity and student work</li> <li>• Teachers have high expectations of students' learning and behaviour, and they express these often</li> <li>• Teachers are innovative and creative in responding to students' interests, strengths and learning needs</li> <li>• Teachers have high expectations that all students will succeed regardless of their previous educational success (or lack of it), and their cultural and social backgrounds</li> <li>• Teachers are both firm and flexible in how they manage the behaviour of students (refer to school culture and environment)</li> <li>• Staff and students support each other to achieve</li> <li>• Classroom activity is engaging and intellectually challenging for students</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational activities, topics and themes are relevant to students</li> <li>• There are good opportunities for students to learn in a variety of ways – with others, on their own, using technology</li> <li>• The programme provides students with good opportunities to learn from peers e.g. discussing ideas, reaching conclusions and teaching each other</li> </ul>
<p><b>The quality of school curriculum, planning and review</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school-developed curriculum is appropriate for at risk students e.g. programmes implemented for all students appropriately promote the skills they will need for future success (sustainable learning and development)</li> <li>• There are good links between students’ identified strengths and interests and the (planned) curriculum</li> <li>• The curriculum gives appropriate priority to building students’ knowledge and skills in literacy and mathematics</li> <li>• The curriculum builds effectively on students’ learning (there are progressions in the curriculum)</li> <li>• The school (planned) curriculum reflects the vision and principles of <i>The New Zealand Curriculum</i></li> <li>• There is evidence that leaders review the school curriculum in light of information from a variety of sources (including students)</li> <li>• The curriculum is appropriately balanced (consideration is given to what needs to be achieved and what students find engaging)</li> <li>• Resources effectively support students’ learning (there are enough and they are appropriate)</li> <li>• The school curriculum effectively promotes the identity, language and culture of students</li> <li>• Students have access to good quality education programmes throughout the year (not just in term times)</li> <li>• High quality career education and guidance is given with an emphasis on transition to the workplace or further education/training</li> </ul>

### Q3. How effectively is the programme improving students' engagement and educational achievement?

<b>Student achievement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence that students are making accelerated progress</li> <li>• There is evidence that students are achieving at year/age appropriate levels (as seen in analysed standardised and norm-referenced results, National Standards and NZQF assessments)</li> <li>• Students are achieving the goals established in their ILP</li> </ul>
<b>Student engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority is placed on identifying and developing the strengths and interests of all students</li> <li>• There are good opportunities for students to make decisions about what and how they learn               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As a regular part of the classroom programme, students are engaged in discussions about their learning processes</li> <li>○ Students have opportunities to pursue their interests and strengths</li> <li>○ Students have opportunities to investigate their own questions/topics</li> <li>○ Students have clear and challenging goals or expectations for learning</li> <li>○ Students receive high quality feedback on their learning (peers and teachers)</li> <li>○ Students initiate aspects of their own learning</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Students state that they enjoy school</li> <li>• Students can say in what ways their learning is contributing to their ongoing achievement</li> <li>• Students are positive about the progress they are making</li> </ul>

### Q4. How effectively do internal and external relationships support the programme for each student?

<b>The links between educational staff and CYF staff</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education and CYF staff meet regularly to review the progress of students</li> <li>• The education and CYF staff develop joint strategies to support the learning and development of students</li> <li>• There is day-to-day collaboration between education and CYF staff to support the learning and development of students</li> </ul>
<b>The alignment between the overall CYF plan and the teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILPs take into account the goals CYF staff have facilitated or coordinated to support the development of students</li> </ul>

<b>and learning programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching staff adapt the learning programme based on the identified needs of students via their CYF-based goals or information</li> </ul>
<b>Relationships with external agencies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school's staff work collaboratively with agencies such as health, iwi, and Non-Government Organisations (NGO) to support student needs</li> <li>The school's staff work with Ministry of Education Special Education to obtain support for students as needed</li> </ul>
<b>Q5. How effectively managed are the transitions students make out of the residence?</b>	
<b>The quality of transition planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit transition planning is based on the progress students have made</li> <li>The exit transition planning includes clear expectations and goals for each student, and the roles and responsibilities to be carried out by those involved in the transition process.</li> <li>The exit transition planning details the types of support students will receive for their ongoing learning and development</li> </ul>
<b>The links between new schools or training providers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a high level of coordination and collaboration between the CYF school, the new school (if any), family and social service agencies</li> <li>Post programme support is ongoing until the student is well established in further training or the workforce (outside of the CYFs direct responsibility but important for the overall review)</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring of the exit transition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The student's destination is monitored and recorded</li> <li>The medium and long term outcomes of transitioned students are monitored</li> <li>Leaders analyse outcomes data to inform the quality of future exit processes for students</li> </ul>



## Q6. How effectively do programme leaders conduct internal evaluation?

### Leading and managing

- Leaders analyse outcomes data to inform the quality of future exit processes for students
- School leaders use information from a variety of sources (e.g. students achievement and progress, students and family/whānau/aiga feedback, transition data) to make decisions about provision for students
- School leaders ensure that the curriculum is well designed and that teachers are implementing high quality teaching strategies and interventions for students
- Good quality and appropriate professional development is provided for staff (PLD is linked to evidence about what needs to be improved)
- A robust performance appraisal process has been established that focuses on building the capacity of teachers and leaders
- Leaders are responsive to community aspirations, interests and concerns
- School leaders provide clear direction for the work and development of the school characterised by:
  - unity of purpose
  - consistency of expectation
  - clear lines of communication
- The school's procedures and practices align with policies and directions.