Principal Sabbatical Report 2019
Cynthia Holden
Warkworth School

Topic

Investigate models of best practice where culturally responsive and relational pedagogy combined with the affordances of innovative learning environments have been maximised to activate deep learning amongst self-regulating learners and promote equity of learning outcomes for all learners.

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge and sincerely thank:

- Warkworth School Board of Trustees for their full support of my sabbatical.
- Mrs Suzanne Donovan Skeens who capably lead the school as Acting Principal in my absence, and the senior leadership team, Mrs Maxine Hatfull and Mrs Josie Hagger, for their support.
- the Middle leaders, teachers and staff who continued to work with dedication and commitment and competently supported the leadership team.
- the Ministry of Education for making it possible to take time away from school to rejuvenate, reflect and plan for future pedagogical developments.

Background and Rationale

Warkworth School is a large primary school with a growing roll on account of Warkworth being a satellite city of Auckland. The school opened in 1945 and with aging buildings has been recently rebuilt as an innovative learning environment. The student population comprises 16% Māori and 14% Pasifika, most of whom are first-generation i-Kiribati. The challenge presented by new buildings and a changing student population is that it requires transformative pedagogical practice.

Introduction

From the beginning of the 21st Century, the call to educators to address the long tail of underachievement in our education system, and in particular to reduce the number of Māori students who are overly represented in this long tail, increased in urgency.

Running parallel to this has been a call for educators to educate students for "their future, not our past" meaning we need to deliver a style of education that is future-focussed, where learners develop skills that will enable them to solve increasingly complex problems in an ever-changing world. In an attempt to address this duality, many educators have turned their attention to culturally responsive and relational pedagogy and to innovative learning practice, the latter especially where schools have been either rebuilt or remodelled as innovative learning environments. But how are these two pedagogies aligned, and what does that look like in practice? What overarching model must teachers attend to so that they are able to blend their theoretical understandings of these two pedagogies and truly maximise the affordances of the new environments to benefit all learners, but especially Māori learners, who continue to be overly represented in the long tail of underachievement?

This paper begins by exploring the literature around culturally responsive and relational pedagogy in order to develop a broad conceptual understanding. It then examines the characteristics of innovative learning environments seeking to highlight the affordances that support implementing culturally responsive and relational pedagogy. The discussion then turns to the Treaty of Waitangi as a framework that embraces the underlying concepts of both pedagogies, offering it as a model of best practice in achieving the ultimate goal of reducing disparity of achievement for Māori students and promoting equity of learning outcomes for all learners.

Culturally Responsive and Relational Pedagogy

The term culturally responsive and relational pedagogy is used widely in education. Its origins stem from Te Kotahitanga, a kaupapa Māori research project that began in 2001. The intention of the project was to improve educational outcomes for Māori students in mainstream secondary schools. It gathered the views of Māori students and their whanau, their teachers and principals, and from this information came to understand what prevented and what promoted Māori student attendance, engagement and achievement. Where relationships were toxic, students disengaged with a consequential detrimental impact on learning outcomes (Bishop and Berryman, 2006). Toxic relationships were the outcome of unconscious bias, deficit theorising, and attempts to relate to Māori by including superficial elements of Māori culture.

Unconscious bias, according to Flora, cited in Berryman et al (2018), occurs from the outset of meeting a new person. She contends that "part of our initial response to meeting a stranger appears to be influenced by first impressions created by their physicality; for instance, their size, skin colour, dress, and facial expressions. These first impressions lead to unconscious reactions based on our sense of whether they are more 'like me' or 'other'." (p6). Adding to these first impressions, judgements are also made based on stereotypes of cultures, and in the case of Māori students, these stereotypes are often negative.

Deficit theorising is driven by teachers holding mental images that arise from thought patterns of others as having deficiencies, deficiencies linked to socio-economic factors such as poor nutrition, poor health, poor housing and poor family circumstances. These thought patterns inadvertently influence the way teachers interact and communicate with students. Students detect these negative thought patterns and interpret them as an assault on their Māori culture and their sense that, as Māori, they are not accepted or acceptable (Bishop, 2017). This disrupts the development of positive relationships with an adverse impact on learning outcomes.

In their efforts to connect positively with Māori students and show acceptance of their culture, teachers often include visible elements of the culture in their classrooms. Commonly, however, these tend to be superficial elements of the culture such as Māori vocabulary, kowhaiwhai patterns, Māori motifs, and cultural practices such as powhiri and waiata. The potential risk of this is that at best, Māori students view them as first steps by teachers to connect with them, and at worst, as tokenism (Bishop and Berryman, 2006).

In contrast to toxic student relationships were positive relationships created by agentic teachers, teachers who believe they have the power to make a difference to the educational outcomes of Māori students. These agentic teachers sought to create learning contexts where Māori students could "be themselves as Māori: where Māori students' humour was acceptable, where students could care for and learn with each other, where being different was acceptable and where the power of Māori students' own self-determination was fundamental to classroom relations and interactions"

(Bishop and Berryman, 2009, p.29). The teachers described the strategies they used to effect positive educational outcomes and from this information, the researchers synthesised six key actions. They explained them in terms of Māori understandings and called it the Effective Teaching Profile. It comprised:

- *Manaakitanga: Caring for students as Māori*
  Teachers demonstrate this when they recognise and embrace Māori students as seeing and interacting with the world in different ways, accepting that they bring to learning conversations prior experiences that are different to others but are equally acceptable and legitimate, and who create learning contexts where Māori students can be themselves.

- *Mana motuhake: Caring for the performance of Māori students*
  Teachers who held high expectations of their Māori students, allowing them flexibility in ways of working, whether that be independently or interdependently with others, saw their learners reach their expectations and achieve highly.

- Ngā whakapiringatanga: *Creating a secure, well-managed learning environment*
  Teachers who were well organised, shared expectations and boundaries for learning, who were pedagogically knowledgeable and well prepared for lessons gained positive learning outcomes from their Māori students. These teachers were also pedagogically creative and could adapt the curriculum in response to evolving learning conversations among Māori students to sustain engagement and achievement.

- *Wānanga: Engaging in effective learning interactions with Māori students*
  Teachers who were able to use a range of teaching strategies rather than relying solely on the transmission model of 'chalk and talk' achieved positive outcomes for their learners. These teachers facilitated active learning by allowing students to discuss concepts with their peers and work with the teacher in small-group workshops. They provided feedback to their students and direction for future progress (feed forward), actions which promoted learning for Māori students.

- *Ako: Using a range of teaching strategies*
  Māori students achieved better outcomes when their teachers used a range of dialogic and discursive practices that allowed Māori students to draw on their

prior experiences and co-construct new meaning with their peers or their teachers through discursive discussion and interactive dialogue. Teachers who used a range of teaching strategies were those who were willing to act as a learner, rather than always being the knower, and who were equally comfortable with learning from their Māori students as they were with the students learning from them.

- *Kotahitanga: Using student progress to inform future teaching practices*
  Effective teachers were those who shared learning intentions and success criteria so students could self-assess and monitor their own learning. This collaborative approach, with opportunities to engage in learning conversations, enabled students to work towards continuous self-improvement but equally provided feedback to teachers about the effectiveness of their teaching. It enabled the teachers themselves to engage in continuous self-improvement of their own teaching practice.

<div align="right">Adapted from Bishop and Berryman (2009)</div>

The Effective Teaching Profile was used as an observation and feedback tool in an endeavour to shift teachers' practice to one that is culturally responsive and relational. It guided teachers to reflect on their relationships with students and the responsiveness of their practice as a means of encouraging agentic theorising. Agentic theorising means teachers taking professional responsibility for the learning outcomes of Māori students, accepting they have the power to make a difference to those educational outcomes. If teachers established cultural relationships with Māori students and modified their practice responsively to engage them in interactive learning contexts, the achievement outcomes were positive. This teaching strategy was referred to as a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations.

More recently, Berryman et al (2018) have argued for a renaming of this term to cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy. The renaming places emphasis on two key components, that when combined and implemented effectively, have a positive impact on educational outcomes for Māori students.

Using Māori metaphors to describe this work, they connect the first key component, cultural relationships, to the metaphors whanaungatanga (caring, family-like

relationships), whakapapa (knowing the student and their whanau, understanding their identity and values), and kaupapa (schooling goals are aligned with what whanau want) in order to give emphasis to the nature of the relationships teachers establish with their Māori students. They hint at the tendency for teachers to develop relationships based on academic achievement without necessarily taking into account the student's cultural identity, or their physical, emotional and spiritual wellbeing which are equally important. This broader approach to building relationships is achieved when teachers invite Māori students into learning conversations, opening up opportunities for them to bring their prior knowledge, understandings and experiences, their cultural identity, beliefs, values and aspirations into that conversation. This creates a relational dialogic space that facilitates co-construction of new meanings and understandings from multiple world views, that of the student and the teacher, rather than just one world view, that of the teacher. Adopting this stance provides a powerful way of creating positive cultural relationships.

The second key component, responsive pedagogy, is defined using another three Māori metaphors – wānanga (ways of learning), ako (learning from and teaching others) and mahi ngātahi (working together as one). This pedagogy emerges from within a dialogic relational space. It requires risk-taking on the part of the teacher who must adopt a position of not knowing then actively listen to the student, valuing the knowledge and experiences they bring to their ways of knowing, so as to make sense of what is being said. This type of power-sharing practice is fundamental to responsive practice. It requires teachers to call upon their professional skill and adaptive expertise to advance the learning for their students. Adaptive expertise is described as "the ability to respond in flexible, context-sensitive and intelligent ways to novel situations that arise in their work" (Berryman et al, 2018, p.7). In other words, there is no 'one size fits all' approach to learning: learning is a dynamic exchange of ideas between groups of people, where multiple strategies for teaching are utilised, each selected as being the most effective for that particular moment in time. Adaptive expertise requires the teacher to adjust their practice responsively, moment-by-moment throughout the learning process, to facilitate the very best outcomes for all learners.

While it is useful to separate the two key components for the purpose of developing an understanding of the terms, the two are interdependent and must work in synergy.

If cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy is effectively implemented, Berryman et al (2018) postulate that Māori students will not only come to better understand their world and their place in it, but will also be better prepared for their engagement with the 21st century and with other communities in the global world. They suggest that this would position Māori students in a state of 'mauri ora' a concept drawn from the work of Sir Mason Durie meaning "a person is engaged in positive relationships with others, feels a sense of belonging, is spiritually and emotionally strong, and is positive and energetic. For Māori, this means that success enables them to walk confidently in the two worlds of Aotearoa New Zealand . . . te ao Pākehā and te ao Māori (the Pākehā world and the Māori world)" (p.8).

While Berryman et al (2018) have adopted the term cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy, Bishop (2019) retains the term culturally responsive pedagogy of relations and, building on the original Effective Teaching Profile (ETP), added a third component and renamed it Relationships-based Leaders of Learning Profile (RBLP). The change reflects his recent research revealing that the ETP was only effective in achieving improved outcomes for Māori students when there was significant input from external sources, for example, additional PLD funding from the Ministry of Education or a funded expert facilitator. In the absence of these supports, only the dedicated few continued the work. This had an overall adverse impact on school-wide Māori student attendance, engagement and achievement. The revised profile is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Relationships-based Leaders of Learning Profile

Relationship-based Leaders of Learning:
***Create** a family-like context for learning by:*
- Rejecting deficit explanations for learners' learning
- Caring for and nurturing the learner, including their language and culture
- Voicing and demonstrating high expectations
- Ensuring that all learners can learn in a well-managed environment so as to promote learning
- Knowing what learners need to learn

Interact within this family-like context in ways we know promotes learning by:

- Drawing on learners' prior learning
- Using formative assessment: feedback
- Using formative assessment: feed- forward
- Using fo-construction processes
- Using power-sharing strategies

Monitor learners' progress and the impact of the processes of learning by assessing (using the GPILSEO model) how well learners are able to:

- Set goals for their learning (GOALS)
- Articulate how they prefer to learn (PEDAGOGY)
- Explain how they prefer to organise/be organised in their learning/learning relationships and interactions (INSTITUTIONS)
- Participate in leadership roles and functions (LEADERSHIP)
- Include others in the learning context and interactions (SPREAD)
- Provide evidence of how well they are progressing and what progress they are making (EVIDENCE)
- Take ownership of their own learning (OWNERSHIP)

(Bishop, 2019, pp. 51-52)

The third component of the RBLP addresses sustainability by promoting self-regulation of learning by students, teachers, leaders and education coaches. It calls on them to self-monitor their progress towards a range of learning dimensions including being able to set and achieve goals for their learning, articulate how they prefer to learn, explain how they prefer their learning settings to be organised, participate in leadership roles and functions, include others in learning, provide evidence of how well they are progressing and where to next, and taking ownership of their own learning. This complex process requires additional professional skill on the part of the teachers, and on the part of leaders, coaches and principals in order to facilitate this with their teaching colleagues. Bishop is emphatic that the three components working together are necessary conditions to effect improved outcomes for Māori students. He contends that while creating a family-like context for learning is a necessary condition for having a positive impact on educational outcomes for Māori students, on its own is not sufficient. Similarly, interacting in ways known to promote

learning is a necessary condition for effecting change to educational outcomes, but on its own is not sufficient. "What is absolutely necessary is what is called a *sufficient condition,* one that will produce the event. In this model the sufficient conditions are the interactions between all three parts of the profile; any one part one part on its own is insufficient, all parts (creating, interacting and monitoring) interacting together is the sufficient condition and will produce the desired outcome" (Bishop, 2019, p.53). If we are serious about disrupting the status quo for Māori educational outcomes where inequities are illustrated in league tables demonstrating the disparity of achievement for Māori students, the teaching profession must take heed of this model.

From the research of Berryman et al (2018) and Bishop (2019), some common themes are evident. They include learner-centred constructivist theory, formative assessment practices of self-monitoring also known as self-regulating learners, and contextualising learning in real-world contexts. These themes have much in common with Innovative Learning Environments.

Innovative Learning Environments

Innovative Learning Environments (ILEs) formerly referred to by the Ministry of Education (MoE) as Modern Learning Environments (MLEs) are learning spaces that accommodate two or more teachers and 50 or more students. At Warkworth School, ILEs are spaces that accommodate either four teachers and 100 students or eight teachers and 200 students. The MoE's emphasis in the early years of construction was on the physical environment and associated building codes that would distinguish them from the Open Plan buildings of 1970 – 1980, codes that focused on heat, light, ventilation and acoustics. Thus the terms ILE and MLE developed a conceptual understanding that was more about the physical layout of the buildings rather than the pedagogy that was necessary to make learning effective within those buildings. In contrast, the OECD Innovative Learning Environments research project investigated inspiring cases of innovative learning from countries across the globe. They referred to ILEs as places of learning where there were "significant departures from mainstream learning arrangements for younger children or older teenagers, while promising to meet the ambitious objectives needed for 21st century learning." (OECD, 2013. p.11). The project further defined 'learning environment' as "an organic, holistic concept – an ecosystem that includes activity and the outcomes of learning." (OECD,

2013. p.11). In this paper, I will use the term ILE as the OECD use it – to refer to the combination of the learning space and the pedagogy occurring within that space.

The key affordance of innovative learning environments is flexibility – flexibility in the use of the space and flexibility in the use of the teachers. The spaces in an ILE usually include a large open space and one or two breakout spaces. Different kinds of furniture are used in these spaces including individual tables, group tables, and soft furniture such as ottomans, couches and beanbags. The furniture is generally strategically positioned in the spaces to invite different types of learning – learning from an expert, collaborative learning, solitary learning or creative learning. These spaces are often labelled respectively as campfire, watering hole, cave and life, or sandpit in the New Zealand context (Oddone n.d.). The life space may include a wet area where construction, visual arts, cooking and science activities take place, a place of creativity. The cave is a space where solitary learning through contemplation and reflection is promoted using furniture that invites a single user, such as a beanbag, a study carrel or a private nook. The watering hole is a collaborative space that brings together multiple users to actively engage in conversation and share their ideas while the campfire is a space that invites the presentation of ideas to a large group gathered together to listen to an expert speaker or a small group of presenters. Flexible use of the furniture means these spaces can be redefined according to student or teacher need at any time of the day, week or term. A key affordance of ILEs is they can be used as a highly responsive environment to actively facilitate learning.

The second type of flexibility ILEs afford is the multiple ways in which teachers' expertise can be maximised. In a space of say four teachers and 100 students, while each teacher may take responsibility for the pastoral care of 25 students, responsibility for the teaching and learning of all students can be shared across all teachers using a range of co-teaching strategies. Cook and Friend (1995) distinguish between five key co-teaching strategies, namely, one teach-one assist – where one teacher teaches a large group and the other roves providing coaching to individual students as needed; station teaching – where each teacher specialises in teaching one part of the learning and the students rotate through all of the teachers to make up the whole learning; parallel teaching – where each teacher is teaching the same content at the same time; alternative teaching – similar to parallel teaching but where one teacher takes a

smaller group of students to deliver targeted, needs-based teaching in order to accelerate their learning; and team teaching – where two teachers jointly teach the content as one. Co-teaching strategies allow teachers to flexibly respond to the diverse learning needs of their students by grouping and regrouping according to context and need. Drawing on the these affordances, teachers in ILEs are more readily able to personalise the learning for their students and provide greater opportunities for dialogic and discursive practice, those relational practices that have the greatest impact on positive outcomes for Māori students. ILEs also afford students greater flexibility in selecting the best means of learning and the best location for their learning. This supports student agency and self-regulation, skills critical for 21st century learning. (Butler et al, 2017).

The OECD research project distinguish 21st century learning environments from conventional learning environments based on the presence of the seven principles of learning, all of which must be present at once for effective learning to take place. The seven principles are:

1. Make learning central, encourage engagement, and be where learners come to understand themselves as learners.
2. Ensure that learning is social and often collaborative.
3. Be highly attuned to learners' motivations and the importance of emotions.
4. Be acutely sensitive to individual differences including prior knowledge.
5. Be demanding for each learner but without excessive overload.
6. Use assessments consistent with its aims, with strong emphasis on formative feedback.
7. Promote horizontal connectedness across activities and subjects, in and out of school.

(OECD, 2013, pp.187-188)

These principles align well with the characteristics that define culturally responsive and relational pedagogy from the perspectives of each of the aforementioned researchers. Thus, if a teacher is being culturally responsive and relational in their pedagogy, they are also embracing those principles that make learning effective in an ILE as shown in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

Characteristics of Culturally Responsive and Relational Pedagogy		Principles of Learning in Innovative Learning Environments	
Cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy Berryman et al (2018)	Culturally responsive pedagogy of relations Bishop (2019)	Principles of Learning	Description of Principle
Cultural relationships ~ whanaungatanga ~ whakapapa ~ kaupapa	Create a family-like context ~ caring for and nurturing the learner, their language and culture	1	Make learning central, encourage engagement, and be where learners come to understand themselves as learners.
Cultural relationships ~ whanaungatanga ~ whakapapa ~ kaupapa	Create a family-like context ~ knowing what learners need to learn	3	Be highly attuned to learners' motivations and the importance of emotions.
Cultural relationships ~ whanaungatanga ~ whakapapa ~ kaupapa	Create a family-like context ~ voicing and demonstrating high expectations	5	Be demanding for each learner but without excessive overload.
Responsive pedagogy ~ wānanga ~ ako ~ mahi ngātahi	Interact within a family-like context ~ using co-construction processes	2	Ensure that learning is social and often collaborative.
Responsive pedagogy ~ wānanga ~ ako ~ mahi ngātahi	Interact within a family-like context ~ drawing on learners' prior knowledge	4	Be acutely sensitive to individual differences including prior knowledge.
Responsive pedagogy ~ wānanga ~ ako ~ mahi ngātahi	Interact within a family-like context ~ using formative assessment	6	Use assessments consistent with its aims, with strong emphasis on formative feedback.
Responsive pedagogy ~ wānanga ~ ako ~ mahi ngātahi	Interact within a family-like context ~ using power-sharing strategies	7	Promote horizontal connectedness across activities and subjects, in and out of school.

This alignment of culturally responsive and relational pedagogy with the principles of learning exists on account of each being situated within constructist theory – a theory of learning that is learner-centric in terms of the learners' knowledge and sense-making processes. In short, it means that an individual actively constructs their own personal meaning and conceptual understandings through experiencing new events or ideas which are influenced by prior knowledge and understandings. ILEs provide flexibility for teachers to actively develop this sense-making process through the use of a range of co-teaching strategies and encouraging their students to utilise the range of learning spaces to assist with the co-construction of their new understandings. The principles and characteristics also align comfortably because they support the development of self-regulating learners, a critical skill if students are to become active participants in the 21st century as lifelong learners, the vision of the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007). Learner self-regulation is a process where students learn *how* to learn through the process of setting goals, monitoring their progress towards those goals and evaluating their achievement. Self-regulating learners are lifelong learners (Butler et al, 2017). The importance of self-regulation is further emphasised by Bishop who states that students must "learn the skills and attributes of self-regulation which, by extension, strongly influence their ability to control their gratification, impulses, and emotional expression in later life. Otago University's longitudinal multi-disciplinary study has shown that, above all things that contribute to a person being successful in later life, employed, and keeping out of trouble with the law, is their skill to regulate themselves" (Bishop, 2019, p.93).

Combining the principles of culturally responsive and relational pedagogy with the principles of learning and drawing on the affordances of ILEs, teachers are well positioned to achieve equity of outcomes for Māori students. This will not become a reality, however, unless teachers have a firm understanding of the articles of the Treaty of Waitangi and use it a model of best practice.

The Treaty of Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840, is a relational document that is future-focused. "The key intent of the Treaty of Waitangi was to uphold relationships of mutual benefit between the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa and all those who had come, and were

to come, to settle here." (Margaret, J. 2016, p.9). The Treaty was agreed to by the British Crown and many, but not all, hapū. From the English text, it was interpreted as having an obligation to Māori under three principles, commonly referred to as the 3Ps – partnership, participation and protection. From the Māori text, it was interpreted as three articles – kāwanatanga (honourable governance), rangatiratanga (self-determination) and ōritetanga (equity). Margaret (2016) claims that viewing the Treaty from the English text and focusing on the 3Ps is problematic because within each of these principles, inequity occurs. She considers the history of cultural dominance by the Crown has resulted in an unequal partnership, disproportionate participation, and inequity of opportunity to access the benefits promised by the Crown. This inequity is illustrated by poorer outcomes for Māori across the spectrum of socio-economic indicators. Margaret (2016) thus recommends an approach that speaks to the Treaty in terms of the three articles. Hotere-Brown and Riki-Waaka (n.d.) define and describe the articles within an education context suggesting that teachers who embrace the three articles and use it as a model of best practice are strongly positioned to give mana to the Treaty of Waitangi and achieve the ultimate goal of equitable education outcomes for Māori students.

Article One, kāwanatanga, means to govern honourably. Honourable governance requires everyone to share equally in decision-making processes. In a learning setting, teachers can achieve this when they enact whanaungatanga, whakapapa and kaupapa as they work to create extended family-like relationships with Māori students and their whanau. Inviting them into the conversation about the hopes, dreams and aspirations they have for their child and actively listening to their voice, promotes shared decision-making about what is important, and of priority in learning. Making decisions with the people who will be impacted the most by those decisions is a defining characteristic of kāwanatanga. This means ongoing, reciprocal and transparent communication between whanau, hapū and iwi is needed and this must occur at all levels of the school, including leadership and board level, so that an equitable partnership is established and embedded in the culture of the school.

Article Two, rangatiratanga is about self-determination. In education, it is called self-regulation and is often referred to as agency. Agentic students have the power to act. They have the authority to assert their power over their own learning. In a learning

setting, it can look like students co-constructing learning intentions and success criteria; students planning how they will learn, what they will learn and where they will learn; students monitoring their progress and reporting on their achievement. Power-sharing strategies that enhance rangatiratanga, self-determination (self-regulation) will result in schools where both Māori and Pākehā culture is equally reflected in the culture of the school.

Article Three, ōritetanga or equity, means Māori have the same rights as non-Māori and access to an equal share of the benefits of the Crown. In education, ōritetanga or equity would be evident if there was no disparity of achievement between Māori and Pākehā students. The historical long tail of under-achievement for Māori students illustrates a failure on the part of the Crown to honour Article Three of the Treaty. To redress educational inequity, schools must remove barriers to learning by sharing decision-making processes and sharing the power with Māori students and their whanau.

Attending to the three articles of the Treaty of Waitangi, with a focus on kāwanatanga and rangatiratanga as a means for achieving ōritetanga, offers a model of best practice that will facilitate equity of education outcomes becoming a reality for Māori students.

Conclusion

In order to fulfil our obligation to the Treaty of Waitangi, an approach that enables Māori learners to contribute to the decision-making about their learning, to exercise authority over their learning, and that enables them to achieve the same educational outcomes as others must be actively implemented on a daily basis. This is complex work that will need knowledgeable and skilful coaches to support teachers develop practice that is firmly situated within the articles of the Treaty of Waitangi, that maximises the affordances of ILEs and combines it with culturally responsive and relational pedagogy to transform their practice. This is critical and urgent work if we to avert perpetuating inequitable educational outcomes for Māori students and support equity of educational success for all students.

References

Berryman, M., Lawrence, D., & Lamont, R. (2018). "Cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy: A bicultural mana ōrite perspective". *Set: Research Information for Teachers, no.1, pp. 3-10.*

Bishop, R. (2017). "Relationships are fundamental to learning". Retrieved from http://cognitioneducation.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Russell-Bishop-Editorial-for-CPCO.pdf

Bishop, R. (2019). Teaching to the north-east: Relationship-based learning in practice. Wellington: NZCER Press.

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning.* Wellington: Huia.

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2009). "The te kotahitanga effective teaching profile". *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, no. 2, pp. 27-33.

Butler, D. L., Schnellert, L., & Perry, N. E. (2017). Developing self-regulating learners. Toronto: Pearson.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). "Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices". Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234620116_Co-Teaching_Guidelines_for_Creating_Effective_Practices

Davis, A. W., & Kappler-Hewitt, K. (2013). "Australia's campfires, caves and watering holes." Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1015175.pdf

Glover, C. (2019). Creating powerful and engaging learning environments. Retrieved from https://www.bfx.com.au/creating-powerful-and-engaging-learning-environments/

Hotere-Brown, A., & Riki-Waaka, J. (n.d.). What's the treaty got to do with it? The treaty of waitangi and future-focused education. Purchased from https://www.core-ed.org/shop/breakfast-recordings/whats-the-treaty-got-to-do-with-it-the-treaty-of-waitangi-and-future-focused-education/

Margaret, J. (2016). Ngā rerenga o te tiriti: Community organisations engaging with the treaty of waitangi. Retrieved from https://trc.org.nz/sites/trc.org.nz/files/Application/Nga-Rerenga-o-Te-Tiriti.pdf

Ministry of Education. (2007). New Zealand Curriculum. Wellington: Learning Media

Oddone, K. (n.d.). Re-imagining learning spaces to inspire contemporary learning – part one: Models for change. Retrieved from http://www.linkinglearning.com.au/re-imagining-learning-spaces-to-inspire-contemporary-learning-part-one-models-for-change/

OECD (2013). Innovative learning environments: Education research and innovation. OECD Publishing.