Introduction

We are dealing, it would seem, not so much with culturally deprived children as with culturally deprived schools. And the task to be accomplished is not to revise, and amend, and repair deficient children, but to alter and transform the atmosphere and operations of the schools to which we commit these children. Only by changing the nature of the educational experience can we change the product. To continue to define the difficulty as inherent in the raw material, the children, is plainly to blame the victim and to acquiesce in the continuation of educational inequality. (Ryan, 1976, pp. 61–62)

This book is about scaling up, about extending and sustaining educational reform. It is our contention that scaling up educational reform has the potential to have a major impact on the disparities that exist in our society. In most cases these disparities are historical, ongoing and seemingly immutable. However, we are not claiming that educational reform on its own can cure historical disparities. We are saying that educational reform can play a major part in a comprehensive approach to addressing social, economic and political disparities. However, like all human activities, attempts to address disparities

and realise the potential of groups currently minoritised[1] run into power differentials in society; hence the subtitle *Addressing the Politics of Disparity* to acknowledge that much of what we talk about in this book is highly contested.

Current approaches to scaling up educational reform have not worked for minoritised students. Most attempts are short term, poorly funded at the outset and often abandoned before any real changes can be seen, to be replaced by some "bold new initiative". In contrast, we are talking about the need for educational reforms that have built into them, from the very outset, those elements that will see them sustained in the original sites and spread to others. It is our contention that these elements will allow educational reforms to be scaled up with the confidence that the reform will not only be able to be sustained in existing and new sites, but that, above all, they will work to reduce disparities and realise the potential of those students currently not well served by education. Put simply, educational reforms that can be sustained and extended can have an impact on educational and social disparities through increasing the educational opportunities for students previously denied these options.

The major social challenge facing New Zealand today is the continuing social, economic and political disparities within our nation, primarily between the descendants of the European colonisers (Pākehā) and the indigenous Māori people. Having said that, we acknowledge that there are many other minoritised groups in our society, such as involuntary migrant ethnic groups, those of all races with special needs and the children of other marginalised groups. However, we as Māori are the indigenous population of Aotearoa New Zealand, and we have rights under international agreements. We also have the Treaty of Waitangi as a national foundation, guaranteeing us the full benefits of living within the nation of New Zealand, which was established in 1840. That these benefits have yet to be realised is the focus of this book.

However, we have found that in addressing the disparities that affect Māori we can also help others. We will present evidence later in this book to show that focusing reform on Māori also benefits other minoritised peoples, whereas focusing reform on all peoples tends to benefit those who have been benefiting all along—not those who really need it.

Although some progress has been seen in recent times, Māori continue to have higher levels of unemployment, are more likely to be employed in low-paying employment, have much higher levels of incarceration, illness and poverty than do the rest of the population and are generally underrepresented in the positive social and economic indicators of

---

1 "Minoritised" is a term used in Shields, Bishop, and Mazawi (2005) to refer to a people who have been ascribed characteristics of a minority. To be minoritised one does not need to be in the numerical minority, only to be treated as if one's position and perspective are of less worth; to be silenced or marginalised. Hence, for example, in schools on the Navajo reservation with over 95 percent of the population being Navajo, or in Bedouin schools, we find characteristics of the students similar to those we may find among Māori in mainstream schools in which they are actually in the numerical minority.

society. These are all outcomes of a process of colonisation that removed Māori control and power over their resource base, language and culture, and which, given a different set of relationships, could have seen Māori people being full participants in the emerging economy and society of the new nation, instead of being overrepresented in the negative indices (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Walker, 1990). As Colin James (2008) wrote recently in a *New Zealand Herald* column under the title "Nation's Duty to Protect Vulnerable":

> Iwi and hapu were protected in theory by the Treaty of Waitangi. Maori were made equal 'subjects' (citizens). In fact, they were largely dispossessed of their assets, their culture and their self-respect. It wasn't genocide but it crushed morale. Hapu and whanau were less able to ensure their members' welfare. In part the gang violence can be traced to that dispossession and demoralisation. In short, Governments here for 140 years failed the 'responsibility to protect' test for a large and distinguishable minority of our citizens. Only with the initiation of the Treaty of Waitangi process of truth and reconciliation and compensation a generation ago have governments recognised this past failure and attended to it … Rebuilding assets and morale is a multi-generation task … [and indicates] the paramount necessity [for the state] to invest well in our children … reversing the demoralisation of iwi is a demanding project, this responsibility to protect.

The necessity to invest well in our children was also the subject of a recent report to Parliament, entitled the *Inquiry into Making the Schooling System Work for Every Child*, by the Education and Science Committee of the House of Representatives (2008). In its report the committee points to the part education should play in addressing disparities in terms of the impact on Māori as a people, and as people expected to contribute to the nation. The committee pointed out that because Māori represent 28 percent of newborn New Zealanders, the increasing proportion of Māori in the population means that unless "the gap between the performance of Māori students and others is not addressed, the negative consequences for New Zealand will grow exponentially" (p. 10). Professor Mason Durie is quoted as saying that "until the disparity in Māori achievement is corrected, Māori will continue to feature disproportionately in indicators of poor outcomes, *and will be a wasted resource for New Zealand*" (p. 10, emphasis added). The report then identifies how this situation not only affects those who fail at school later in life, in terms of their earning and employment potential, their health and wellbeing and the strong "connection between non-engagement with school and youth offending" (p. 11), but also has effects on the wider society:

> As employment becomes less labour-intensive, and more dependent on the use of technology, fewer jobs will be available for those who lack functional literacy and numeracy. The larger the group, the more difficult will it be for New Zealand to create and sustain a high-performing, internationally competitive economy. (p. 11)

The Education Counts website[2] also identifies a substantial body of evidence that demonstrates that students who are not well served by the education system are heavily disadvantaged in later life. For example, those with higher levels of education are more likely to participate in the labour market, face lower risks of unemployment, have greater access to further training and receive higher earnings on average. Conversely, people with no formal school qualifications have unemployment rates far exceeding those with qualifications, and have the lowest median incomes:

> In 2006, the unemployment rate for those with a bachelor's degree or higher was 2.1 percent; for those with another tertiary qualification 2.9 percent; with only a school qualification 4.1 percent; and with no qualification 5.2 percent … The median weekly income for those with bachelors' and higher degrees was $785; for those with other tertiary qualifications it was $575; for those with school qualifications it was $335; and for those with no qualifications $310. (Education and Science Committee, 2008, pp. 10–11)

The Education Counts website also contends that young people leaving school without any qualifications may have difficulty performing in the workforce and may face difficulties in terms of lifelong learning or returning to formal study in later years. It suggests that a considerable number of research studies show a strong connection between early school leavers and unemployment and/or lower incomes, which are in turn generally related to poverty and dependence on income support.

In his submission to the Education and Science Committee (cited above), Judge Andrew Becroft, the Principal Youth Court Judge, estimated that up to 80 percent of offenders in the Youth Court are not attending school, either because they are not enrolled or because they are suspended or excluded. He continued by suggesting that between 25 and 30 percent of youth offending takes place between 9 am and 3 pm. Judge Becroft proposed that "[e]ngaging all young people of compulsory school age in education would reduce the crime rate among this group significantly" (p. 11).

In terms of offending, the report noted that young Māori offend at twice the rate of young Pasifika people and at four times the rate of young Pākehā, and in the experience of Judge Becroft failure at school contributes to the establishment of a vicious circle that leads to recidivist offending. The Ministry of Social Development also presented evidence that gaining stable employment helps young offenders to desist from offending, particularly if their jobs offer learning opportunities. However, "[s]tudents who fail at school clearly have less chance of obtaining such employment" (pp. 10–11).

Despite the choice provided by Māori-medium education in New Zealand,[3] the vast majority of Māori students attend public/mainstream schools and are taught by non-Māori teachers who have problems relating to and addressing the educational needs of

---

2 http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/, retrieved 2007.
3 Adrienne Alton-Lee (2008) provides us with evidence that students in Māori-medium classrooms are achieving at higher rates than their contemporaries in mainstream schools.

Māori students (Bishop & Berryman, 2006). In addition, decades of educational reforms and policies such as integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism have failed to support teachers adequately to address systemic shortcomings. These reforms have made very little difference for the large proportion of Māori students who have attended mainstream schools since these educational disparities were first statistically identified over 40 years ago (Hunn, 1960).

It is unfortunate that despite these attempts at reform, and encouraging indications that disparities began to reduce in 2005 (Hood, 2008), disparities still remain. The overall academic achievement levels of Māori students are low; more leave school without any qualifications than do their non-Māori counterparts; their retention rate to age 17 is far less than that for non-Māori; their rate of suspension from school is three to five times higher, depending on gender; they are overrepresented in special education programmes for behavioural issues; they enrol in preschool programmes in lower proportions than other groups; they tend to be overrepresented in low-stream education classes; they receive less academic feedback than do children of the majority culture; they are more likely than other students to be found in vocational curriculum streams; they leave school earlier, with fewer formal qualifications; and they enrol in tertiary education in lower proportions (Hood, 2008; Ministry of Education, 2005b).

Addressing these educational disparities is a difficult, yet necessary task for educators at all levels within our system. Most countries that have diverse ethnic student populations will attest to this fact, for this is where educational disparities really show themselves: among the marginalised and minoritised peoples within mainstream educational settings.

In 2001 we, Russell Bishop and Mere Berryman, began an educational reform project called Te Kotahitanga,[4] which aims at improving the educational achievement of indigenous Māori students in mainstream secondary schools. Over the past eight years the project has spread to 33 secondary schools in New Zealand, where we are now seeing some remarkable changes in Māori student engagement with learning and achievement. The project is funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Education and is based on a theoretical approach to research and development termed "kaupapa Māori".[5] The project developed from a unique perspective, in that it draws on the ways of knowing

4   Te Kotahitanga literally means unity of purpose, but it has increasingly come to embody its figurative meaning of unity through self-determination. Many Māori meeting houses and marae are named Te Kotahitanga in acknowledgement of the movement of the same name that developed in New Zealand in the late 19th century, and which had self-determination for Māori as one of its key policies.

5   Kaupapa Māori is a discourse of proactive theory and practice that emerged from within the wider revitalisation of Māori communities that developed in New Zealand following the rapid Māori urbanisation in the 1950s and 1960s. This movement grew further in the 1970s, and by the late 1980s had developed as a political consciousness among Māori people, which promoted the revitalisation of Māori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse.

of the people most affected by educational disparities, and the project has built on Māori aspirations, preferences and practices for educational reform (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2007; Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, & Richardson, 2003).

Having said that, this book is not about the project as such. Instead, it seeks to address an even more complex question than how to design and implement effective educational reform. It seeks to understand how to develop an educational reform programme that is both extendable and sustainable; that is, a model that addresses both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of education reform. In other words, a model of scaling up educational reform that not only addresses the need to expand enclaves of successful reform to more schools and classrooms, but also addresses the qualitative complexity that lies beneath reform efforts in ways that sustain "change in a multi-level system characterized by multiple and shifting priorities" (Coburn, 2003, p. 3). In this way, we understand that educational reform will play a part in impacting on social disparities by impacting on educational disparities.

This book considers the conditions that are necessary for extending and sustaining educational reform by considering what McLaughlin and Mitra (2001) term "theory or principle-based educational reforms". Fullan (2007) terms these "large-scale reforms". Such reforms focus on improving student outcomes by creating a professional learning context in which teachers acquire an in-depth understanding of the underlying theoretical principles of the reform so that they can use their learning flexibly in their classrooms when new situations and challenges arise. Such reforms are initiated and designed outside of schools and focus on the need to reform educational practice at a number of levels—the classroom, the school and the education system as a whole—in order to improve student outcomes.

Scaling up theory- or principle-based reforms requires that all of those currently involved deepen their understanding of their practices in response to changing circumstances within existing reform sites, as well as broadening the reach of the reform to these teachers' other classrooms, to other teachers' classrooms within the initial and new schools and to policy makers at the national level. As Glennan, Bodilly, Galegher, and Kerr (2004) observe, from their detailed meta-analysis of attempts to scale up a number of large-scale, theory-based educational reforms in the United States, scaling up an educational reform is no longer thought of in terms of a one-way replication model that simply seeks to increase the number of sites involved in the reform. Rather, scaling up is seen as a "non-sequential process of interaction, feedback, and adaptation among groups of actors—teachers, providers, schools, and district and state administrators" (p. 27). In other words, reform participants are not acted upon but are active participants in an *iterative* process. Successful scale up of educational reform requires of active participants that they not only change core instructional practices from those currently dominant in the schools, but also provide infrastructural and organisational support at a

variety of levels—within the schools and beyond, and within the system itself. This may extend to changing "policies governing standards, assessments and accountability; the supporting infrastructure, including incentives for teachers and other actors; funding and resource allocations patterns; and networking arrangements" (ibid.).

Issues of extending and sustaining educational reforms are not mutually exclusive: they are two sides of the same coin. Extending education reform means broadening the reform to other sites, be they classrooms, schools or regions. By sustainability we follow the understandings of Coburn (2003), Elmore (1996), McLaughlin and Mitra (2001), and Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung (2007), who stress that sustainability means more than simply maintaining the practices of the reform over time, or even continuing the level of implementation achieved when the reform design team leaves the school. Rather, by sustainability we mean *the provision of a means whereby the reform is able to be deepened and extended by teachers, school leaders and policy makers in response to a changing student curriculum, and context, over time and circumstance.*

Following Coburn (2003), Elmore (1996) and McLaughlin and Mitra (2001), we emphasise that issues of extension and sustainability are addressed by the same means, and that these means need to exist from the very inception of the reform and be built into the design and implementation of the reform from its very outset. In other words, "issues of invention, implementation, sustainability, and scale occur simultaneously when going deeper and broader with theory-based change" (McLaughlin & Mitra, 2001, p. 301).

Sarason (1996) warns that, despite the initial success of a reform, reforms tend to founder once external support and funding are withdrawn, personnel and policies shift and competition for internal resources grows. Theory-based reforms are designed to counter this tendency in that, while they are generally large scale, they have a motivating theoretical base which establishes core principles or norms of practice that define the change in terms of the theoretical foundations of classroom practice. This flexibility allows the reform to be appropriate to and owned by practitioners in a wide range of settings and circumstances. Indeed, what is crucial is that the local participants be able to adapt and modify their actual activities in line with the reform's principles to make the reform relevant to their own setting. As Coburn (2003) notes, to deepen and extend the reform, schools, teachers and students need to be able to take *ownership* of the reform in order to maintain the focus in the face of competing interests and agendas.

Along with Freire (1970) and Fullan (1993), we acknowledge that too many educational reform initiatives have been top down, drawing on expert theories of change while ignoring the necessary involvement and ownership by those on the ground. Although theory-based reforms are usually externally generated, they are given practical form in school settings, often requiring "significant teacher learning and contextualization if they are to change teaching and learning in significant, sustained ways" (McLaughlin &

Mitra, 2001, p. 302). In short, theory-based reforms are externally generated, contain core principles and allow for "co-invention and flexible implementation in practice" (ibid.).

Such an approach is vital, for, as Elmore (1996) notes, "innovations that require large changes in the core of educational practice seldom penetrate more than a small fraction of US schools and classrooms and seldom last for very long when they do" (p. 1). By the core of education, Elmore means:

> how teachers understand the nature of knowledge and the student's role in learning, and how these ideas about knowledge and learning are manifested in teaching and classwork. The 'core' also includes structural arrangements of schools, such as the physical layout of classrooms, student grouping practices, teacher responsibilities for groups of students, and relations among teachers in their work with students, as well as processes for assessing student learning and communicating it to students, teachers, parents, administrators, and other interested parties. (p. 1)

This book is about educational reform at three levels: the classroom; the school; and the system. As Datnow and Stringfield (2000), Fullan (2007) and Glennan et al. (2004) all stress, it is the interdependence of the actors at all the levels of the education system that is crucial for sustaining and expanding educational reform. Such an approach is necessary, for although we understand clearly that teachers in classrooms are the engine room of educational reform, as Elmore (2004) suggests, the key to change is teacher action supported by responsive structural reform. Or, as Glennan et al. (2004) observe, "new teaching methods are doomed to fade if not supported by school- and district-wide policies and infrastructure" (p. 29).

It is worth noting that in Bolman and Deal's (2006) model, infrastructure ranges from and includes school management structures, organisation and reporting systems, such as staffing role allocations and capability-building procedures, decision-making processes, through to the symbolic representation of what is important to the school. Our earlier work (Bishop et al., 2003, 2007) has investigated what effective teacher action looks like in depth, and we will draw on that work here. However, now it is also timely to consider just what "responsive structural reform" looks like in practice and how to implement this at the school and system-wide levels. Based on our experiences of working within a large educational reform project with 33 secondary schools, their teachers, leaders and communities (some for over five years), and with reference to the literature in this field, we have developed in this book a model for sustaining and extending theory-based educational reforms.