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1. Relationships enable us to do our jobs, *BUT they are not sufficient in themselves*

◆ We need to be heading to the NORTH EAST.
Researching in Maori settings is a matter of establishing extended family-like relationships.
Relationships and Discursive Interactions.
Scatterplot of the predicted probability of high Discursive Practice by Whanaungatanga
Figure 1: Scatterplot of the percentage of Engagement observed relative to the mean level of observed Whanaungatanga
Figure 1: Scatterplot of the predicted probability of high Engagement by Whanaungatanga
Relationships and Interactions.
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Mathematics gain by Pedagogy

![Bar chart showing mean gain in mathematics achievement across different levels of pedagogical effectiveness. The x-axis represents pedagogical effectiveness from 1.00 to 4.00, and the y-axis represents mean gain in mathematics achievement from 0 to 100.]
Table X: Effect sizes for each of the mean gain scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Pedagogy by 1SD group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>1.00 (2 SD below mean)</td>
<td>69.69</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 (1 SD below mean)</td>
<td>87.31</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 (1 SD above mean)</td>
<td>96.09</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 (2 SD above mean)</td>
<td>95.81</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>.57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Maori</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>72.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>86.70</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>114.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>.49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>57.95</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>79.56</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>90.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>108.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. We need a common code of practice.

- We need to implement those interactions that we know make a difference for learners.
- Prior Knowledge; Feedback & Feed-Forward; Co-construction; power-sharing strategies.
- We need a means of knowing how learners are progressing.
3. We need to be careful of the plague of ‘good ideas’ that masquerade as evidence-based practice, (Sleeter, 2014).

We need evidence that our theories actually do work.
4. We need to be aware that most PLD is ineffective.

- Teachers suffer from “Initiative-itis,”
5. We need to listen to students, but what we hear is teachers’ voice.

- Listen to all involved in education, especially student ‘voice’.
We found that all these people drew on 3 discourses to explain their experiences and from which to offer solutions:

- Problems of the child and the home
- Structures and systems
- Relationships within the classroom and the school
What the narratives said

*Discourses Explaining Maori Achievement: Students, Whanau, Principals and Teachers*

© 2003 Ministry of Education
6. Culture is most often seen as customs and objects, rather than as sense-making processes,

- Pedagogies need to be responsive to the culture of the students: Culturally Responsive Pedagogies.
7. Principal turnover is a major issue in sustaining gains.

- Where principals remained, it was more likely that gains would be sustained,
- Where there was principal turnover, it was more than likely that gains were not sustained.
8. We need to support School and System Leaders to persist with what makes a difference to student outcomes.
We should see evidence of the following:

**Goal**: Focus should be on improving target student’s participation and achievement.

- Development of a **Pedagogy** of Relations to depth
- Development of supportive **Institutions** and Structures
- Development of distributed and instructional **Leadership**
- **Spread of** the reform to include others
- **Evidence** of the progress of the reform in the school
- **Evidence of Ownership**
In 2010 and 2011 we tested this hypothesis in Phase 3 and 4 schools. We identified that in high implementer and high supportive schools, leaders were using the GPILSEO model effectively.
### Table 1: Comparison of Māori Student Outcomes at Year 11 NCEA Level 1, 2006-9, between Group 1 and Group 2 Schools in PHASE 3 Implementation categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation categories</th>
<th>Mean % pass NCEA Level 1</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 and 2 (Group 1)</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>50.99</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 3 and 4 (Group 2)</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>45.07</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point difference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z value</td>
<td>2.44 *</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>3.40**</td>
<td>3.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bishop et al., 2011
Table 2: Comparison of Māori Student Outcomes at Year 11 NCEA Level 1, 2009-11, between Group 1 and Group 2 Schools in PHASE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation categories</th>
<th>Mean % pass NCEA Level 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 and 2 (Group 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 3 and 4 (Group 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bishop et al., 2012
Phase 5: Achievement Gains. 2009-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>% difference 2009-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCEA Level 1 Comparison</td>
<td>10.8 (41.6 - 52.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 (42.1 - 46.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA Level 2</td>
<td>14.7 (44.9 – 59.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>4.8 (44.1 – 48.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA Level 3 Comparison</td>
<td>10.8 (32.3 – 42.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 (30.0 – 33.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Entrance Comparison</td>
<td>3.1 (22.9 – 26.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 (21.2 - 23.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, how do we address all of these problems?

◆ **Relationship-based Leaders of Learning Profile**
◆ An integrated model of reform includes context creation, effective interactions and monitoring at all levels.
◆ TESTING: NZ, Northern Territories/Australia, Canada with Cognition Education.
Relationship-Based Leaders of Learning Profile.

- Part 1: *Create* an extended family-like context in classrooms and schools,
- Part 2: *Interact* within this context in ways that promote learning,
- Part 3: *Monitor* learners’ progress by using their ‘voice’; Know your impact.
Part 1: Creating an extended family context for learning.

- Anti-deficit thinking (*kaua e whakaiti*)
- Caring for the children (*manaakitanga*)
- Having high expectations (*tumanako teitei*)
- Managing learning effectively (*tiakitanga*)
- Knowing what needs to be learnt (*mohiotanga*).
Part 2: Interacting within the Learning Context.

- *drawing* on learners’ prior learning,
- *Using* Formative assessment: Feedback, Feed-forward,
- *Using* Co-construction processes,
- Using power-sharing strategies (tino rangatiratanga, ki tena, ki tena)
Part 3 *Monitor* learners’ progress and the impact of the processes of learning.

Goals
Institutions
Spread
Ownership

Pedagogy
Leadership
Evidence
Summary: Relationship-based Learning model;

- Enables us to do our job
- Provides a common code of practice
- Is Evidence/research based
- Is transformative
- Promotes use of student voice
- Understands culture to be sense-making
- Enables leaders of learning to focus on outcomes
- Is sustainable

1. Teachers, working together, as evaluators of their impact

2. The power of moving from what students know now towards explicit success criteria

3. Errors and trust are welcomed as opportunities to learn

4. Maximize feedback to teachers about their impact

5. Getting the proportions of surface to deep correct

6. The Goldilocks principles of challenge, and deliberate practice to attain these challenges
Ma te Runga Rawa koutou, e tiaki, e manaaki.