

Kura Kaupapa Maori: *Tomorrow's Schools and Beyond*

An examination of the development of Kura Kaupapa Maori in the context of the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms and subsequent government policy initiatives

PETER APPLEBY

Abstract:

Kura Kaupapa Maori are a distinctive and unique feature of the New Zealand education system. This report outlines a literature review that seeks to examine the position of such schools within the reformed New Zealand educational environment since 1988. The project focuses on the Tomorrow's Schools reforms, before giving a briefer review of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, Assessment for Better Learning and the Report of the Literacy Taskforce. A number of themes emerge, including the increasing acknowledgement of Kura Kaupapa Maori in policy documents over time, the lack of specific provision for such schools, and the incongruence of Maori beliefs and aspirations and the philosophical foundation of the policy arena.

The reform of New Zealand education in 1988 was based on a number of "features" or principles outlined in what has become known as the Picot Report: *Administering For Excellence* (Department of Education, 1988a). Two of these are of particular significance here. The first is that *decisions be made at appropriate levels*. The vision of the reformers was that greater decision making should be devolved to individual schools and communities so that schooling that was appropriate and responsive to community needs could be offered. A second principle of the reform process was that of *openness and responsiveness*. Here the vision was of "consumer choice". It was

proposed that a "market" model of schooling could be constructed and that consumers – students and their families – could choose a "product" that suited their needs, and that market pressure would ensure that the varying needs of the "customer base" would be met. In such an environment we might have expected to see significant changes in New Zealand schools.

In fact since 1988 diversification of primary schooling in New Zealand has been limited. In the main, schools have remained relatively homogenous, beyond the welcome variations in architectural style and colour schemes that dot our suburbs and towns today. But Kura Kaupapa Maori are an exception to this trend. The development of these schools is a radical departure for New Zealand, moving well beyond the philosophy of the Native Schools/Maori Schools of the past to an innovative model of schooling that responds to the cultural, linguistic and educational needs of a significant group of our indigenous students.

Kura Kaupapa Maori emerged from the success of the Te Kohanga Reo movement which introduced Maori immersion pre-schools in the 1980s. Parents and students graduating from Kohanga sought to develop a model of schooling that was an appropriate "next step". This was an intervention initiative concerned both with "Maori language revival and survival", and with offering an environment in which "to be Maori" is taken for granted and the legitimacy of Maori language, knowledge, culture and values are assumed to be natural" (Smith, 1991, p. 7). Kura Kaupapa Maori were from the beginning based on six distinctively Maori principles: tino rangatiratanga/self-determination; taonga tuku iho/cultural aspiration; ako Maori/culturally preferred pedagogy; kia piki ake i nga raruraru i nga kainga/mediation of socio-economic and home difficulties; whanau/extended family; and kaupapa/collective vision (1991, pp. 12-13).

The first Kura were private or alternative schools, operating outside of the state structure. The development was an attempt to "resist (the) inhibiting structural elements embedded in ... (state) schools and which were ... perceived as generally contributing to the poor performance of many Maori pupils" (1991, p. 7). This initial development of Kura outside the state structure ensured that Maori were able to design systems of administration, curriculum and pedagogy in accord with tikanga Maori. Although the *Integration Act* of 1975, designed to incorporate Roman Catholic and other church schools into the state system, set a precedent for schools of "special character" to be part of

mainstream education, it was not until the *Education Amendment Act* of 1989 that Kura were specifically included in legislation. By this time there were five Kura Kaupapa Maori operating in Auckland as part of a national trial.

The policies

Tomorrow's Schools 1988

The advent of *Tomorrow's Schools* (Department of Education, 1988) heralded the most profound reform of New Zealand education ever undertaken (MacPherson, 1998, p. 1). While the need for reform was widely acknowledged at the time, there was disquiet amongst many educational professionals at the direction the process was taking and at the underlying philosophy of the leaders of the reforms. In particular this was true of Maori commentators concerned with the issues surrounding the achievement of Maori students and the preservation of Te Reo Maori (Smith, 1988, 1989, 1991, 1992; Smith & Smith, 1990; Reedy, 1991). While acknowledging that the reform process was not as extensive as had been initially intended, the notions of "choice and voice" (Smelt, 1998, p. 10) that were implicit in the final reform structure suggested new opportunities were to become available for "interest groups" such as Maori to pursue initiatives like Kura Kaupapa Maori. In fact there was little provision for alternative Maori educational structures, and indeed certain impediments were identified within the *Tomorrow's Schools* model to such development.

The *Tomorrow's Schools* model was underpinned by a philosophy of "functionalism, localism, centralism and efficiency. It did not include pluralism" (MacPherson, 1998, p. 7). It was essentially a "mainstream" initiative geared to the needs and aspirations of Pakeha and arguably, the middle-class. "Others" were included by default. It is conceivable that a broad policy like this might be couched in generic terms. However it seems inconceivable, in retrospect, that a New Zealand policy statement a little over a decade ago, did not overtly and directly address issues for Maori education in general, nor an initiative as important as Kura Kaupapa Maori more specifically.

It should be noted that there is indeed a section in *Tomorrow's Schools* (3.2) addressing *Maori Interests*. Clause 3.2.1 allows that "opportunities will be made available to parents who wish to have their children learn or be educated in the Maori language... (and 3.2.2 continues that) ... Whanau will be able to have access to and participate

in education ... through individuals within the whanau being eligible for election to the board of trustees" (Department of Education, 1988, p. 26). Maori commentators noted at the time that such a provision for Maori education and Kura Kaupapa Maori in particular was inadequate. Such clauses imply

that this whanau representation on a Board of Trustees would be sufficient to implement a school programme where children can actually be taught in the Maori language. This of course does not necessarily follow and in fact would be very unlikely to happen. (Smith, 1989, p. 34)

The issue of Kura Kaupapa Maori and *Tomorrow's Schools* is sometimes thought to be dealt with in sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the document. The first of these form the so-called "opt-out" clauses. "Groups of parents will be able to withdraw from an existing institution and set up a separate one if the particular educational needs of their children cannot be met locally" (Department of Education, 1988, p. 37). To include Kura Kaupapa Maori within such a provision was a seriously flawed policy. First, clause 5.5.3 notes that "the setting up of a new institution will be a last resort" (p. 37). The prospect of protracted negotiations with the Ministry of Education to "prove" that student needs were not being met in existing schools was unenviable. However, more importantly, Maori were incensed that recognition of the *official status* of Te Reo Maori in 1984, and its place among *nga taonga* protected in Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi was relegated to a "last resort" category. Secondly, it was feared that the requirement that new institutions "must be consistent with national guidelines" (p. 37), "would probably rule out the setting up of Kura Kaupapa Maori ... since the stated methods (and philosophy noted above) of Kura Kaupapa Maori currently lie outside the norm" (Smith, 1989, p. 34). Thirdly there was anxiety about funding. Smith notes that even if Kura Kaupapa Maori could be established under these clauses they would presumably be "funded in the same way as other institutions" (p. 34). Clearly such a notion is inadequate. Kura Kaupapa Maori had, and continue to have, particular funding needs. In 1991 it was observed that Kura Kaupapa Maori were chronically under-funded, with some battling to provide even adequate sanitation (Reedy, 1991, p. 8). Twelve years later *Nga Haata Matauranga* (1999/2000) notes that there remains a shortage of skilled teachers of Te Reo Maori and of teaching resources (Ministry of Education, 2001, p. 11). In addition there continues to be a serious lack of assessment resources in Te Reo Maori (Bishop et al., 2000). It took 10 years for the funding issue to be

addressed with some adequacy. In 1999, "a new establishment process for kura kaupapa Maori ... (was) ... developed ... so new kura are identified and established using a consistent approach and sound viability criteria (both *financially* and educationally (Ministry of Education, 2001, p. 11) [italics added]. Such an approach was legislated for in the *Education Act* of 1999.

Kura Kaupapa Maori are acknowledged directly in the *Tomorrow's Schools* document in clause 5.6.1. Here it is indicated that "the definition of 'special character' schools ... will be extended to include kaupapa Maori schools" (Department of Education, 1988, p. 37). As with the "opt-out" clause, many Maori were offended to find themselves an "add-on", to be included with integrated church schools and minority interest groups such as Steiner and Montessori schools. It should be acknowledged at this point, that the number of students in Kura Kaupapa Maori in 1988 was very small indeed. Even in 2000, only 3 percent of Maori students were enrolled in Kura Kaupapa Maori.

However this is not a case of "another minority interest". Maori and Pakeha are signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi and so partners in all social and political endeavour. Awareness of the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi and the issues arising from it were widely acknowledged politically and in the media in the 1980s. Bicultural education programmes were offered by institutions as diverse as the teacher unions and the mainline churches. By the time of the 1988 reforms, the Waitangi Tribunal had been established, Te Reo was an official language (as was noted above) and the country was preparing to celebrate the sesqui-centennial of the signing of the Treaty in 1990. It is understandable that Maori commentators were angry as they critiqued the reform documents.

Kura Kaupapa Maori should be established for its own worth and particular Maori character and not by default, because the state system couldn't fit us in. For a century now, things Maori have been "fitted in" to the general state system. The character of Kura Kaupapa Maori contains many of the taonga of our Maori ancestors and are not and cannot be "fitted in" – rather they must stand as of their own right. (Smith, 1989, pp. 34-35)

Two further provisions of the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms offered Kura Kaupapa Maori a potential avenue to express their needs and enter into dialogue with the new Ministry of Education. The Parent Advocacy Council was designed "to help groups and individuals whose needs are not being listened to elsewhere in the system" to have a voice

(Department of Education, 1988b, p. 22). The Community Forums were intended to "identify and gather together views ... of all education sectors", to "discuss policy initiatives proposed by the ministry and provide feedback on these" and to "discuss broad educational issues" (pp. 14-15). The latter proposal was warmly received, but short-lived. Unfortunately both the proposed parent council and the forums were abandoned in 1990.

We move now from the reform documents and legislation themselves to the wider philosophical arena of the reforms, and the impact of these on Maori and particularly Kura Kaupapa Maori. It is now widely recognised that much of the economic and social reform of the 1980s (internationally and in New Zealand) was driven by what is popularly called the "New Right". This movement, or perhaps more accurately, this paradigm shift, was primarily Treasury-driven with the support of Roger Douglas and others in the Labour Government of the time. Treasury thinking was dominated by "neo-Friedmanism or market liberalism, public choice theory, and reiterated the State Services' vertical structural efficiency principle" (MacPherson, 1998, p. 8). Such an agenda has been expressed as a drive towards the commodification of education, something which has been widely criticised both in the academic literature (Codd, 1998; Grace, 1990; MacPherson, 1998; Robertson, 1999), by professional educators, and by social commentators.

Maori have a particular and distinctive critique of this new philosophy and approach. Graham Smith, in discussing the report of the Picot taskforce, refers to the "inhibitive effect of Pakeha administrative structures on (Maori) language and culture" (Smith, 1988, p. 37). The verticality and individuality of the reform paradigm are the antithesis of the horizontality and collectivity of Maori spirituality and social processes. Accountability, though a major theme of the reforms, is not addressed from a Maori perspective. The notion of cultural accountability is implicit in the Treaty of Waitangi. Yet *Tomorrow's Schools* does not include any mechanism by which schools or the Minister can be held accountable for the "delivery of services" to Maori collectively. *Tomorrow's Schools* is built on a distinctive notion of social equity – implicit in what Lockwood Smith, as Minister of Education, later called the "level playing field". There is scarcely any acknowledgment of difference, and as has been noted above, none at all of pluralism. This is a concern for all New Zealand schools and particularly for Kura Kaupapa Maori. The notion of equity in the reform context is problematic. Rae notes the tension between equity mediated

through “procedural policies” and the principles of social justice (Rae, 1998, p. 18). Equity, with its implication not only of fairness but also of impartiality is, in the view of the reformers, to be mediated by the “market”. “Equity is best achieved through systems which combine enabling legislation with awareness and education” (Department of Education, 1988, p. 25).

Such an approach has been described as consisting of “false notions of fairness, equality, equity. Processes of equivocation serve to moderate minority Maori interests and aspirations through a concern to be fair to ‘all’. As a consequence Maori needs and aspirations are subsumed within the concern to be ‘fair’ to everyone”. (Smith, 1988, p. 41)

This policy is determinedly monocultural, devoid of thorough social and political analysis and clearly dismissive of any notion of *equality* of opportunity and outcomes for Maori students. Acknowledging that some reference was made to culture and language in the reform documents, Johnston notes that no “connection was made to structural factors” which Maori submissions to the Picot taskforce had identified as being necessary to expedite enhanced achievement for Maori students (Johnston, 1999, p. 81). It is testament to the power of the Treasury’s agenda to control “fiscal exposure” in public education, that the guarantees of the Treaty of Waitangi were virtually ignored by the reformers (Wylie, 1997).

A final comment on *Tomorrow's Schools* and its failure to address issues for Maori and particularly Kura Kaupapa Maori recalls the wealth of material that was available at the time of the reforms, highlighting the need for decisive action in order to address the special needs of Maori and education. The Hunn Report of 1960, *Towards Partnership* (1976), *The Royal Commission on Social Policy* (1988), and The Hirsh Report (1990), to name just a few, all recommended that urgent attention be given to issues of Maori retention and achievement within the New Zealand education system. Irwin notes that Johnson, reporting on Maori education over the period 1961–1982,

identified seven areas of recommended changes which have emerged from reports: “curriculum, pedagogy and evaluative systems; the Maori pupil and English language; the need for a culturally competent teaching force; school staffing and support services; Maori language; preschool education; and school community relationships.” (Irwin, 1999, p. 68)

It is probably fair to say that apart from passing references to Maori language, and a redefinition of “evaluation” as “accountability”, *Tomorrow's Schools* addresses none of these issues.

New Zealand Curriculum Framework 1993

At the same time as the administration of schools in New Zealand was being reformed, a restructuring of curriculum was taking place, almost simultaneously. Previously the New Zealand school curriculum had been rather disparate and in need of revision. Indeed a curriculum review was being undertaken by the Department of Education when *Tomorrow's Schools* was introduced. The review was abandoned. The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF) project of 1993 arose out of a desire by the government to address a perceived “crisis” in student achievement and to enhance New Zealanders’ abilities to compete in world labour markets, issues which are returned to below.

The document was presented as the “foundation policy for learning”, offering a “coherent framework for learning and assessment in all New Zealand schools.” The introduction goes on “to acknowledge the value of the Treaty of Waitangi” and to suggest that the framework “allows schools the freedom to develop programmes which are appropriate to the needs of their students” (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 1). Kura Kaupapa Maori are acknowledged in the document (pp. 3, 8) and Maori generally have welcomed the inclusion of attitudes and values/*nga waiaro me nga uara* (p. 21) and the brief reference to Te Reo Maori (p. 10). However there is disquiet amongst Maori education professionals and commentators who believe that the framework and the subsequent documents on learning areas offer little opportunity for authentic Maori teaching and learning in a Kura Kaupapa Maori context.

Soon after the implementation of *Tomorrow's Schools* the Government changed. However educational change continued to be high on the political agenda of the new National Government. The first step taken by the new Minister, The Hon. Lockwood Smith, was to introduce the *Achievement Initiative* (Ministry of Education, 1991) with the object of “raising standards” and averting the supposed “crisis” in educational achievement in New Zealand.¹ The *Achievement Initiative* proposed that curriculum reform focus on science, mathematics, technology and literacy. These were subjects which the Minister deemed important “for students to succeed at in order for them to

participate *productively* and confidently in the modern competitive environment"¹ [italics added]. Curriculum reform, like school administration reform before it, was clearly being driven by an economic imperative. Through the intervention of Ministry of Education officials, curriculum reform was broadened to include the seven essential learning areas, a set of essential skills and some overarching principles. However vestiges of the "crisis" mentality remained. The third paragraph of the NZCF Foreword begins "Today, New Zealand faces many challenges. If we wish to progress as a nation, and to enjoy a healthy prosperity ... we need a work-force which is increasingly highly skilled and adaptable, and which has an international and multi-cultural perspective" (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 1). Nowhere however, does NZCF address the well documented and real "crisis" of the achievement of Maori students at the time. "Arguably, the most apparent crisis within New Zealand education in the 1990s is that which relates to the education of Maori as a group" (Smith & Smith, 1990). The Hirsh Report of 1990 notes that the issues of Maori achievement are of national importance. Yet in all the talk of the challenges New Zealand faced in the international community, there was no reference at all to the urgent and pressing challenges facing Maori students within our own country, which had been identified time and again since 1960.

As noted earlier, Maori commentators have rendered problematic the philosophical foundations of the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms. Likewise there is uneasiness at the epistemological and pedagogical direction taken by the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. Vercoe notes that Kura Kaupapa Maori generally approach teaching and learning in an integrated and holistic way. Here he is referring not to the notion of doing an occasional integrated study that is common in many mainstream classrooms, but rather a fundamental philosophy that understands the connectedness of all learning. Vercoe's is the notion of a non-time-tabled classroom, where, for example, algebra is learned in the context of a sea-shore study. And so he asks, "How can a national curriculum, based upon a collection code (as opposed to an integrated code) epistemology, adequately address the learning needs of Maori children?" (Vercoe, 1995, p. 128). A segmented national curriculum, for all its lip-service to flexibility and the interrelatedness of the learning areas (Ministry of Education, 1993, pp. 8-9) offers an added difficulty for Kura Kaupapa Maori, operating under already stressful conditions. Vercoe goes on to raise a fundamental question which vexes all

indigenous educators – "Who decides what it is that is worth learning?" Although the New Zealand Curriculum Framework makes some reference to values, attitudes and skills that are of particular significance to tikanga Maori (such as *rangimarie* and *aroha*), and the skill to *participate appropriately in a range of social and cultural settings* (Ministry of Education, 1993, pp. 19, 21), there has been little attempt to define or legitimate distinctively "Maori knowledge" as being of "high status" and therefore worthy of inclusion in the curriculum (Vercoe, 1995, p. 129).

Bishop and Glynn also have reflected on the pedagogical practice of Kura Kaupapa Maori, and their findings offer a further critique of the NZCF. They report that Kura Kaupapa Maori operate in distinctive ways that offer students an opportunity to "participate on terms determined by the students themselves, because the pedagogic process itself holds this to be a central value.... Learning and teaching are to be reciprocal and interactive; home and school learning are to be interrelated; learners are to be connected to each other and learn with and from each other" (Bishop & Glynn, 2000, p. 5). They are suggesting here that Kura Kaupapa Maori operate a constructivist model of curriculum in which students are "co-learners" with teachers, and where teacher/student roles are reciprocal. Such a model is collaborative. It is politically transparent and invites critical reflection and an ongoing critique of power relationships. This *narrative pedagogy* is incompatible with a prescribed national curriculum.

Perhaps the most surprising omission from the New Zealand Curriculum Framework is any substantive discussion of Te Reo Maori. Certainly the language is mentioned.

Maori is the language of the tangata whenua of New Zealand. It is a *taonga* under the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi and is an official language of New Zealand. *Students will have the opportunity to become proficient in Maori.*" (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 10) [Italics added]

The first two sentences are strong and welcome. However the third is puzzling. It is unclear which students are being referred to and what it would mean to be "proficient". It certainly is not an endorsement of Kura Kaupapa Maori. In fact Linda Smith believes the *Language and Languages* statement in New Zealand Curriculum Framework represents a "marginalization" of Maori language. She acknowledges the importance of English language learning for Kura Kaupapa Maori students, but believes that the New Zealand Curriculum Framework, by "over-emphasising the significance of English language ... undermines the worth of Maori language" (Smith, 1992, p. 224). The

point raised earlier, that awareness of Maori issues has been on the "national agenda" for decades now, is apposite. The references to Maori language in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework are hardly adequate to meet the needs of Pakeha students preparing for life in a society marked by increasing cultural diversity. For Maori students, the document is profoundly disappointing.

Information For Better Learning 1999

Assessment and accountability have been constant themes of the educational reform process during the last decade of the twentieth century. The notion of national testing has had vociferous support from business leaders, the Education Review Office (ERO) and some within the professional education community. The New Zealand Curriculum Framework envisaged School-Based Assessment as being primarily diagnostic in character and purpose. Alongside this were proposals to develop Key Transition Point Assessments – which eventually became the Assessment Resource Bank Programme (ARB), and the development of a programme for National Monitoring through light sampling – which evolved into the National Educational Monitoring Project (NEMP). However, although the latter internationally renowned project had been in place since 1995, and although ARB resources were being developed and School Entry Assessment/Aro Matawai (SEA/AKA) was in its second successful year, the call for universal national tests had not abated. In 1998, a Green Paper *Assessment for Success in Primary Schools*, was presented for consultation. There was considerable support for all the proposed assessment initiatives except national testing. However, the National Government decided to press ahead with that proposal and it was presented along with the other initiatives – further Diagnostic Tools, Exemplars of Student Work, and a modified NEMP programme in the White Paper of 1999. With the change of government that same year, national testing was set aside. The other proposals are continuing with some modifications. In general Maori concerns and structures have been more carefully attended to in this area than in some previous policy initiatives. Kura Kaupapa Maori have particularly welcomed the provision from the beginning of a Maori language format for School Entry Assessment (*Aro Matawai*) and the separate reporting by NEMP of the achievement of Maori students in Kura Kaupapa Maori from 2000. However, there remains a high degree of frustration at the limited number and range of assessment resources available to Kura Kaupapa Maori students and teachers.

That Kura Kaupapa Maori have been under-resourced generally has been reported since 1991 (Reedy, 1991). It is somewhat surprising therefore to find that in 2000, Bishop et al. report that significant change has not occurred. In the field of diagnostic assessment tools they report that availability is limited. In fact only three of the measuring tools surveyed have "widespread currency" in Maori medium schools (the study included a sample of all Maori medium education sites, not just Kura Kaupapa Maori): *Nga Kete Korero* (early literacy assessment), *Aro Matawai* (school entry assessment) and *Hei Awhina Matua* (writing assessment) (2000, p. 13, Table 1). Unfortunately, not all schools use even these few assessment resources, with cultural appropriateness and lack of professional development cited as reasons for their reluctance. The issue of "cultural validation" is addressed specifically in the report.

Bishop et al. note the work of Graham Smith (1995) in recalling the purpose of Maori medium education.

Tino rangatiranga (self-determination) over what constitutes an appropriate model, as well as medium of education (Smith, 1995) is what is intended. By addressing that issue with survey respondents, they have been able to conclude that "tools developed in accordance with cultural aspirations ... have acceptance." (2000, p. 6)

Clearly, "translating" existing diagnostic assessment tools into Te Reo Maori will not meet the needs of students in Kura Kaupapa Maori. The conclusion in the report that "cultural ownership" is a significant factor in the success of diagnostic assessment tools, and possibly of resources generally, is important if the resourcing issue is to be addressed successfully, and the learning achievements of Maori students enhanced.

The initiative of NEMP in beginning to report Kura Kaupapa Maori results is most encouraging, though in the first report it is noted that initial difficulties were encountered and the results are tentative at this stage (Flockton & Crooks, 2000). However, although the Assessment Resource Bank project is well established, and has not thus far been diverted to the end of national "transition point" assessment, it is yet to offer items in Te Reo Maori.

The "problem" of resourcing assessment mechanisms for Kura Kaupapa Maori was acknowledged by the ERO in 1995 and is reported in *Nga Haata Matauranga* (1999/2000). It is therefore surprising and disappointing that 16 years after the establishment of the first Kura Kaupapa Maori, the political will is still lacking to adequately resource

these schools in something as basic and fundamental to sound learning outcomes as high quality diagnostic assessment tools.

The Report of the Literacy Taskforce 1999

In 1999 the National Government announced its goal that: "By 2005, every child turning nine will be able to read, write, and do maths for success." The new Labour Government retained the goal and set in place a literacy and numeracy strategy. This included revising the National Administration Guidelines (NAGs) to reflect the new focus schools would need to adopt in these curriculum areas, provision of significant professional development opportunities for teachers, and the initiation of a Literacy Leadership programme in primary schools. The report acknowledges that "in general, New Zealand children are successful readers and writers compared with children from countries with similar or better socio-economic conditions." However "Maori performed significantly below the international average, and Maori boys performed at a level below that of Maori girls" (Ministry of Education, 1999b, p. 10). The report suggests that such a disparity implies a need to attend to the teaching programmes of underachieving students, so that all students have access to high quality programmes that meet their needs. Unfortunately the report was unable to comment on the literacy levels of Kura Kaupapa Maori students, as data were not available at that stage.

There are several specific references to Kura Kaupapa Maori (and Maori medium education) in the report. However, there appear to be no particular strategies proposed to deal with the literacy learning needs of students in Kura Kaupapa Maori. We have already noted the chronic shortage of resources for Kura Kaupapa Maori from the beginning. A 1996 report indicated that learning materials, and literacy resources in particular, were lacking in all Maori medium schools. The authors note particularly a lack of early instructional reading material and the paucity of supply of recreational readers for students in such schools (Hohepa & Smith, 1996). The Literacy Taskforce's own assertion that "Maori performed significantly below the international average", leaves us with the uncomfortable question: What is planned to be done? We can only hope that some other initiative is planned to target the literacy needs of students in Kura Kaupapa Maori, but it is extremely worrying to note that there is no mention at all in *Nga Haata Maturanga* (1999/2000) of any such plan.

Conclusion

This review of the literature covers a period of 40 years from the *Hunn Report* of 1960 to the work of Maori researchers in 2000. The focus has been the *Tomorrow's Schools* reforms of 1988, with a briefer examination of *New Zealand Curriculum Framework, Assessment for Better Learning and the Literacy Taskforce Report*. A number of themes emerge in relation to Kura Kaupapa Maori. First, there is an increasing recognition of the existence of these unique indigenous schools within the wider education scene. Surprisingly, there is minimal recognition within the *Tomorrow's Schools* document, published at a time when Maori issues and concerns were high on the public agenda in New Zealand. The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework and Assessment for Better Learning* make a more significant mention, while the *Literacy Taskforce Report* is pointed in its inclusion of Maori issues. A second theme concerns the provision policy statements make for Kura Kaupapa Maori. Arguably none of the policies reviewed actually provides for Kura Kaupapa Maori. *Tomorrow's Schools* and the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* "allow" for such schools, *Assessment for Better Learning* has some provision, but the *Literacy Taskforce Report* offers none at all. A third theme is the strongly articulated belief that the market driven, "New Right" philosophy underpinning the educational reforms is incongruent with Maori beliefs and aspirations.

We must recognise the difficulty in designing inclusive policies that meet the needs of mainstream, bilingual, Maori immersion and Kura Kaupapa Maori students. Important issues of Maori autonomy need to be addressed. However, as was noted earlier, Kura Kaupapa Maori are not "just another minority interest group". Maori and Maori initiatives have a "partnership relationship" with the mainly Pakeha mainstream. If it is important to have new policies addressing the issues facing mainstream education, it is just as important, in fact more so, to have well resourced, culturally appropriate policies in place for Maori students in Kura Kaupapa Maori.

To conclude: *Tomorrow's Schools* and the subsequent policies reviewed have not enhanced the development of Kura Kaupapa Maori. These schools have succeeded "in spite" of policy. Whether the policy direction of the last decade has inhibited such a development is more difficult to assess. However it is not unreasonable to suggest that amidst all the difficulties facing Kura Kaupapa Maori (experienced leadership, teacher supply, resourcing) the demonstrable lack of policy support

over the period of the review constitutes an inhibiting factor in the successful development of these important schools.

Note

1. From Wood (1993, revised 1995, 1998) *The Political Origins of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. Unpublished paper presented to students on course EDUC502 at Victoria University of Wellington, May 3, 2000.

References

- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Glynn, T., & Richardson, C. (2000). *Diagnostic assessment tools in Maori medium education: A stocktake and preliminary evaluation*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, E. (2000). Kaupapa Maori messages for the mainstream. *set: Research Information for Teachers*, 1, 4-7.
- Codd, J. (1998). *Educational reform and the culture of mistrust*. Paper presented to Annual Conference of the New Zealand Association of Research in Education, Dunedin, December 3-6.
- Department of Education. (1976). *Towards Partnership*. A Report of the Committee on Secondary Education. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (1988a). *Administering for excellence: Effective administration in education* (Picot report). Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Education. (1988b). *Tomorrow's Schools: The reform of educational administration in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Education Review Office. (1995, Winter). *Kura Kaupapa Maori*, 10.
- Flockton, L., & Crooks, T. (2000). *Assessment Results for Maori Students 1999: Science, Art, Graphs, Tables and Maps*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Grace, G. (1990). The New Zealand Treasury and the commodification of education. In S. Middleton, J. Codd & A. Jones (Eds.), *New Zealand policy today* (Chapter 2). Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Hirsh, W. (1990). *A report on issues and factors relating to Maori achievement in the education system*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Hohepa, M. & Smith, L. (1996). *He Arotakenga Pukapuka: An evaluation of Maori medium learning materials*. Auckland: Te Pou Taki Korero, Auckland Uniservices Limited.

- Hunn, J. (1960). *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Irwin, K. (1999). Maori Educational Policy 1989–1998: Lampooning it up! *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies Special Issue*, 34(1), 66-76.
- Johnson, P. (1999). "In through the out door": Policy developments and process for Maori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 34(1), 78-85.
- MacPherson, R. (1998). *Towards the "Daughter of Picot" – He Kaupapa Tangatarua mo Aotearoa: Bicultural nation-building for New Zealand*. In *Ten Years On: Reforming New Zealand Education* (Vol. 2). Paper presented at Biennial Conference of the New Zealand Educational Administration Society, January 11-14.
- Ministry of Education. (1991). *Achievement Initiative*. Unpublished paper.
- Ministry of Education. (1993). *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework/ Te Anga Marautanga o Aotearoa*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1999a). *Information for better learning: National assessment in primary schools*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1999b). *Report of the Literacy Taskforce*. A Report prepared for the Minister of Education. Wellington: Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Education. (2001). *Nga Haata Matauranga: Annual report on Maori education (1999/2000)*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Rae, K. (1998). *Whakaritorito Te Tupu o te Harakeke – Growing the flax shoots: Dilemmas of devolution in New Zealand schools*. In *Ten Years On: Reforming New Zealand Education* (Vol. 2). Paper presented at Biennial Conference of the New Zealand Educational Administration Society, January 11-14.
- Reedy, T. (1991). *Te Kura Kaupapa Maori*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Robertson, S. (1999). "Strip away the bark. Expose the heartwood. Get to the heart of the matter": Re/regulating teachers' labour. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 34(1), 121-132.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1987). Wellington: Government Printer.
- Smelt, S. (1998). *Today's schools: Governance and quality*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, Institute of Public Policy.
- Smith, G. (1988). *Pikau: A Burden for one's Back.... Access*, 7, 34-44.

- Smith, G. (1989). Kura Kaupapa Maori: Innovation and policy development in Maori education. *Access* 8(1), 27-43.
- Smith, G., & Smith, L. (1990). Ki te whai ao, ki te ao marama: Crisis and change in Maori Education. In A. Jones, G. McCulloch & J. Marshall (Eds.), *Myths and Realities: Schooling in New Zealand* (pp. 123-156). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Smith, G. (1991). *Tomorrow's schools and the development of Maori education*. Paper presented at Second Educational Policy Conference, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington, August 1990.
- Smith, L. (1992). Kura Kaupapa Maori and the implications for curriculum. In G. McCulloch, (Ed.), *The School Curriculum* (pp. 219-231). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Treaty of Waitangi. (1840). Wellington: National Archive.
- Vercoe, A. (1995). Resistance in Maori Education: A critique of Kura Kaupapa Maori. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 1, 119-135.
- Wylie, C. (1999). *Ten years on: How schools view educational reform*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

The author

Peter Appleby was formerly a primary school teacher. He is now working towards a PhD in education at Victoria University of Wellington. His principal interest are in educational theory, particularly in the context of indigenous and cultural issues, and gender and sexuality education.