



Child Youth and Family  
Residential Schools  
→  
November 2013

## Foreword

The Education Review Office (ERO) is an independent government department that reviews the performance of New Zealand's schools and early childhood services, and reports publicly on what it finds.

The whakataukī of ERO demonstrates the importance we place on the educational achievement of our children and young people:

*Ko te Tamaiti te Pūtake o te Kaupapa  
The Child – the Heart of the Matter*

In our daily work we have the privilege of going into early childhood services and schools, giving us a current picture of what is happening throughout the country.

We collate and analyse this information so that it can be used to benefit the education sector and, therefore, the children in our education system. ERO's reports contribute sound information for work undertaken to support the Government's policies.

This report discusses the overall quality of education provided at the nine Child Youth and Family (CYF) residential schools in New Zealand. These schools cater for some of the country's most vulnerable children, with adolescents placed in these residences because of serious criminal or welfare issues.

ERO found that the quality of education across most of the CYF schools was not of a consistently high standard. While there were many good aspects identified, just two schools were judged to be effective, four somewhat effective and needing moderate improvements, and three were of limited effectiveness. The report has recommendations for staff at the schools, the Ministry of Education, and Child Youth and Family.

Successful delivery in education relies on many people and organisations across the community working together for the benefit of children and young people. We trust the information in ERO's evaluations will help them in their work.

Diana Anderson  
Chief Review Officer (Acting)  
Education Review Office

## Contents

Overview .....	1
Next steps.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology .....	5
Findings.....	5
Effective residential schools .....	5
Somewhat effective residential schools .....	7
Residential schools with limited effectiveness .....	8
Conclusion .....	9
Next steps.....	9
Appendix 1: CYF residential schools: indicator framework for 2013 reviews .....	11

## Overview

This report discusses the quality of education at the Child Youth and Family (CYF) residential schools. CYF residential schools provide education for the young people in New Zealand's Youth Justice and Care and Protection services. There are nine schools across the country catering for up to 40 students at a time.<sup>1</sup>

Students at CYF residential schools can have a range of high and complex needs. This is a specialised area of the education sector and the knowledge, skills and practice of those who teach in CYF residential schools need to be of the highest quality.

In this evaluation ERO found that the quality of education across most of the CYF schools was not of a consistently high standard. Most need to make either moderate or significant improvements in the delivery of the curriculum, the planning and programme design for individual students, and the processes to transition students to further education, training or employment.

### ***Judgements about effectiveness***

This report describes the overall quality of education provision across the nine CYF residential schools. While there were many good aspects identified, just two schools were judged by ERO to be effective. Four were judged to be somewhat effective and three were judged to be of limited effectiveness. While those that were somewhat effective required only moderate improvements, the schools identified as being of limited effectiveness were well below that expected for a service dealing with young people in CYF care.

The schools of limited effectiveness had several areas where they could improve. For example:

- Their programme design was not well linked to student interests, strengths and transitions.
- Some poor quality teaching was observed and, in some cases, teachers showed a limited understanding of how *The New Zealand Curriculum* could be used to meet the needs of residential students.
- While some students made progress, student achievement was not as high as that of the more effective schools.
- Teaching staff did not have strong collaborative relationships with CYF staff and this limited the extent to which they cooperated on matters such as student behaviour.

### ***Special education support***

Evidence was also found that the Ministry of Education's special education services were not being used to support students in some of the CYF residential schools - typically those operated by private providers and not those operated by the state-funded Kingslea School and Central Regional Health School.

---

<sup>1</sup> Four of these 'schools' are units of Kingslea School. See Table 1 of this report.

## ***Suggestions for improvement***

The conclusion of this report identifies potential improvements in the Ministry of Education's monitoring of the CYF schools and in the coordination of aspects such as quality assurance and the professional development of staff.

Improved partnerships between the teachers at the residential schools and CYF field social workers, especially in relation to the transition of students, is needed to support students returning to the community. Teaching staff could play a more significant role in ensuring that students make successful transitions to education, training or employment as part of the overall CYF placement of a young person back in the community.

## **Next steps**

ERO recommends that the staff of the CYF residential schools use the findings of their institutional reports, this report and their own self review to identify priorities for improving the quality of education.

ERO recommends that the Ministry of Education review the current structure of CYF residential schools, with a focus on how to improve the overall quality of education. This review could consider ways to improve the coordination between the individual schools and possible improvements to the monitoring, quality assurance processes, access to special education resources, and the professional development of staff. It should also highlight the importance of student transitions to community education and training providers as part of an education programme provided through a CYF residential school.

ERO also recommends that the Ministry of Education monitor the success of student transitions to employment, education and training as part of its overall monitoring of the CYF residential schools.

ERO recommends that the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Social Development - Child, Youth and Family work together to establish protocols for how CYF and education staff are to work together to support students, especially during student transitions. These protocols should also include mechanisms for dealing with any CYF concerns about the quality of education provided by residential schools.

## Introduction

### ***Schooling in Child Youth and Family residential centres***

Child Youth and Family (CYF) residential facilities cater for some of the most vulnerable young people in New Zealand. Adolescents are placed in these residences because of serious criminal or welfare issues. The educational services at these residences form part of the rehabilitation and/or support for these young people. They offer students an opportunity to develop literacy, numeracy, and the wider educational and social skills for a more positive future.

There are two main types of CYF residences discussed in this report. Youth justice facilities accommodate young people who have offended. Care and protection services are in place for young people whose safety has been at risk in their previous living arrangements.

Young people may have short or long stays at these CYF residences depending on their circumstances. Young people on remand from the Court may be at Youth Justice residences for less than a month. Young people in care and protection services usually stay longer. Boys residing at Te Poutama Ārahi Rangatahi may stay up to two years or more.

*Table 1: The CYF residential schools*

Name of CYF residence	Location	Nominal roll number
<b>Whakatakapokai</b> Care and Protection Residence	Auckland	20
<b>Korowai Manaaki</b> Youth Justice Residence	Auckland	40
<b>Central Regional Health School - Lower North</b> Youth Justice Residence	Palmerston North	30
<b>Epuni</b> Care and Protection Residence	Wellington	20
<b>Te Poutama Ārahi Rangatahi</b> Youth Justice Residence	Christchurch	12
<b>Kingslea school - Te Puna Wai ō Tuhinapo</b> Youth Justice Residence	Rolleston, Christchurch	40
<b>Kingslea school - Te Oranga</b> Care and Protection Residence	Christchurch	10

<b>Kingslea school - Puketai</b> Care and Protection Residence	Dunedin	8
<b>Kingslea school - Te Maioha o Parekarangi</b> Youth Justice Residence	Rotorua	30

Table 1 includes a list of the ‘schools’ reviewed as part of this report. Note that the last four residential schools are actually units within Kingslea School. The Central Regional Health School oversees the Youth Justice facility located at Palmerston North. The four remaining educational services - Whakatakāpokai, Korowai Manaaki, Epuni and Te Poutama Ārahi Rangatahi are operated by private training providers contracted by the Ministry of Education.

***Previous ERO report: Child Youth and Family Residential Schools (September 2010)***

In September 2010 ERO published its first national evaluation report on CYF residential schools. This report found that the quality of education provided by the CYF residential schools was generally sound or good. The report suggested that CYF schools needed to make greater use of students’ ideas and provide more authentic teaching and learning activities.

CYF residential schools had effective processes for inducting students and suitable processes for identifying students’ needs, especially in numeracy and literacy. ERO noted that students needed to have access to an education programme outside of the normal school year. This recommendation was linked to the need to make the most of a young person’s placement in a residence even where this placement occurs during the traditional term breaks for mainstream New Zealand schools.

The report also found that more could be done to manage the exit transitions of students, in particular better use should be made of the teachers in CYF schools to support students transitioning to new education or training destinations. At the time of the review, CYF was introducing a new service model for the residences. One of the aims of this service model was to create more collaboration between CYF staff and the range of other professionals supporting young people, including staff from the residential schools.

## Methodology

The information for this national report was gathered through institutional ERO reviews of each CYF school. With the exception of the Lower North Youth Justice facility, each of the CYF residential schools received an individual review report.<sup>2</sup> The Lower North residential school was reported on within an institutional report ERO prepared for the Central Regional Health School.

The review of the CYF residential schools focused on:

- the quality of teaching
- the transitions of students into and out of the school
- the coordination between the education programme and the wider CYF plan for each student.

A set of indicators was used to inform the judgements of the review teams. These indicators are published in Appendix 1 of this report.

## Findings

The findings section of this report is focused on the overall quality of the nine CYF residential schools. These schools have been grouped in three broad quality categories. Two schools were found to be effective, four were somewhat effective, and three were identified as being of limited effectiveness.

### ***Effective residential schools***

The key features of the two residential schools judged to be effective were:

- the strong relationships between staff and students
- the well-developed curriculum, and
- the good levels of cooperation between teachers and CYF staff.

One of these schools demonstrated good quality practices and processes across the range of indicators examined by ERO, while the other had a few areas for improvement. Overall, most students were well supported and made progress during their time at these schools.

Students transitioned into these schools as soon as possible. For example, at one residence students attended the school on the day of their admission. The school's positive learning environment supported the prompt transition of students.

---

<sup>2</sup> The review of the Lower North Youth Justice facility was incorporated into the review report of the Central Regional Health School. Each of the 4 'units' of Kingslea school received an institutional review report. These four units are treated as 'schools' for this review, as is the Lower North Youth Justice facility within the Central Regional Health School.



In both of these schools, the Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) of students were developed in the first two to three weeks of schooling. These were informed by observational and formal assessment data and were focused on well-developed goals for numeracy and literacy, along with more generalised goals for key competencies and values from *The New Zealand Curriculum*. The career and transition goals of students informed individual student programmes. Regular contact between teachers and the CYF residential staff ensured good levels of collaboration in relation to each student's academic and social development.

Both schools provided students with diverse and engaging programmes. Students took part in a range of numeracy and literacy activities strongly linked to their individual needs. At one school, for example, students had well-planned programmes in health, physical education, Te Reo Māori, social studies, visual arts and life skills. The social studies programme included a focus on careers education, while a life-skills course helped students develop specific skills in cooking and sewing. Students at the other school had opportunities in horticulture, languages and technology. This school had also developed outdoor education opportunities for students in kayaking and fishing.

One of the schools involved students in the Young Enterprise Scheme and, as part of its curriculum, provided students with the opportunity to create arts and crafts that have been sold at a local market. The items created by students include cushions, paintings and sculptures. The profits from this activity were donated to a local charity.

STAR<sup>3</sup> courses provided individual students with off-site learning linked to their potential pathways, for example, through forestry and hospitality courses. At one of these schools, a student, with an interest in agriculture, was also able to carry out work experience on a farm. Because these students were in youth justice facilities, high levels of planning had to occur for students to take part in learning opportunities linked to their pathways. High levels of cooperation between education and CYF staff have facilitated these opportunities.

School assessment information indicated that most students made good progress during their time in these schools. At one school, student evaluations showed that students enjoy their learning. When students have left the residence for a local placement, and have attended a local school or polytechnic, education staff have worked with community education providers to successfully transition students. Evidence from one school showed that approximately two-thirds of students have transitioned to community-based education with some success.

The barriers to successful student transitions included the reluctance of some mainstream schools to accept students who have been in a CYF residence. Staff from the CYF schools also noted that they cannot provide the same level of transition support to students who transition to a school away from the surrounding area.

---

<sup>3</sup> Secondary-Tertiary Alignment Resource funding from the Ministry of Education.

### ***Somewhat effective residential schools***

Four residential schools were judged to be somewhat effective. While they performed well in several areas, there were some aspects where they could make noticeable improvements.

These schools had suitable processes when students started at the school. They had timely assessment procedures and identified appropriate numeracy and literacy goals for students. Key competencies were used to identify broad social goals for students. ILPs included notes about student interests and future pathways, although these were not a strong focus of classroom learning.

Classroom learning tended to be sound, albeit relatively conventional. Literacy and numeracy activities were the foundation for these programmes, some of which students accessed through information and communications technology (ICT). At one school, ICT was not widely used because of the perceived safety issues of allowing students to use the internet.<sup>4</sup>

The students at these schools had good access to learning options, including STAR courses, art, carving and music. In some cases these options were well linked to student career pathways. For example, each of these schools facilitated opportunities for some students to take part in off-site courses linked to their future pathways. There is evidence that some students experienced good levels of success following these opportunities.

Student achievement information showed that some students made good progress during their time in a residence. Two of these schools needed to set higher academic targets, especially for students who stayed for several months. One of these schools did not yet have good quality literacy and numeracy assessment information on which to consider the school-wide achievement of students.

CYF and education staff often cooperated in support of student outcomes. On a day-to-day basis education and care staff exchanged useful information about student attitudes and readiness for learning. In some cases structural difficulties prevented high levels of cooperation. For example, at one residence suitable meeting times had not been found for the multi-agency team meetings, whereby education, CYF, health and other staff could come together to discuss student wellbeing and development.

As was evident across all the CYF schools, CYF field social workers (those responsible for student placements in the community) did not routinely liaise with education staff or work in partnership to ensure that the education dimension of a student's placement was suitably transitioned from the CYF school to a mainstream setting. This affected the extent to which education staff could support students transitioning from the residential schools to community education, training or employment.

---

<sup>4</sup> Greater access to ICT-based resources would be possible with improved technological monitoring and the cooperation of CYF staff who could also supervise computer use.

### ***Residential schools with limited effectiveness***

Three of the residential schools were judged to be of limited effectiveness. These schools demonstrated good practice in some areas – but they also had some significant areas for development. These issues affected the quality of student outcomes.

Students' entry to these schools was based around similar strategies to those used in other residential schools. Staff got to know students over the first couple of weeks and collected information about student achievement levels through relevant academic testing. ILPs were focused on numeracy, literacy and key competencies. In some cases, the ILP social goals were too general and did not provide a sufficient basis to gauge students' improvement.

Across these schools, assessment information was not consistently used well in the design of each student's learning programme. One of the schools also identified that they needed to enhance their teamwork in addressing the personal goals, which students set for their development.

In line with the limitations of the ILPs, teaching programmes were not strongly focused on student interests, strengths or transitions. Classroom planning sometimes reflected a limited understanding of *The New Zealand Curriculum* and, as a result, classroom activity was unlikely to be engaging.

Some poor quality teaching was observed. In some cases teachers were somewhat isolated with few opportunities to see high quality teaching in other settings. For contract providers<sup>5</sup> there were also very few opportunities to work with staff from the Ministry of Education's special education service.

Student outcomes at these residential schools were variable. While there was evidence that at least some students made progress, the levels of achievement were not as consistent as those of the more effective schools. Similarly, there was evidence that some students had made effective transitions from these residential schools to community-based education and training. However, transitions were not a consistently strong focus of these residential schools.

The relationships between teachers at these residential schools and the CYF staff were not always positive. For example, at times CYF staff were reluctant to share information and support classroom programmes because of perceived weaknesses in the classroom management of teachers.

---

<sup>5</sup> Contract providers were those who were not part of a state school. In this evaluation, state school provision of residential education was provided by Kingslea School and the Central Regional Health School. The remaining providers were Private Training Enterprises (PTEs).

## **Conclusion**

The quality of education at the CYF residential schools needs to be improved. The level of provision found by ERO was not of a consistently high standard. In many cases the quality of provision at some schools has not improved since ERO's previous evaluation of CYF residential schools. Given the range of needs shown by many of the young people in CYF care, it is important that staff can develop consistently high quality individual learning plans (ILPs) and programmes.

The quality of teaching across the residential schools is likely to benefit from improved coordination, monitoring, quality assurance and the professional development of staff. All the teaching staff in CYF residential schools should have access to other educational professionals, including the Ministry of Education's special education service.

While ERO saw some situations where CYF and education staff worked well together, there is room for improvement in this partnership. This is of primary importance in the transitions which students make to community education, training and employment opportunities. Education staff need to have greater awareness of each student's career pathway and closer links with the CYF aspirations for each young person.

Currently some education staff offer good support to students who transition to a community education provider within close proximity to the residential school. In many cases CYF field social workers do not work with the education staff to support students returning to the community. Greater partnership between CYF and a school would see the teachers from the residential schools having a more consistent role in ensuring that students can effectively transition to community education, training and employment.

## **Next steps**

ERO recommends that the staff of the CYF residential schools use the findings of their institutional reports, this report and their own self review to identify priorities for improving the quality of education.

ERO recommends that the Ministry of Education review the current structure of CYF residential schools, with a focus on how to improve the overall quality of education. This review could consider ways to improve the coordination between the individual schools and possible improvements to the monitoring, quality assurance processes, access to special education resources and the professional development of staff. It should also highlight the importance of student transitions to community education and training providers as part of an education programme provided through a CYF residential school.

ERO also recommends that the Ministry of Education monitor the success of student transitions to employment, education and training as part of its overall monitoring of the CYF residential schools.

ERO recommends that the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Social Development - Child, Youth and Family work together to establish protocols for how CYF and education staff are to work together to support students, especially during student transitions. These protocols should also include mechanisms for dealing with any CYF concerns about the quality of education provided by residential schools.

## Appendix 1: CYF residential schools: indicator framework for 2013 reviews

The indicators below provide an outline of the features anticipated in high quality teaching and learning for the students in these schools. Depending on how the education provision is managed at these residences, additional features may be apparent. Likewise some of the indicators below may not be directly relevant. These indicators should be used in collaboration with ERO's *Evaluation Indicators for Schools* (2011).

<b>Student induction</b>	
<b>Induction to a CYF residential school</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a well planned, and implemented, process for inducting students</li> <li>• Staff provide a welcoming environment for new students</li> <li>• The induction programme allows students to build positive relationships with their peers</li> <li>• The induction programme works well at all times of the year (i.e. during 'school holidays')</li> <li>• There are processes to convey to students expectations about behaviour and learning</li> <li>• New students report that they have a sense of belonging</li> <li>• Appropriate multi-disciplinary and/or special educational support is identified and made available as early as possible</li> <li>• Where possible, there are coordinated linkages between school and social service agencies that promote students' successful transition into the school</li> </ul>
<b>Initial identification of students' strengths, interests and learning needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers and leaders use valid and reliable processes to identify the educational strengths, interests, and next steps of new students</li> <li>• Teachers/leaders have sought, and used, the student's point of view with regard to inclusive practice and learning</li> <li>• The school has processes in place for identifying and supporting the needs of students in relation to their physical, sensory, psychological, neurological, behavioural or intellectual needs</li> <li>• The school has culturally responsive processes to identify and support the needs and aspirations of Māori and Pacific students</li> </ul>
<b>The quality of the relationship between education and CYF staff</b>	
<b>The alignment between the overall CYF plan and the teaching and learning programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILPs/IEPs take into account the goals CYF staff have facilitated or coordinated to support the development of students</li> <li>• Teaching staff adapt the learning programme based on the identified needs of students via their CYF-based goals or information</li> <li>• There is day-to-day collaboration between education and CYF staff to support the learning and development of students</li> </ul>
<b>The links between educational staff and CYF staff</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education and CYF staff meet regularly to review the progress of students</li> <li>• The education and CYF staff develop joint strategies to support the learning and development of students</li> <li>• There is day-to-day collaboration between education and CYF staff to support the learning and development of students</li> </ul>

<b>Student achievement, progress and engagement</b>	
<b>Student achievement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence that students are making accelerated progress</li> <li>• There is evidence that students are achieving at year/age appropriate levels (as seen in analysed standardised and norm–referenced results, National Standards and NZQF assessments)</li> <li>• Students are achieving the goals established in their IEP/ILP</li> </ul>
<b>Student engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority is placed on identifying and developing the strengths and interests of all students</li> <li>• There are good opportunities for students to make decisions about what and how they learn <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As a regular part of the classroom programme, students are engaged in discussions about their learning processes</li> <li>○ Students have opportunities to pursue their interests and strengths</li> <li>○ Students have opportunities to investigate their own questions/topics</li> <li>○ Students have clear and challenging goals or expectations for learning</li> <li>○ Students receive high quality feedback on their learning (peers and teachers)</li> <li>○ Students initiate aspects of their own learning</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Students state that they enjoy school</li> <li>• Students can say in what ways their learning is contributing to their ongoing achievement</li> <li>• Students are positive about the progress they are making</li> </ul>
<b>Teaching and learning</b>	
<b>School culture and environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall culture of the school and the classrooms is supportive of students' learning and development</li> <li>• There is a warm, nurturing and safe atmosphere for all students</li> <li>• Humour is used to support the development of positive relationships between staff and students</li> <li>• Staff show enthusiasm about improving outcomes (educational, social, emotional) for students</li> <li>• Staff demonstrate the importance of social and pastoral care as a pathway to support the achievement of students</li> <li>• The school has highly responsive systems and personnel that are focused on the social and educational needs of students</li> <li>• There are non-authoritarian and non-coercive classroom structures where power is shared between the student and teacher, e.g. classroom rules are co-constructed</li> <li>• Staff are compassionate, actively listening to students and reflecting their points of view</li> <li>• Staff display understanding (sensitivity) in responding to student needs</li> <li>• Staff correctly pronounce the names of students</li> <li>• Staff support the development of student self-management</li> <li>• Staff apply strategies to limit negative behaviour</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff model that learning is important</li> <li>• Adult educators operate as role models to students</li> <li>• Staff have a good understanding of, and affirm the cultural backgrounds of the students (i.e. they observe and promote students' culture, identities, language)</li> <li>• Students express a sense of security and comfort with the environment</li> </ul>
<b>Pedagogy for at risk students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a significant focus on accelerating the learning of students</li> <li>• The progress, achievement and engagement of students is regularly monitored so that they experience success as individuals</li> <li>• Classroom programmes address the individual needs of students (as described in students' IEPs/ILPs)</li> <li>• Students receive high quality individualised attention in their classroom programmes</li> <li>• There are clearly stated expectations for classroom activity and student work</li> <li>• Teachers are innovative and creative in responding to students' interests, strengths and learning needs</li> <li>• Teachers have high expectations that all students will succeed regardless of their previous educational success (or lack of it), and their cultural and social backgrounds</li> <li>• Teachers are both firm and flexible in how they manage the behaviour of students (refer to school culture and environment)</li> <li>• Staff and students support each other to achieve</li> <li>• Classroom activity is engaging and intellectually challenging for students; not dumbed-down busy work</li> <li>• Educational activities involve (a degree of) authentic problems, and are relevant to students</li> <li>• Topics and themes link to situations outside the classroom context and have some immediate relevance and meaning to students</li> <li>• Students are able to investigate their own questions</li> <li>• Students are able to work together in some situations, discussing ideas, reaching conclusions and teaching each other</li> <li>• Teachers recognise that motivation is likely to be a bigger challenge than ability for many students</li> <li>• Students are taught to evaluate their own learning and are aware of their achievements and next steps</li> <li>• There are good opportunities for students to learn in a variety of ways – with others, on their own, using technology</li> <li>• The programme provides students with good opportunities to learn from peers e.g. discussing ideas, reaching conclusions and teaching each other</li> </ul>
<b>Curriculum management</b>	
<b>Planning for the success of students including Individual Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are high quality processes used to identify and remove the barriers to achievement faced by students</li> <li>• ILPs have clear goals for learning or development</li> <li>• ILPs explain the processes to be used to support students to reach their goals</li> <li>• ILPs are regularly reviewed and revised in line with student progress and needs</li> </ul>



<b>Plans (ILPs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILPs contain a well structured and clearly conveyed plan for each student’s future education/employment</li> <li>• ILPs contain an understanding of the student’s exit transition and what has to happen to support that transition</li> <li>• ILPs include an indication of what the young person wants to achieve in the school to prepare them for their future education/employment</li> <li>• The daily programme has a focus on achieving the goals identified in each student’s ILP</li> <li>• Planning reflects the need to identify and develop the interests and strengths of students (i.e. has good links to ILPs and the overall CYF goals for young people)</li> <li>• IEPs take into account the goals CYF staff have facilitated or coordinated to support the development of students</li> <li>• Teaching staff adapt the learning programme based on the identified needs of students via their CYF-based goals or information</li> <li>• Education and CYF staff meet regularly to review the progress of students</li> <li>• The education and CYF staff develop joint strategies to support the learning and development of students</li> </ul>
<b>The quality of school curriculum, planning and review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school-developed curriculum is appropriate for at risk students e.g. programmes implemented for all students appropriately promote the skills they will need for future success (sustainable learning and development)</li> <li>• There are good links between each student’s identified strengths and interests and the (planned) curriculum</li> <li>• The curriculum gives appropriate priority to building each student’s knowledge and skills in literacy and mathematics</li> <li>• The curriculum builds effectively on students’ learning (there are progressions in the curriculum)</li> <li>• The school (planned) curriculum reflects the vision and principles of <i>The New Zealand Curriculum</i></li> <li>• There is evidence that leaders review the school curriculum in light of information from a variety of sources (including students)</li> <li>• The curriculum is appropriately balanced (consideration is given to what needs to be achieved and what students find engaging)</li> <li>• Resources effectively support students’ learning (there are enough and they are appropriate)</li> <li>• The school curriculum effectively promotes the identity, language and culture of students</li> <li>• Students have access to good quality education programmes throughout the year (not just in term times)</li> <li>• High quality career education and guidance is given with an emphasis on transition to the workplace or further education/training</li> </ul>
<b>Literacy and numeracy learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning in literacy and numeracy is appropriate for meeting the specific requirements of each student</li> <li>• Literacy and numeracy resources are appropriate, accessible and enhance the programme</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diagnostic assessments describe each young person’s ability in reading (especially in decoding and comprehension), writing and mathematics</li> <li>• Each student’s progress and achievement in literacy and numeracy is well-monitored</li> </ul>
<b>The exit transition planning and processes</b>	
<b>The quality of transition planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit transition planning is based on student progress</li> <li>• The exit transition planning includes clear expectations and goals for each student, and the roles and responsibilities to be carried out by those involved in the transition process</li> <li>• The exit transition planning details the types of support students will receive for their ongoing learning and development</li> </ul>

<b>The links between new schools or training providers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a high level of coordination and collaboration between the CYF school, the new school (if any), family and social service agencies</li> <li>• Post programme support is ongoing until the student is well established in further training or the workforce (outside of the CYF direct responsibility but important for the overall review)</li> </ul>
<b>Relationships with external agencies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school’s staff work collaboratively with agencies such as health, iwi, and Non Government Organisations (NGOs) to support the multiple needs of a student in transition</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring of the exit transition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The student’s destination is monitored and recorded</li> <li>• The medium and long term outcomes of transitioned students are monitored</li> <li>• Leaders analyse outcomes data to inform the quality of future exit processes for students</li> </ul>