



IAN AXFORD
(NEW ZEALAND)
FELLOWSHIPS
in
PUBLIC POLICY

Early Childhood Education Policy in Aotearoa / New Zealand: The Creation of the 20 Hours Free Programme

Prepared by
Brenda K Bushouse, MPA, PhD

With funding from the sponsors of the
Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy

July 2008

© Brenda K Bushouse 2008
Published by Fulbright New Zealand, July 2008

The opinions and views expressed in this paper are the personal views of the author and do not represent in whole or part the opinions of Fulbright New Zealand or any New Zealand government agency.

ISBN 978-1-877502-00-2 (print)
ISBN 978-1-877502-01-9 (PDF)

Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy

Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy were named in honour of Sir Ian Axford, an eminent New Zealand astrophysicist and space scientist who is patron of the fellowship programme.

Since his education in New Zealand and England, Sir Ian has held Professorships at Cornell University and the University of California, and was Vice-Chancellor of Victoria University of Wellington for three years. For many years, Sir Ian was director of the Max Planck Institute for Aeronomy in Germany, where he was involved in the planning of several space missions, including those of the Voyager planetary explorers, the Giotto space probe and the Ulysses galaxy explorer.

Sir Ian is recognised as one of the great thinkers and communicators in the world of space science, and is a highly respected and influential administrator. A recipient of numerous science awards, he was knighted and named New Zealander of the Year in 1995.

Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy have three goals:

- To reinforce United States/New Zealand links by enabling fellows of high intellectual ability and leadership potential to gain experience and build contacts internationally.
- To increase fellows' ability to bring about changes and improvements in their fields of expertise by the cross-fertilisation of ideas and experience.
- To build a network of policy experts on both sides of the Pacific that will facilitate international policy exchange and collaboration beyond the fellowship experience.

Fellows are based at a host institution and carefully partnered with a leading specialist who will act as a mentor. In addition, fellows spend a substantial part of their time in contact with relevant organisations outside their host institutions, to gain practical experience in their fields.

The fellowships are awarded to professionals active in the business, public or non-profit sectors. A binational selection committee looks for fellows who show potential as leaders and opinion formers in their chosen fields. Fellows are selected also for their ability to put the experience and professional expertise gained from their fellowship into effective use.

We acknowledge and thank the following government and corporate sponsors that support the Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy programme:

- Department of Building and Housing
- Department of Corrections
- Department of Internal Affairs
- Department of Labour
- Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
- Mighty River Power
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage
- Ministry for the Environment
- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
- Ministry of Economic Development
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Fisheries
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Research, Science and Technology
- Ministry of Social Development
- New Zealand Customs Service
- New Zealand Police
- State Services Commission
- Te Puni Kōkiri (Ministry of Māori Development)
- The Treasury

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For six months the Education Management Policy team at the Ministry of Education graciously hosted me by providing work space and support for my research. Special thanks to the entire team: Shirley Nesbit, Anne Armstrong, Natasha Kuka, Kim Ang Chhim, Patrick Feron, Fiona Mao and Zaineb Ali. My sincere appreciation goes to Karl Le Quesne, Senior Policy Manager of EMP for providing me with access to meetings, records, as well as many conversations along the way. I also thank Rose Cole, Senior Manager for the Early Childhood Education Programme Office, for being generous with her time and wit. I also thank the Facilities Management Unit group that share the 5th floor. I learned more about Labradors and keeping MOE buildings running than I ever could imagine.

This project would not have been possible without the willingness of the people below to take time out of their busy days to help me understand early childhood policy in New Zealand. Special thanks to:

Nancy Bell, New Zealand Childcare Association
Paula Bennett, Member of Parliament, National ECE Spokesperson
Ross Boyd, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
Lynne Bruce, New Zealand Education Institute
Rose Cole, Ministry of Education
Carmen Dalli, Victoria University, Institute for Early Childhood Studies
Judith Duncan, University of Otago, Children's Issues Centre
Julie Keenan, Ministry of Education
Karl LeQuesne, Ministry of Education
Hon Steve Maharey, Member of Parliament, Minister of Education 2005-2007
Hon Trevor Mallard, Member of Parliament, Minister of Education 1999-2005
Helen May, University of Otago, College of Education
Anne Meade, Anne Meade Associates, Inc.
Linda Mitchell, New Zealand Council for Education Research
Marion Pilkington, New Zealand Playcentre Federation
Anne Smith, University of Otago, Children's Issues Centre
Arapera Royal Tangaere, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust
Sue Thorne, Early Childhood Council
Clare Wells, New Zealand Kindergartens Incorporated

I greatly appreciate the assistance and support of Mele Wendt, Rae Holdsworth and the entire Fulbright staff. Upon arrival in New Zealand, we were met by Kameswari Vanka and escorted to our apartment, which was stocked with basic foodstuffs so that we did not have to immediately venture out. It was a very pleasant welcome to New Zealand.

The Axford fellows were a wonderful group with whom to share this experience. The Fulbright team did a superb job in selecting Kacky Andrews, Patti Grogan, and Penny Bishop to participate in the Axford program. We all were committed to our work and shared a passion for exploring the beautiful country of New Zealand. Our many conversations, our absolute addiction to flat whites, and the ongoing emails provided the social support so necessary when living in a foreign country. My children, Sophia and Maxwell, especially appreciated the Ducharme/Bishop boys and Teek/Grogan

girls, and my husband, Charlie Schweik, enjoyed the camaraderie of the other Axford spouses. We could not have had a better experience while living in New Zealand.

Brenda K Bushouse
Wellington, July 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In his 2004 Budget Speech in Parliament, Minister of Finance Michael Cullen announced that by 2007 a new programme would be established providing 20 hours of free early childhood education for three- and four-year-olds. The policy announcement was unanticipated by most of the early childhood community. The 20 Hours Free Programme was not part of the ten-year strategic plan for early childhood education (2002–2012) and represented a major increase in public funding for early childhood. But while it was a significant increase in funding, it was also a major policy shift.

Prior to 20 Hours Free, New Zealand provided subsidies to all early childhood services for up to 30 hours per week for each child from zero to five years of age. A programme for children from low-income families provided additional subsidies. The 20 Hours Free programme was a stark departure because it marked a shift in funding policy from a subsidy to a level expected to cover the average cost of care at the regulated quality level. Service providers were not permitted to ‘top up’ the funding rate for 20 Hours Free ECE with parent fees.

However, while the funding is not a subsidy, it is also not an entitlement. The government does not own the ECE services and services are not required to participate in the 20 Hours Free programme. Therefore the government is not able to regulate the supply of services providing Free ECE, and parents are not guaranteed a space for their child.

The 20 Hours Free Programme symbolises a paradigm shift. Through this policy change, the New Zealand government has made a statement that it believes early childhood education is important enough for the government to remove financial barriers to participation for all children.

This report describes the creation of the 20 Hours Free programme within the historical context of early childhood policy in New Zealand. It provides an historical narrative of the actors involved, the timing of events, and competing interests.

The report identifies wedge issues to be considered in future policymaking including:

- The future of private, for-profit providers of ECE
There is a segment of the ECE policy community that prefers community-based provision of ECE to the exclusion of private provision. The opposition to private provision is due to the concern that profits will be given a higher priority than providing quality ECE. My position is that the Government’s practice of regulating quality inputs (teacher education, ratios, group size) is an effective strategy and should be continued.
- The exclusion of parent/whānau-led service provision of Free ECE
The Government chose to limit participation in Free ECE to teacher-led services, which necessarily meant that parent/whānau-led were excluded. Both Playcentre and Kōhanga Reo want to participate in Free ECE but are reluctant to change aspects of their programmes that they feel are fundamental. However, both of these types of services are experiencing

declining enrolments over the last decade and therefore each of these services needs to address the larger socioeconomic and demographic trends that are causing the decline. The Government role is to work with both Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust and Playcentre Federation in a way that recognizes the long and unique history of Playcentre in New Zealand and the importance of Kōhanga Reo in preserving Māori culture.

The Ministry of Education decided not to pursue a unique identifier for the children participating in ECE. While that may have been the appropriate choice at the time, the lack of a unique identifier limits the ability to design a robust evaluation of child outcomes. It also hinders the Ministry's ability to report accurate data. Finally, without a unique identifier the Ministry has to rely on attestation forms rather than having an administrative mechanism to detect participation rates that exceed 20 hours.

With the 20 Hours Free Programme the government committed itself to funding ECE at the regulated quality level for all three- and four-year-old children who participate. This was a paradigmatic shift in ECE policy from a subsidy to a commitment to cover the cost of quality ECE. The next government will make a fundamental decision to continue the paradigm shift or to revert to back to a subsidy programme. The challenge is to maintain ECE quality gains and commitment to access, while managing the fiscal risk to government. The main danger is if the government continues with the paradigm shift but does not increase funding to keep pace with the cost of providing quality ECE. If the government does not commit to keeping pace, then it could result in lowering quality. If the government reverts to a subsidy strategy to manage fiscal risk and maintain quality, the negative consequence is that the cost to parents could increase, which could decrease access to ECE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | v |
| PREFACE | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 1 THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION POLICY COMMUNITY | 5 |
| The Services..... | 5 |
| Kindergartens | 5 |
| Playcentres | 6 |
| Early Education and Care Centres..... | 7 |
| Kōhanga Reo..... | 8 |
| Home-Based..... | 11 |
| The Correspondence School..... | 11 |
| Playgroups..... | 12 |
| Membership Associations | 12 |
| Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa – New Zealand Childcare Association | 12 |
| Early Childhood Council..... | 15 |
| New Zealand Education Institute | 15 |
| Pacific Islands Early Childhood Council Aotearoa..... | 16 |
| Research and Education Organisations | 16 |
| New Zealand Council for Education Research | 16 |
| University Academics | 17 |
| University Research Centres | 18 |
| ECE Teacher Education Institutions | 18 |
| 2 EARLY CHILDHOOD POLICY WAVES | 19 |
| Advocacy Development in the 1960s and 1970s | 19 |
| The 1980s Policy Environment..... | 21 |
| The 1990s Political Environment..... | 24 |
| The Rise of Future Directions | 25 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3 | THE DREAM REVISITED: ECE RISES ON THE AGENDA..... | 29 |
| | The Strategic Plan..... | 30 |
| | Implementation of Policy Changes..... | 32 |
| 4 | POLITICAL GAZE SETTLES ON 20 HOURS FREE..... | 35 |
| | Reactions to 20 Hours Free..... | 36 |
| | Teacher-led Requirement..... | 37 |
| | Community-based Limitation..... | 38 |
| | Other ECE Issues in the 2005 Election..... | 39 |
| 5 | LAUNCHING FREE..... | 41 |
| | Strategic Plan Quality Improvements..... | 41 |
| | Subsidy or Free?..... | 42 |
| | Setting the Funding Rates..... | 43 |
| | Sector Response to Funding Rates..... | 43 |
| 6 | FIRST YEAR IMPLEMENTATION AND THE FUTURE..... | 47 |
| | The Future..... | 48 |
| | Wedge Issues..... | 49 |
| | Private Services..... | 49 |
| | Teacher-led versus parent/whānau-led..... | 50 |
| | Evaluation of Free ECE..... | 51 |
| | Concluding Thoughts..... | 52 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 53 |
| | TABLES AND FIGURES..... | 65 |
| | Table 1 - Number of Early Childhood Education Services by Type of Service (1990, 1995, 2000 - 2007)..... | 66 |
| | Table 2 - Number of Enrolments in Early Childhood Education by Type of Service 1995 and 2007..... | 67 |
| | Table 3 - Children on the regular ECE roll as at 1 July 2007 by type of service, form of ownership, and age..... | 68 |
| | Table 4 - Free ECE Funding Rates*..... | 69 |
| | APPENDICES..... | 71 |
| | Appendix A - List of ECE Teacher Training Institutions..... | 71 |

Appendix B - Guide to the New Early Childhood Education Funding System 72

PREFACE

I came to New Zealand shortly after completing a book on universal preschool in the United States, titled *Universal Preschool: Policy Change, Stability, and the Pew Charitable Trusts*.¹ My research analysed the passage of legislation in six different states that individually decided to publicly fund the education of three- and four-year-olds. When Michael Mintrom of the University of Auckland told me of the 20 Hours Free Programme, I set my sights on researching this new policy development in New Zealand. I followed the media coverage leading up to the launch of the 20 Hours Free Programme and initially planned to focus on the implementation controversy. However, when I arrived the take up rates for the programme were respectably high and the controversy had evaporated. As I educated myself about the Ministry of Education and the history of early childhood policy in New Zealand, I was able to place 20 Hours Free in a broader context. What I failed to appreciate until coming here was the long history of activism and the waves of early childhood education policy that created the foundation for the 20 Hours Free Programme policy change.

While the US limps along with an under-funded federal preschool programme for very poor children and limited childcare support for families on social welfare benefits, New Zealand subsidises the operating costs of all ECE services, regardless of family income. It also provides additional assistance to families in need that are far more generous than in the US. Even before 20 Hours Free was created, New Zealand was head and shoulders above the US in terms of subsidising ECE. There is much the US can learn from New Zealand about how to support families and our youngest children.

Through my research I discovered divisions within the ECE policy community that were quite foreign to my American lens, and cultural complexities that were difficult for me to grasp. Given the admitted shortcomings of an American perspective, this report represents my best effort to understand the policy landscape in New Zealand. I have benefited greatly from the insights of ministry officials, political actors, and the many different perspectives held by the ECE policy community. Given the generosity of time afforded me by all of these people, any errors or omissions in this report are entirely my own.

¹ Bushouse (forthcoming 2009)

INTRODUCTION

The New Zealand government's total spending on early childhood education increased from \$409 million in the year ended June 2002 to an estimated \$771 million in the year ended June 2007.² This translates to an 88 percent increase, which in and of itself is remarkable. In the following year the 20 Hours Free Programme was implemented to provide free early childhood education to three- and four-year-olds. This programme led to an additional \$92 million investment in early childhood education from July to September 2007.³ It is projected that participation in Free ECE will continue to increase which will raise spending levels even further.⁴ This voluntary programme for three- and four-year-olds provides funding for 20 hours of free early childhood education (ECE) at a diverse array of services with qualified teachers. When the Free ECE programme began in July 2007 participation was large enough to affect the Consumer Price Index. Statistics New Zealand reported: "Education prices fell 5.2 percent [for the September quarter], due to lower prices for early childhood education as a result of changes to government funding".⁵

Prior to this new programme the Ministry of Education already provided subsidy funding to early childhood services for up to 30 hours for each child age zero to five, regardless of family income. In addition, services providing ECE to low-income families received subsidies from the Ministry of Social Development, further reducing the cost of ECE for some families. Under both of these subsidy programmes services were able to charge fees to supplement the funding rates they received from government. The Free ECE Programme breaks with past funding policy because it is not a subsidy. The intent is to provide public funding at a rate that covers the full cost of ECE for the average service provider, at the regulated level of quality. If services choose to participate they are permitted to request voluntary donations from parents, but they may not charge mandatory fees for the publicly funded hours. But 20 Hours Free is not an entitlement. Services are not mandated to participate nor are they owned by the government, as in the public school sector; therefore, the government is not able to control the supply. Participation in Free ECE is a demand driven programme in which parents seek out participating services. If there is no service available for a child to attend the government is not responsible for creating a new service. However, by January 2008, 76 percent of services were participating in the programme, and serving 86 percent of three- and four-year-old enrolments.⁶ With this policy change New Zealand has taken a bold step in the direction of universal funding for ECE.

The policy process leading up to the 20 Hours Free Programme flows from decades of advocacy. This new programme is the latest major change in a series of policy changes. Helen May, who has carefully researched the history of early childhood policy in New Zealand, uses the conceptual tool of the "dream" of the advocates and the "gaze" of the politicians to identify areas of convergence and divergence.⁷ When there is convergence, there are opportunities for policy change. This report provides a

² Carter (2007), p.1

³ Ministry of Education (4 February 2008)

⁴ Carter (2007)

⁵ Statistics New Zealand (October 2007), p.1

⁶ Ministry of Education (4 February 2008)

⁷ May (2000)

discussion of the waves of convergence and divergence as the backdrop for the emergence of the 20 Hours Free Programme.

Chapter One examines the early childhood education sector and policy community. New Zealand has a diverse array of early childhood arrangements including sessional and school-day kindergartens, full-day centre-based education and care, Māori and Pasifika language nests, parent-led centres, home-based education and care, and playgroups. These services are represented through membership organisations that, along with academics, research organisations, unions, and universities, comprise the policy community.

Chapter Two presents the historical context of early childhood education policy in New Zealand from the 1960s to 1990s. In this period, the policy community took shape, and a policy wave built in the 1980s only to recede with a change in government. Another policy wave began to build that led to the creation of a strategic plan for ECE in 2002. That process and the initial implementation of the plan are the focus of Chapter Three.

Chapter Four discusses the announcement of the 20 Hours Free Programme and the policy community's responses to it. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the political environment of the 2005 election. Between the formation of the new government and July 2007 the Ministry of Education planned for the implementation of the new programme. The controversies that emerged during that time are the subject of Chapter Five. Chapter Six discusses the first year implementation. In the concluding chapter I identify salient issues to be considered in future policy-making.

1 THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION POLICY COMMUNITY

The early childhood education (ECE) sector in New Zealand has a long history dating back to the establishment of kindergartens in the 1880s. This chapter describes the different types of services that comprise the sector and the broader policy community.

The Services

New Zealand has a well developed and diverse early childhood education sector. All services must be licensed where three or more children (who are not siblings) attend regularly for education or care, unless a specified exemption has been granted.⁸ Unlicensed services may operate for no more than three hours on any one day, must have more than half the parents attending each session and they assume responsibility for each child attending the group. Among the licensed services, there is variation on length of stay (sessional or full-day), philosophical approach (Montessori, Steiner, etc.), teaching approach (parent/whānau or teacher-led), and auspice of centre. The only government-owned early childhood services for children are in hospitals and through The Correspondence School. The rest of the sector consists of community-based and private providers. In New Zealand, community-based services are not-for-profit services run by incorporated societies; charitable or statutory or community trusts; or some trusts with charitable tax status or services owned by a community organisation (such as a city council).⁹ These services are not able to distribute financial gains to their members. Private services, a heterogeneous category ranging from small proprietary businesses to the public corporations, are able to redistribute profits to shareholders and owners. The main categories of early childhood services are: kindergartens, playcentres, early education and care centres, Kōhanga Reo, home-based education and care services, and correspondence schools.

Kindergartens

The kindergarten movement in New Zealand first emerged in the form of Froebel societies, and as an adjunct to infant school classrooms in the 1870s. Based on the teaching of Friedrich Froebel, who established the first kindergarten in Prussia in 1837, kindergarten provided an alternative for young children to staying at home or going to school with older children. The first free kindergarten in New Zealand was established in Dunedin in 1889.¹⁰

New Zealand kindergartens were, and still are, administered through charitable associations. During the 20th Century, the kindergarten philosophy was to maintain accessible, high-quality, early childhood care and education services. By the 1940s it focused on three key elements:

- Fees would not be charged for attendance (although voluntary donations are requested and parents are expected to fundraise);
- Kindergartens would be run by trained and qualified teachers, and supported by a professional team of senior teachers; and
- Parental volunteers would assist in running and managing the service.¹¹

By and large, the kindergarten associations evolved independently from government. In 1906 the government began to provide a small per child subsidy, which was subsequently cut in

⁸ Education Act 1989, Section 308

⁹ www.educationcounts.govt.nz/data_collections/ece_staff_return

¹⁰ May (2006)

¹¹ Duncan (2004)

1931 but reinstated in 1935. Preceding and during the WWII years kindergarten children, like school children, had access to free milk, medical checks and dental care, and kindergartens were granted a small increase in the subsidy level.¹² In 1947 the Report of the Consultative Committee on Preschool Education (the Bailey Report) recommended that the state take over the operation of kindergartens. What resulted was a partnership between the government and the kindergarten associations. One of the changes instituted in 1948 was that kindergarten teacher training would be funded by the government, although the kindergarten associations had to provide the training. This led to a transition from kindergarten teaching being viewed as charity work to one of a profession. The key policy shift resulting from the Bailey Report was political acceptance of the view that a preschool education for three- and four-year-olds at a kindergarten and/or playcentre (described below) could benefit children prior to their arrival at school at age five.¹³ However, this political acceptance did not translate fully into reality. As May notes: “No government over the next 40 years pretended that they intended to meet the demand if every 3-4 year old child sought a place”.¹⁴ Where the waitlists were too long, a mother’s only option, aside from lobbying, was to set up a playcentre.

A key aspect of kindergartens is that historically they have not charged fees; however, voluntary donations of money and parents’ time were (and are) common. This made kindergarten a low cost alternative compared to childcare centres (described below). They have traditionally provided sessional programmes during the school year and are closed for term breaks and the summer vacation. Participation has been for three- and four-year-olds, although they are allowed to enrol children over two.¹⁵ The current ratio is one teacher to 15 children. Kindergartens often have three teachers with 45 children for a morning and an afternoon session. Kindergarten teachers have, since the 1950s, been represented by a union.¹⁶ With their long history, ECE policies evolved to a point at which kindergartens were the highest funded form of service; however, reforms in the 1980s levelled the playing field (discussed in Chapter 2). Since that time, kindergartens have experienced tremendous change,¹⁷ with a new trend to charge fees¹⁸ and offer school-day rather than sessional programmes. The number of kindergartens has increased from 575 in 1990 to 618 in 2007 (see Table 1).

Playcentres

Playcentres are unique within the sector in that they are co-operatively managed and supervised by parents with support from experienced Association and Federation personnel. They provide sessional programmes for children birth to school age in mixed ages environments.

The first playcentre was opened in Wellington during World War II by a group of university-educated women, in order to assist the women around them struggling to raise children while the men were off at war. The two basic strands in the playcentre philosophy are “the good of the child and the good of the parents.”¹⁹ The organisation valued active involvement of parents alongside a child-oriented approach to education. The Playcentre philosophy

¹² May (2004)

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ *ibid.* p. 78

¹⁵ See Duncan et al. (2006) for a discussion of two-year-olds in kindergarten.

¹⁶ Kindergarten teachers have been represented by three different unions: Initially by the Kindergarten Teachers Association union, then the Combined Early Childhood Union of Aotearoa, and currently the New Zealand Education Institute.

¹⁷ Duncan (2004); Duncan et al. (2006)

¹⁸ Duncan (2007)

¹⁹ Stover (1998), p.3

emphasises the importance of child-directed learning through play, a concept that was not widely accepted in the 1940s and 1950s. Prevailing attitudes of the time were inclined towards strict, disciplinarian approaches to child rearing and a belief that real education began only once children started school.²⁰ The Playcentre philosophy brings mother and child together, rather than providing a separate place for children's education, which distinguishes it from the kindergartens described above.

The post-war economic boom years combined with the baby boom, led to the flourishing of Playcentres in new community facilities. The Playcentre movement grew into a federated organisation, established in 1948, thereby allowing regional differences and a decentralised approach to governance. Currently, there are 466 licensed Playcentres and 22 unlicensed (see Table 1), affiliated through 33 regional associations. However, enrolments in Playcentre have decreased by 30 percent since 1995 and now comprise only nine percent of enrolments in ECE (see Table 2).

Playcentres have had interconnected memberships with Māori organisations such as the Māori Women's Welfare League, thereby linking ECE with a system of organisation that validated local culture. In the 1960s over 200 Māori Playcentres emerged in the northern part of the north island, largely fuelled by Lex Grey of the Māori Education Foundation. At that time, Māori culture was subordinated to the dominant Pākehā culture. But in the Mid North Playcentres, "There was no ethnic caste and no professional caste."²¹ Māori leaders emerged through Playcentre training, some of whom travelled to Australia to work with Aboriginal families.²² In 1989 the Playcentre Federation formally endorsed Te Tiriti o Waitangi and made a commitment to biculturalism.²³ However, as a decentralised, federated organisation implementation of biculturalism was not an easy task. As the Māori movement grew, some of the Māori playcentres evolved into Kōhanga Reo (Māori language nests describe below) while others remained playcentres.²⁴ Playcentre continues its commitment to and work on implementing te tiriti-based relationships with Māori families.²⁵

Playcentre provides an adult education programme to parents through a Playcentre-specific Level 6 diploma. The Playcentre Diploma in Early Childhood and Adult Education is accredited by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority but a Level 7 diploma is required for a centre to be "teacher-led" and receive a higher funding rate (and participate in the 20 Hours Free Programme). Some Playcentres also offer parenting programmes for new parents. The Hutt Playcentre Association developed the Supporting Parents Alongside Children's Education (SPACE) programme for first time parents with newborn babies. Weekly sessions through the child's first year of life provide opportunities for parents to socialize, discuss information on parenting and child reading, introduce parents to rhymes, music and books for infants, and provide play sessions.²⁶

Early Education and Care Centres

The formal definition of an early education and care centre is that it provides sessional, all-day, or flexible hour programmes for children from birth to school age. They may be privately owned, non-profit making, or operated as an adjunct to a business or organisation.²⁷ The

²⁰ Diti Hill et al. (1998)

²¹ Cleave and Deverell (1998)

²² Grey (1998)

²³ Jenny Corry (1998)

²⁴ Stover, ed. (1998)

²⁵ Marion Pilkington, personal communication (13 June 2008)

²⁶ Playcentre (2008)

²⁷ Education Counts (2007)

centres evolved as a necessary arrangement for children of ‘unfortunate’ mothers who had to work. From the start, these arrangements were seen as less preferable than care by mothers in the home or in kindergartens or playcentres. Scandals in the 1950s of poorly cared for children in unsafe environments prompted childcare regulation in 1960. The new regulations were promulgated by the Division of Child Welfare (initially located in the Department of Education but then relocated to the Department of Social Welfare), whereas the kindergartens and playcentres were under the jurisdiction of the then Department of Education. This administrative split continued until the late 1980s and contributed to the second-best reputation of childcare centres. The New Zealand Childcare Association (NZCA) emerged in 1963 as a membership association that advocated for raising the reputation and quality of ECE services. In the 1990s the Early Childhood Council emerged as a second membership organisation for centres (both organisations are discussed below).

The number of early education and care centres increased as women entered the formal labour force in the 1960s and 1970s. Working mothers needed full-day childcare arrangements, not the sessional programmes provided by kindergartens and playcentres. The number of services increased from 719 in 1990 to 1,932 in 2007, and is the fastest growing type of care in New Zealand (see Table 1). The number of children enrolled at these services increased by over 40 percent between 1995 and 2007, making them the largest source of enrolment at 54 percent (see Table 2). Data from 2007 indicate that private providers enrol the largest proportion of children (31 percent in centres and 4 percent in home-based) over any other type of service (see Table 3). While early providers were community-based centres or businesses started by women, usually in their homes, there are now several chains operating in New Zealand. Kidicorp, Kindercare, ABC Learning Centres, and Forward Steps operate over 150 centres. In 2007, Kidicorp changed its auspice and is now a public charity. The ABC chain, a relative newcomer to New Zealand, is a publicly traded company listed on the New Zealand Stock Exchange. Corporate chains represent less than 10 percent of centres in New Zealand, with the remainder community-based or privately-owned. Geographically, private centres are most heavily represented in the Auckland area, whereas community-based providers dominate the South Island.²⁸

Kōhanga Reo

Te Kōhanga Reo grew out of the Māori movement to preserve New Zealand’s indigenous population’s culture and language and to honour the Treaty of Waitangi. Māori children did not historically participate in ECE to the same extent as Pākeha (European descent) children. Many Māori considered that kindergartens and playcentres did not meet their needs. Māori activist Donna Awatere stated:

The education system is the major gate which keeps Māori out. There is an invisible sign over every kindergarten, playcentre, school and university. That sign reads, “Māoris Keep Out. For Whites’ Use Only.” White people can’t see this sign... Kindergartens are the first of the educational gates: a bastion of white power. Kindergartens have frightened Māori people off pre-school education... Māori parents won’t take their children there, not because they don’t want to, but because kindergartens, in particular, and playcentres to a lesser extent, don’t meet their needs.²⁹

²⁸ ECE sector data are available for public download at: http://www.minedu.govt.nz/web/downloadable/dl6434_v1/directory-ece-web.xls.

²⁹ Donna Awatere quoted in May (2006), p. 246

The divisions between Māori and Pākeha stem from the differing language in the Treaty of Waitangi signed in 1840. The English version of the Treaty of Waitangi gave the Crown sovereignty over the land; the Māori language version however did not. A land war ensued in the 1860s and in the aftermath of the Crown's victory, Māori land was confiscated. From that point forward, Māori became a largely landless population. By the 1960s Māori culture and language were disappearing as Māori were assimilated into the dominant Pākeha culture.³⁰

A political awakening of the Māori population began in the 1960s and 1970s, in which self-determination replaced assimilation. An important development in the Māori movement occurred at a series of national meetings of Māori tribal leaders in 1979 culminating in the 1981 decision to create Kōhanga Reo.³¹ Literally translated as 'language nests', Kōhanga Reo were envisioned to strengthen and empower Māori families; and save and maintain te reo Māori (the language). As mother of the movement Iritana Tawhiwhirangi conveyed: "Kōhanga Reo are more than early childhood development but rather envisioned as Māori development".³² It is a holistic approach in which Māori language and culture are passed from one generation to the next.

The first Kōhanga Reo pilot, Pukeatua, was started in Wellington followed soon after by three more. Television coverage of Wellington Kōhanga Reo reached the rest of the country spurring rapid development. The first Kōhanga Reo in the Auckland area, Orakei in Mangere, was formed within a few months, raising the number of pilot programmes to five.³³ Between 1982 and 1988, the number increased from five pilot centres to 521.³⁴ The Department of Māori Affairs provided some funding to establish kōhanga; however, Māori communities, such as in Mangere, also funded their own. The number peaked in 1994 at 800 and has now decreased to 407 licensed Kōhanga Reo in 2007.³⁵ Kōhanga Reo enrol approximately 9,000 children, which represents a 52 percent decline in enrolment since 1995. Currently Kōhanga Reo enrol five percent of total enrolment in ECE (see Table 2).

Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust was established in 1982 and formalised as a charitable trust in 1983 to manage the kaupapa (philosophy) of the Kōhanga Reo movement and to facilitate a partnership between the Māori people and the departments of government, in particular, the Department of Māori Affairs. As the governing body for Kōhanga Reo, the Trusts' main functions are:

- To promote, support and encourage the use and retention of Te Reo Māori;
- To promote and encourage the establishment and maintenance of Te Kōhanga Reo Centres;
- To provide financial, advisory, and administrative assistance for the centres;
- To provide support and the means of obtaining support to people involved in the Te Kōhanga Reo Centres; and
- To liaise with government departments and other relevant bodies on aspects of preschool tuition in Māori language and the administration of the Te Kōhanga Reo programme.³⁶

³⁰ Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust cited by Government Review Team (1988)

³¹ Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust cited by Government Review Team (1988)

³² Iritana Tawhiwhirangi, personal communication (11 June 2008)

³³ Arapera Royal Tangaere, personal communication (11 June 2008)

³⁴ Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust cited by Government Review Team (1988), p. 19

³⁵ Education Counts (2007)

³⁶ Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust (n.d.)

In 1987 a review of Kōhanga Reo by the Social Equity Committee of the Cabinet was prompted by policy changes in childcare policy and funding. The review team found that “Te Kōhanga Reo is a vigorous lively movement. It has arrested fragmentation of the traditional cultural base. It has revitalised the use of the marae. It is helping to preserve the Māori language.”³⁷ They noted that the creation of Kōhanga Reo required whānau to learn new skills and a shortage of skills placed heavy burdens on the kaiako (teachers) and kaumata (elders). This was matched with a lack of funding for operational costs. The review team recommended increased funding from \$11 million to \$20 million, greater training support for kaiako, and training for teacher trainees and public servants to develop cultural sensitivity.³⁸ A key sticking point was beyond the scope of the review. The review was limited to early childhood but the Trust wanted it to encompass Māori development. That difference in perspective continues to be a struggle for Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust in its relations with government.

In 1990, as part of broader structural government reforms, the responsibility for Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust was transferred from the Department of Māori Affairs to the Ministry of Education. The Department of Māori Affairs was being disestablished, which required the Trust to be placed in another government agency; however, the decision to place it under the jurisdiction of education was controversial because of the differing perspectives of Kōhanga Reo as Māori development versus early childhood education. While Kōhanga Reo gained funding by the move to the Ministry of Education, it was difficult for them to adapt. The Trust’s website provides this perspective on the shift: “Kōhanga Reo had to come to terms with the regulatory environment and compliances of the early childhood sector and a mainstream department, whilst maintaining the unique kaupapa of the Kōhanga Reo movement. Such a system of measurement often came at a heavy cost to our kaupapa.”³⁹

When the Trust was reviewed in 1999 by the Education Review Office (ERO), these difficulties were highlighted. The Trust viewed the accountability arrangements for early childhood funding as inappropriate and compromising the independence of the movement, and conflicting with the Treaty of Waitangi. However, the Ministry of Education’s regulatory system expressly focuses on early childhood education and was not well suited to the larger mission of Kōhanga Reo. These challenges presented thorny issues for all involved. The ERO report also identified difficulties in financial management due to lack of financial acumen by some whānau, as well as payment issues from the Trust to the individual Kōhanga Reo.⁴⁰

The Trust began a strategic planning process to address the issues raised in the report. In the presentation of the strategic plan to the Ministry of Education in 1999, the Trust wanted a direct relationship with the Crown. To clarify the relationship between the Crown and Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, a working group was established in 2000. The working group was charged with identifying outcomes for “progressing” the relationship between the Trust and the Crown and identifying barriers to attaining those outcomes. It was charged with recommending the most effective form of relationship between the two and to advising on how to achieve it.⁴¹ The working group recommended a tripartite relationship between Te Puni Kōkiri (the Ministry of Māori Development), the Ministry of Education, and the Trust with dedicated relationship managers in each of the three organisations. It recommended additional funding through Te Puni Kōkiri for the aspects of the Kōhanga Reo movement not specific to early childhood education. The working group also tackled a difficult issue over

³⁷ Government Review Team (1988), p. 7

³⁸ *ibid.* p. 9

³⁹ Kohanga National Trust (2008)

⁴⁰ Education Review Office (1999)

⁴¹ Ministry of Education (2001)

the Trust using MOE capital grants as a revolving loan fund (known as Property Putea) and recommended that it be discontinued.⁴² The final recommendation of the working group was to devolve Kōhanga Reo to the Iwi by 2006.⁴³ The Trust supported the devolution, although many individual kōhanga did not, however it has yet to be implemented.

The Ministry of Education currently provides quarterly operational grants and funded child hours (i.e. kaupapa payments) to the Trust, which acts as the fiscal agent for licensed Kōhanga Reo. The Trust has contracts with the Ministry of Education for professional development and offers training on Te Whāriki (the national curriculum) and strategies to improve language pedagogy. They develop seminars based on whānau demands and to educate whānau about new developments in government. The Trust offers a three-year diploma, Whakapakari Tohu, taught in Māori and recognized by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. The diploma covers an expansive programme including child development and pedagogy alongside Kōhanga Reo history, Māori history, human relations, evaluation, administration, language acquisition (te reo), health of the mind, body and spirit, and other topics. Graduates, referred to as kaiako, qualify a Kōhanga Reo to be teacher-led and thereby participate in Free ECE; however, the Teachers Council does not recognize Whakapakari for teacher registration purposes. Therefore Kōhanga Reo are not able to qualify for the higher funding rate reserved for services with teachers possessing an ECE diploma. The Trust also provides four different one-year courses: two on Māori language (beginner and semi-fluent), information technology, administration of voluntary programmes. The Trust's professional development and courses are available around the country.

Home-Based

Home-based education and care involves an educator providing education and care for up to four children, under the supervision of a registered teacher (coordinator) who visits the educator at least once a month to provide advice and support. This takes place in the caregiver's home, or at the child's home, on a full-day or part-day basis, and is part of a chartered home-based care network.⁴⁴ The home-based networks have grown rapidly increasing from 40 in 1990 to 227 in 2007 (see Table 1). At the time of this report, the Team Up website listed 260 home-based services. From 1995 to 2007 enrolment in home-based education increased by 45 percent, and now comprises 6 percent of the enrolment in ECE (see Table 2).

The Correspondence School

The Correspondence School offers learning programmes for children aged three-to-five-years who live too far away from early childhood education services or who are ill or disabled.⁴⁵ This is the only type of ECE that is run by the government. Enrolment in correspondence school ECE comprises less than one percent of total enrolment in ECE (see Table 2).

⁴² The cultural practice of kōha by Māori requires that one gives to those in need, and others will give to you in your time of need. The Trust utilised the capital funds provided by the Ministry of Education in a programme referred to as Property Putea as a form of kōha in which a loan would be granted to a Kōhanga Reo, which would then pay it back to the Trust to be loaned out to another Kōhanga Reo. This allowed the Trust to respond quickly to the needs of whānau. When the Discretionary Grants programme stopped allowing loans, it disrupted the kōha system. Royal Tangaere, personal communication (11 June 2008).

⁴³ Ministry of Education (2001)

⁴⁴ Team Up (n.d.-a)

⁴⁵ Team Up (n.d.-b)

Playgroups

New Zealand has license-exempt playgroups in which parents/whānau and caregivers meet together to provide play programmes for their children. If the programmes run for no more than three hours each day and the majority of children are accompanied by a parent, then no license is required. These groups receive some government funding to pay for equipment and rental space and the Ministry of Education provides training for those involved in running them. There are playgroups specifically for Māori (Nga Puna Kohungahunga) and for Pasifika (Pacific Islands Early Childhood groups).

Membership Associations

In addition to the types of services and organisations associated with the early childhood providers discussed above (Kindergarten Associations, Playcentre Federation, Kōhanga Reo National Trust), the stakeholder community for early childhood in New Zealand includes membership organisations for childcare centres, a teachers union, and research and teaching organisations.

Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa – New Zealand Childcare Association

The New Zealand Childcare Association was founded in 1963 by Sonja Davies, a legendary figure in New Zealand early childhood policy, as a way to organise the disparate providers of daycare after the first regulations for childcare centres emerged in 1960 (described in the next chapter). After unsuccessfully trying to become part of the New Zealand Free Kindergarten Union and the New Zealand Playcentre Federation, Sonja Davis organised a meeting of 10 centres with a representative from the Ministry of Social Welfare responsible for regulating childcare centres) resulting in the formation of the Association of Child Care Centres.⁴⁶

One of the challenges for childcare centres is that the category includes a diverse array of care arrangements – drop-in child minding centres, residential nurseries, private kindergartens, full-day nurseries⁴⁷ – and they are organised as both community and private entities with some relying solely on paid labour and others including volunteer labour. With such a diverse group, the one size fits all childcare regulations made compliance difficult. The regulations included Class A and B licenses, with higher rates paid for trained teachers (such as kindergarten teachers). Childcare workers were often untrained and therefore licensed as a Class B. This classification contributed to the perceived second class nature of childcare centres as opposed to kindergartens.

The New Zealand Childcare Association (NZCA), formerly the Association of Child Care Centres, persistently fought against the negative construction of centre-based care to:

- Promote a high standard of childcare; and to
- Promote and support legislation designed to benefit childcare centres.⁴⁸

One of their big challenges was to define quality. A key problem identified by the NZCA was the lack of training for childcare centre workers. The childcare regulations focused on health and safety, and it was therefore possible to meet the licensing standards while providing low quality care. The NZCA petitioned the Department of Education for a national training scheme. The Minister responded that childcare training was not a government policy or

⁴⁶ May (2003b)

⁴⁷ *ibid.*

⁴⁸ *ibid.* p. 30

responsibility but encouraged the Association to devise training. The Ministers of Health and Social Welfare provided similar responses.⁴⁹ Thus began the NZCA's foundational role in providing training for childcare workers.

The philosophy of the NZCA was that comprehensive training was the key to improving centre-based care.⁵⁰ After much perseverance, the Association successfully established the Royal Society of Health Child Care Certificate. They continued to lobby for a correspondence course, a higher level diploma for supervisors, and a New Zealand childcare qualification. In 1978 the Association took over the Child Care Certificate training and began to pursue an accreditation scheme. Led by Anne Smith, the accreditation was initially targeted for the entire sector but ultimately it only applied to childcare workers.

The focus of the NZCA's training was on competency-based assessment, a cutting edge approach at the time. This allowed childcare workers who had experience but no training to demonstrate competencies while continuing to work (as opposed to taking time off work to pursue training). Grant funding allowed the NZCA to hire a training director, establish a network of area training supervisors, and develop a series of course modules. An Introductory Certificate for staff with little experience was also created. By 1980 the NZCA had established training bases in Auckland, Hawke's Bay, Wellington, Dunedin, Hamilton, Manawatu, and Christchurch with 143 enrolments; however, funding was not available for further expansion.⁵¹

The Association's role in creating training for childcare workers was one step in the long process of raising the standards. Another step was to amass political support for legislation supportive of childcare centres. Ten years after the establishment of the NZCA, progress was made on that front. The newly elected Labour government recognised childcare centres and in 1974 a childcare fee subsidy was put in place to assist childcare centres with parents on low incomes. The fee subsidy along with a capital subsidy (for community-based centres) supported growth in full-day centres because it allowed centres to charge fees that could cover costs of provision. Minimum attendance was 25 hours per week. Administration of the fee subsidy required the creation of administrative organisations (i.e. trusts operating as fiscal agents).⁵²

The Association continued to grow in its second decade. It established a national office and changed its constitution to allow for individual members, as well as organisations. This change allowed childcare workers to join the association. Reflecting this shift in membership, the name was changed to the New Zealand Childcare Association (from the Association of Child Care Centres) in 1980. Some members believed that the membership should remain limited to centres and not opened to individuals. This group split into a separate organisation, the Private Child Care Federation, to represent mainly private centres in Auckland.⁵³

Changes in regulation occurred again in 1985. The Ministry of Education agreed to fund the development and delivery of three year Diploma of Teaching (ECE) programmes. These programmes integrated what had been two year programmes for kindergarten teachers and one year certificates for childcare workers, into a three year programme for both groups. However, education and care services were not required to appoint a staff member with the

⁴⁹ *ibid.*

⁵⁰ *ibid.*

⁵¹ May (2003)

⁵² *ibid.*

⁵³ *ibid.*

Diploma of Teaching (ECE) until 2005.⁵⁴ The NZCA was involved in developing criteria for the curricula and fieldwork content of qualifications which, following the 1989 reforms (described more fully in the following chapter), evolved into the New Zealand Qualifications Authority.

When new regulations were implemented in 1989 the NZCA helped to translate them by writing a guide to implementing the new charter requirement. The shift to bulk funding (described in Chapter Two) created challenges because the funding levels were not tied to quality improvements. The NZCA had fought for so long for increased funding for centres only to have scandals gain media attention because of the misuse of funds by some private centres. The issue of profit became a divisive issue in the Association, which had both private and community-based centres in its membership. Throughout the 1990s, an era of lost ground in hard fought battles for ECE policy change, the NZCA maintained its commitment to improved quality and fair treatment of centres through government policy.⁵⁵

The 1990s were also a time of major internal change for the NZCA. In this decade it became a bicultural organisation. The constitution was changed to reflect the implementation of partnership principle of the Treaty of Waitangi, including: that the runanga (governance structure for Māori participation) and tangata whenua would define kaupapa Māori; that the NZCA runanga would monitor, advise, and support the practice of Treaty of Waitangi requirements in centres; that the runanga would be remunerated for consultancy; and, finally that the constitution would be translated into Māori.⁵⁶ As the Te Kōhanga Reo movement emerged, there was some intersection with the Association over training. During the 1980s there was a growing Māori presence of trainees, staff and executive members. NZCA historian Helen May writes, “As the decade continued, understandings deepened, consciousness was raised, and perspectives were shared” that ultimately led to a fundamental shift in the Association to incorporate Māori culture.⁵⁷ In 1999 the name was officially changed to Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa New Zealand Childcare Association to reflect the structural changes in the organisation.

At the same time the organisation was moving toward biculturalism, the Pasifika presence in New Zealand was increasing and organisations representing Pasifika interests began to advocate for Pacific Island language nests, modelled after Te Kōhanga Reo. NZCA responded by working with Pasifika organisations to develop Pasifika-specific training and hired Pasifika area training supervisors to staff new training centres in areas with high proportions of Pasifika population.

However, all these changes came with a cost. The structural changes to the organisation in becoming bicultural strained the NZCA’s resources. On the brink of financial collapse, the governing structure was streamlined and the organisation had to reassess its operations. As the decade came to a close the NZCA was struggling not only with biculturalism but also with changing teacher requirements that would challenge its approach to training childcare teachers. Fortunately that issue was resolved in 1997 when the NZCA received approval to offer a National Diploma in Teaching in Early Childhood Education. This was critically important for the organisation because of future changes, unknown at that time, that would link funding to teacher qualifications. The NZCA’s focus on training further expanded when it was approved to offer a National Diploma in Teaching in Early Childhood Education

⁵⁴ Nancy Bell, email communication (17 June 2008)

⁵⁵ May (2003b)

⁵⁶ *ibid.*, p. 244

⁵⁷ *ibid.* p. 226

Pasifika in 2004. In 2005 the NZCA won its first professional development contract from the Ministry of Education.

Currently, the NZCA maintains its focus on training and has added a professional development component. It enrolls approximately 800 students at 16 locations in its diploma programme and delivers professional development to around 250 services per year (through Ministry of Education contracts), and additional professional development tailored to particular services' needs. The NZCA lobbies on behalf of its members for policies and resources that promote access to, and quality in, ECE. The membership includes one-quarter of the early education and care services in New Zealand with a higher proportion in the South Island (34%) than in Auckland (15%).⁵⁸

Early Childhood Council

The Early Childhood Council (ECC) is a membership organisation that represents "the interests of independent early childhood centres, and [promotes] the provision of quality early childhood education."⁵⁹ Formed in 1990 from the amalgamation of the Licensed Childcare Centres Federation and the Associated Childcare Council, the ECC officially incorporated in 1991. Membership is available to all community-based and private licensed independent early childhood centres. The ECC website states that there are "over 1000 licensed education and care centres as members of the ECC" with 62 percent private and 38 percent community-based.⁶⁰ By joining the ECC, members receive discounts through various goods and services providers and access to insurance. The ECC keeps members informed through regular news updates, access to a web-based information library, *Swings & Roundabouts* magazine, as well as publication of handbooks and surveys of employment, fee rates and policies in the sector, and an annual conference. The Early Childhood Council has been an active player in the early childhood policy community through advocacy and engagement with the media.

New Zealand Education Institute

The New Zealand Educational Institute Te Riu Roa (NZEI) is New Zealand's largest education union. It represents more than 46,000 New Zealand teachers and support staff working in primary, and secondary schools and early childhood centres, Specialist Education Services and Colleges of Education.⁶¹

Major changes to education in the late 1980s had an enormous impact on NZEI. The State Sector Act 1987 led to changes in wage bargaining and for the first time primary teachers worked under a national award. In 1989 the government introduced Tomorrow's Schools, which changed the employment patterns of teachers. This led to changes in NZEI's organisation and structure. Among the changes was a restructuring to enable Māori members to have greater participation in the organisation. Te Reo Areare, the Māori Council of NZEI, now determines the Māori policy of the organisation and advocates for change in Māori education.⁶²

In 1991 the Employment Contracts Act (ECA) promoted individual contracts rather than collective bargaining, especially for multi-employer contracts. In the wake of the ECA, the Combined Early Childhood Union of Aotearoa (CECUA), which represented early childhood

⁵⁸ Nancy Bell, email communication (17 June 2008)

⁵⁹ ECC (2008)

⁶⁰ *ibid.*

⁶¹ NZEI (2008)

⁶² *ibid.*

workers (formerly the Child Care Workers Union), amalgamated with NZEI to form NZEI Te Riu Roa in 1994. Since that time, NZEI has been a vocal proponent of teacher's employment issues for the ECE sector. A major victory occurred in 2002 when pay parity for kindergarten teachers with primary school teachers was achieved. In October 2004 "pay parity for early childhood education teachers was successfully negotiated for the first time." The consenting parties' agreement affected 180 community-based centres and 1,800 workers.⁶³ Since that time it has continued to win improvements for ECE members.

NZEI is an active part of the ECE policy community. In the 1990s NZEI took a lead role in the development of the *Future Directions* report.⁶⁴ As described in Chapter Two, this report had an important role in shifting the political gaze to 20 Hours Free, among other policy reforms. More recently NZEI has developed a vision for quality ECE that would move the sector towards nationally planned public provision, similar to the school sector, thereby severely curtailing the presence of private ECE services.⁶⁵ In keeping with that vision, in May 2007 NZEI called for a moratorium on funding for new private centres in reaction to the release of a New Zealand Council for Education Research survey of the sector.⁶⁶ When the ABC Learning Centres chain encountered financial difficulties, NZEI's media release called on the government to buy up the centres.⁶⁷

Pacific Islands Early Childhood Council Aotearoa

The vision of PIECCA is for all Pacific people living in New Zealand to have access to high quality Early Childhood Education that strengthens their pride and self-belief through a system that embraces the value of Pacific cultural heritage and identity. Its mission is to build a strong foundation for Pacific children and their families based on the concept of holistic aiga/kainga development. PIECCA has a contract, Vaka Ou, with the Ministry of Education to provide pre and licensing support services. Currently there are approximately 36 centres that have been licensed and chartered, and 10 more are working towards being licensed.⁶⁸ The Vaka Ou team, consisting of the project coordinator and community development officers (CDO), work closely with centres to ensure that licensed centres and those working towards licensing are supported in maintaining high standards, effective systems, awareness of charter and policy compliance standards. The CDOs also assist the centres in applying for ECE Discretionary Grants for renovation or construction. PIECCA provides Parents As First Teachers (PAFT) resources to families in the South and Central Auckland. This home-based programme assists parents with children zero to three years of age in understanding child development and general well-being needs of young children. PAFT is an early intervention service for families whose social and family circumstances put their health, education and welfare at risk.⁶⁹

Research and Education Organisations

New Zealand Council for Education Research

The New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) is an independent, nonprofit, educational research organisation, established in 1934 through grants from the Carnegie

⁶³ *ibid.*

⁶⁴ Wells (1998)

⁶⁵ NZEI (20 June 2007)

⁶⁶ Mitchell and Brooking (2007)

⁶⁷ NZEI (29 February 2008)

⁶⁸ PIECCA (2008)

⁶⁹ *ibid.*

Corporation. It became a statutory body in 1945 and now operates under the NZCER Act 1972 (and amendments). Under Section 13 of the NZCER Act, the organisation is required to:

- Foster the study of, and research into, educational and other like matters;
- Prepare and publish such reports on these matters as may in its opinion be necessary or of value to teachers or other persons; and
- Furnish information, advice, and assistance to persons and organisations concerned with education or similar matters.⁷⁰

While the NZCER provides research and evaluation for education of all ages of children, its early childhood research has been prominent in policy-making. A search of the NZCER catalogue resulted in 107 publications since 1983 and there are certainly many more from the nearly 50 years prior. Virtually every author cited in this report has published through the NZCER and some have been employed by the Council as well (e.g. Anne Meade and Linda Mitchell). The NZCER is independent but plays an influential role in informing policy. Linda Mitchell, in particular, has published extensively evaluating aspects of ECE policy such as bulk funding, funding of private centres, teacher qualifications, and equity funding.⁷¹ Often NZCER projects are contracts with the Ministry of Education such as a study of quality in parent/whānau-led services,⁷² and the Competent Children study (with Victoria University) that provided longitudinal data on the impacts of ECE on children's development.⁷³ With its long history of ECE research the NZCER has been a central part of the policy community.

University Academics

University academics in early childhood education have been closely aligned with the early childhood sector and active in the policy community. Most of the academics started their careers as early childhood teachers and many have been or remain involved in teacher unions. These academics, some of whom have moved in and out of academia, are politically active, committed, and integrally important to the policy changes described in this report. A few who have been particularly active in the policy community are mentioned here, but there are many more who have contributed significantly. Anne Meade played pivotal roles in two critically important waves of reform: the *Before Five* report in 1989,⁷⁴ and *Pathways to the Future*, the 2002 ECE strategic plan.⁷⁵ Currently she is leading the Centre for Innovation project for the Ministry of Education that is providing valuable evidence on best practices in ECE. Helen May and Margaret Carr took the lead in developing *Te Whāriki*, the national early childhood curriculum published in 1996.⁷⁶ In addition to their scholarly contributions, Anne Smith and Helen May were integrally involved in the New Zealand Childcare Association's fight to raise the quality of centre-based care and raise the profile of the early childhood teaching profession. Helen May has played an important role in documenting the history of ECE in New Zealand through her many publications. Linda Mitchell has been a central figure in early childhood research through union involvement, the NZCER and most recently an academic post at Waikato University. A newer arrival, Judith Duncan, has published extensively on kindergartens,⁷⁷ and been involved with the Children's Issue Centre at the University of Otago. Carmen Dalli has written policy narratives for two important waves of ECE policy-

⁷⁰ NZCER (2008)

⁷¹ Mitchell (2001),(2002), (2004), (2006)

⁷² Mitchell et al. (2006)

⁷³ Meade et al. (1995)

⁷⁴ Lange (1988)

⁷⁵ Carter (2007)

⁷⁶ Ministry of Education (1996)

⁷⁷ e.g. Duncan (2006), (2007)

making,⁷⁸ and runs the Institute for Early Childhood Studies at Victoria University. There is a clear agenda among New Zealand's academics to improve early childhood education and, although they may not all agree on exactly what the next steps are, they are each clearly committed to contributing to the ECE policy community.

University Research Centres

While there are many teaching institutions, described below, ECE research occurs at several universities. The University of Otago in Dunedin is home to the Children's Issues Centre which has a mission to address national issues that affect children and contribute to improving children's experiences. Otago's College of Education, with Helen May as its dean, has been engaged over many years in implementing quality ECE into university contexts. The University of Waikato has the Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, that focuses research attention on curriculum, teaching and learning. Victoria University of Wellington has the Institute for Early Childhood Studies, with a mission to bring together early childhood teachers, researchers and other professionals to work collaboratively on ECE research projects. These research institutions contribute to knowledge and their faculty are active participants in the ECE policy community.

ECE Teacher Education Institutions

By 2007, all colleges of education were merged into universities to strengthen links between research, pedagogy, and practice. The academic environment is still adjusting to the change. However, in New Zealand the education of ECE teachers comes from a variety of sources, not only the universities. The NZCA and private training providers also offer three year diplomas in ECE. The universities offer both a three and four year degree. The main difference between a diploma and degree is that the degree has a greater emphasis on research. There are 11 providers of diplomas, 13 providers of bachelor degrees, and seven providers of graduate diplomas. Some of the programmes emphasise Māori or Pasifika language and culture. Other programmes are Montessori or Steiner endorsed. But all diplomas and degrees are three year programmes (or four year in the case of degrees), and graduate students are "qualified" teachers under New Zealand regulations. See Appendix 1 for a full list of teacher training institutions.

The early childhood education policy community evolved through waves of activism, demographic shifts, political and economic changes. In the following section, I discuss the history of early childhood policy that ultimately led to the creation of the 20 Hours Free Programme.

⁷⁸ Dalli (1993); Dalli and Te One (2002)

2 EARLY CHILDHOOD POLICY WAVES

Since childcare was first regulated in 1960 there have been key moments when ECE rose on the political agenda and major policy changes were achieved. In this chapter, I discuss the history leading up to two waves of policy action: the 1988 *Before Five* report and the 2002 ECE strategic plan, *Pathways to the Future: Nga Huarahi Arataki*.⁷⁹ Both of these policy waves were important in creating the policy environment that led to the creation of the 20 Hours Free Programme. In order for these waves to occur, there had been years of advocacy work setting the stage, building the relationships, and preparing for an opportunity to advance policy change.

Advocacy Development in the 1960s and 1970s

New Zealand childcare regulations came about in 1960 as the result of a “baby farming” scandal.⁸⁰ However, there was no movement or national organisation representing childcare comparable to the New Zealand Kindergarten Association and the Playcentre Federation. The 1971 *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Pre-School Education*, while noting the increasing need for early education and care, rejected recommending government support for childcare services.⁸¹ Rather, it urged kindergartens and playcentres, industry and business to meet the needs of single mothers and working mothers.⁸²

As described in the prior chapter, a divide existed between kindergartens and childcare centres, with kindergartens holding a privileged role in early childhood policy. Kindergartens received government funding for buildings and operations and their teachers were paid by the government. However they were primarily sessional, which meant that children attended for a morning or an afternoon session, not both. The sessional nature of kindergarten did not meet the needs of parents who required full-day care. Childcare centres emerged to meet the demand for full-day care and by 1974 low-income families received subsidies for their children to attend. This created a dual system in which centre-based services were seen as “childcare” but kindergartens were viewed as “education.” This split was expressed in the 1975 Early Childhood Convention proceedings as a concern for the “needs of children marooned outside the traditional ‘preschool’ policy frameworks”.⁸³ At this first convention, early childhood researcher and activist Anne Smith presented a paper arguing for universal provision of publicly funded, community-based childcare, with parent involvement, professional support and trained staff.⁸⁴ However, opposing voices from Playcentre decried the pressure for women to enter the formal labour force to free themselves of the care of their children.⁸⁵

A key figure in the emergent advocacy for childcare was Sonja Davies.⁸⁶ As described in Chapter Two, she set up the New Zealand Association for Child Care Centres in the early 1960s in order to provide a mechanism for advancing childcare issues. However, it took until 1974 to build support and change perceptions in order to win childcare subsidies for low-income families. The subsidy change was preceded by a structural change in government when the Department of Social Welfare was created. The Child Welfare Division, which

⁷⁹ In this report I focus on the recent history but an earlier wave of early childhood policy-making occurred with the Bailey Report (1947). For a full discussion of ECE history, see May’s *Politics in the Playground* (2001).

⁸⁰ See May 2003b for a full discussion of this era

⁸¹ Ministry of Education (1971), pp. 115-6 cited in Meade and Podmore (2002), p.9

⁸² Meade and Podmore (2002), p.9

⁸³ May (2003), p. 172

⁸⁴ Anne B Smith (1978) cited in May (2003), p. 172

⁸⁵ May (2003)

⁸⁶ May (2003), (2005)

included childcare administration, had previously been part of the Department of Education. Meade and Podmore note the irony of the structural change because it occurred just as commentators were beginning to talk about early education and care together rather than two distinct types of activities.⁸⁷

The subsidies for childcare came about as more women were entering the formal labour force and needed more care than was available at sessional kindergartens. The differential treatment of children in kindergarten/playcentre and centre-based care became an explosive issue.⁸⁸ Childcare carried with it the stigma of being for the “unfortunate” mothers who had no husbands or had to work. As more educated women began entering the labour force and were placing their children in childcare centres, the negative perception of centre-based care began to change.

Early childhood education became a focus of campaigns associated with women’s rights, children’s rights, and Māori rights. The network of advocacy organisations for early childhood emerged through the 1970s as the result of committed leadership who organised to raise the profile of the education and care of young children. New Zealand’s advocates built their capacity to lobby for change, and strategically utilised international organisations and actors to draw attention to early care and education. 1975 was the International Year of the Woman and there were numerous meetings throughout the year building upon that international dimension. That year also marks the emergence of an early childhood “national constituency” at the first early childhood convention.⁸⁹ The convention was the brainchild of the president of the New Zealand Free Kindergarten Union and was intended to create a forum to share ideas. While there was a strong kindergarten presence at the convention, there was also a mix of academic, governmental, organisational, researcher and practitioners. This mix proved to be a crucial and ongoing feature of early childhood advocacy.⁹⁰ There were also the United Women’s Convention, The Education and the Equality of the Sexes Conference, and a Parliamentary select committee on discrimination of women.⁹¹

In 1976 the Prime Minister convened a Conference on Women in Social and Economic Development that resulted in delegates passing a recommendation that childcare centres be placed on an equal financial footing with kindergartens and playcentres, and, that the government create requirements for employing trained staff. The recommendation was endorsed by a national advisory group on early education and referred to the Minister of Education who referred it to the Minister of State Services in March 1977.⁹² In response, the State Services Commission Working Group on Early Childhood Care and Education was established later that year. The Working Group was featured at the 1978 OECD Conference on Early Childhood Care and Education held in New Zealand. The most radical recommendation from the working group was that funding be increased to a level that covered 50 percent of parents’ costs, and that funding should be equitable across services. However, no government action followed the recommendations.⁹³ The lack of government action led to the creation of the Early Childhood Workers Union in 1979, registered in 1982. Through the union, advocates sought an effective voice to lobby for changes in childcare.

⁸⁷ Meade and Podmore (2002), p. 8

⁸⁸ May (2004)

⁸⁹ Renwick (1978), p. 236

⁹⁰ May (2003b)

⁹¹ Meade and Podmore (2002), p. 10

⁹² *ibid.* p. 10

⁹³ *ibid.* p. 10

The Early Childhood Conventions were held every four years. In 1979 developmental psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner created a new theoretical framework that expanded the mother-child dyadic focus of developmental psychology to include a widening social and cultural network of relationships.⁹⁴ This supported the diverse array of early childhood environments to find a place because it could move the discussion beyond mother and child.

The 1980s Policy Environment

The 1980s were a tumultuous time for New Zealand filled with policy changes and restructurings intended to move the country toward global competitiveness. The new thinking placed emphasis on competition through the use of market incentives to increase efficiency. The public sector experienced seismic shifts as decision-makers rethought the division between public and private sectors.⁹⁵ In the midst of all this momentous change, momentum was building toward an early childhood policy wave.

In 1982, under a National Government, the Early Childhood Workers Union was established but opposition from the Employers Federation and two Arbitration Court cases delayed an award until 1985. In the Consenting Parties Award, the following key principles were established:

- Differential rates for staff who were qualified, unqualified or in training;
- Differential rates for staff at the level of being a supervisor, a senior childcare worker or a childcare worker; and
- Wage levels recognising years of service.⁹⁶

At the same time kindergarten teachers were pushing for pay parity with primary school teachers. While the early childhood workers were moving toward more pay, the broader political and economic environment was heading toward greater deregulation and reliance on the market.

Virtually the entire portfolio of government programmes and scope of government were evaluated with a critical eye toward what was public versus private. Education came under review and early childhood advocates were able to push for an ECE review as part of the larger context of education reform. The review of ECE was included in the report *Tomorrow's Schools*.⁹⁷ The Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group built upon the work of previous reports,⁹⁸ as well as *Tomorrow's Schools*, to make the case for government involvement in ECE for two reasons. The first was for the developmental benefit of the child and the second was the impact on women's participation in economic and social life. Their report, *Education to Be More*, identified five areas needing immediate improvement:⁹⁹

- The low status of the early childhood care and education field;

⁹⁴ May (2003a)

⁹⁵ Kettl (1997)

⁹⁶ May (2005)

⁹⁷ Department of Education (1988)

⁹⁸ Specifically mentioned in the Task Force report is that the working group considered the 1980 *Early Childhood Care and Education*, State Services Commission Working Group; the 1984 *Women's Forum*, Ministry of Women's Affairs; 1985 *Childcare Services* report of the Social Advisory Council; 1985 *Report of the Joint Ministerial Working Party for the Transfer of Administration of Child Care from the Department of Social Welfare to the Department of Education*; 1988 *The April Report*, Royal Commission on Social Policy. They also made use of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration (i.e. the Picot report), which was released during the working group's development of its recommendations.

⁹⁹ Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group (1988), p. 32

- Equity of access to services;
- Tangata whenua (i.e. Māori determination and control over services for Māori children);¹⁰⁰
- The status of women; and,
- An uneven, inequitable, and inadequate funding structure for ECE.¹⁰¹

The Working Group (chaired by Anne Meade) advocated for major changes to ECE policy and administration.¹⁰²

1. A New Administrative Services Model
 - Charters would be developed in consultation with communities and include goals, curriculum objectives, staffing policy, staff development, parent education, rules for trustee elections and code of conduct, and accountability mechanisms.
 - Creation of a Ministry of Education with an Early Childhood Development Unit.
2. Funding changes including :
 - Bulk funding of ECE Services that provide a universal hourly rate of subsidy for centres and kindergartens;
 - Property loans for capital expenditure for kindergarten, playcentres, and nonprofit centres, to replace previous pre-school property building programme; and
 - Discretionary grants for capital expenditures for communities not able to fund development of ECE services.

Most of these recommendations were reflected in the *Before Five* report published four months later.¹⁰³ The success with which the Working Group could coordinate with the reforms of education at other levels was aided in no small part by having the Working Group's chair, Anne Meade, centrally placed in the Minister of Education's office. The Ministry of Education was created (this recommendation was shared across working groups)

¹⁰⁰ The emphasis in the *Before Five* report on Māori self determination reflected the growing recognition of the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi among early childhood advocates, as well as the broader New Zealand society. There had been some connection between early childhood and Māori rights expressed at the 1975 Early Childhood Convention. At the 1979 Convention renowned developmental psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner stayed at the Orakei Marae and Convention attendees were exposed to Māori practices. By 1983 Māori issues were at the forefront of discussion. The Convention was held at Turangawaewae Marae, Ngaruawahia. The Kōhanga Reo movement had recently begun. A logo, whakatauki, and a waiata were adopted (May, 2001). At the 1991 Early Childhood Convention, there was a concerted attempt to integrate Māori and Pacific Nations – Arapera Royal Tangaere and Teupoko Morgan, respectively, addressed population-specific needs. Helen May and Margaret Carr presented some initial perspective on national curriculum guidelines that included a belief that the Treaty of Waitangi necessitated the inclusion of a distinct Māori pedagogy that when combined with the needs of the Pasifika, home-based and special communities meant that there would need to be multiple curricula. Released in 1996 *Te Whāriki* was grounded in the rights of children and the rightful place of indigenous Māori knowledge.

¹⁰¹ In the late 1980s when the Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group reviewed early childhood education in New Zealand, it found that government subsidies heavily favoured kindergartens. In 1988/89 Free kindergartens received \$50 million of the approximately \$70 million in education funding but served only approximately 40 percent of the children participating in ECE. Childcare centres received approximately \$10 million but enrolled approximately 20 percent of children in ECE. Playcentres received \$3.2 and all other preschool agencies received \$1.5 million (the remainder was allocated to buildings and administration) (Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group, 1988). In addition, the Ministry of Education (then the Department of Education) provided 80 percent of kindergarten (and playcentre) construction costs (approximately five new centres were built each year). Community-based centres could apply for an establishment grant with the average amount being \$5,000. There were no funds to subsidise construction of for-profit childcare centres.

¹⁰² Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group (1988)

¹⁰³ Lange (1988)

and bulk funding established. The working group's recommendation for weighting funding levels to take into account such things as age, size, location, parental and staff involvement was not adopted. The adopted version included four funding rates with higher funding given to those services that met higher licensing standards with a 30 hour per week. The bulk funding rates provided a per capita amount for each child regardless of the auspice of the service. It was indeed one of the goals to equalise funding across childcare arrangements but segments of the advocacy community opposed for-profit centres receiving government funding at the same rate as community-based providers. The prior system favoured kindergartens; the government paid teacher salaries and provided professional development funds. Kindertartens also received government grants for administration, operations, and building maintenance.¹⁰⁴ Under bulk funding, initially, kindergarten teachers' salaries remained paid by the government but, in 1992 the National Government removed kindergarten teachers from the union. During most of the 1990s kindertartens received a bulk payment, similar to the rest of the sector, which meant that the teacher salaries were combined with all the other costs. Kindergarten teacher salaries were negotiated through kindergarten associations.

At the time the *Before Five* report was released, the Treasury Department was advocating market solutions for ECE, which clashed with the increased government investment and shifting regulation advocated in the report. In 1989 the Labour Government, against the advice of Treasury, introduced a three-year teacher education qualification for both kindergarten and childcare. Prior to this time it had been a two-year qualification. With this change, early childhood teachers had the same length of education requirements as primary teachers.

The *Before Five* report came at a time of heightened international interest in the importance of high quality early childhood education for improving educational and life outcomes. This research was highlighted at the 1987 New Zealand Early Childhood Convention with David Weikart's presentation of the US longitudinal Highscope Preschool Project. The study found that for every \$1 invested in quality early education there could be as high as a \$7 social return.¹⁰⁵

To implement the *Before Five* report, eight implementation working groups were created. Cabinet confirmed the structures for the reformed administrative system by May 1989. A major objective of the *Before Five* plan was to equalise funding between childcare centres and kindertartens. This was achieved in the 1989 Budget. It provided the same per child, per hour subsidy to centres and kindertartens, with an extra weighting for children under two years of age. The Department of Social Welfare continued to pay a means-tested fees subsidy to reduce costs to low-income families and/or those with high health/disability needs.

In the new administrative structure Te Kōhanga Reo were to be moved from the Department of Māori Affairs to the new Ministry of Education. Māori leaders voiced concern that the Ministry would not have the depth of understanding to effectively administer Kōhanga Reo and also that they would not be funded well:

There are fears that, with four major pre-school services and a host of smaller ones to feed, the Education Department cake is going to be sliced rather thin, and some services will end up with only a few crumbs.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ Mitchell (2001)

¹⁰⁵ Reynolds and Temple (2006)

¹⁰⁶ Tu Tangata (1986, p. 12) cited in Meade and Podmore (2002), p.21

In 1988 there was a review of Kōhanga Reo. The main finding was that “the administrative structure is appropriate for the moment, and is still developing in response to its needs. Financial and cultural accountability arrangements are satisfactory”.¹⁰⁷ By April 1989 the funding models and levels for implementing *Before Five* policies were being finalised. “Officials from a range of relevant departments” recommended to Cabinet that bulk grants be given to the Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust for allocation.¹⁰⁸

The *Before Five* reforms had a five-year staged funding package implementation. Substantive funding increases for children under two were planned during the first three years. May notes that this aspect of New Zealand’s integrated early childhood policy was associated with international attention and acclaim.¹⁰⁹

The 1990s Political Environment

The 1990 election brought in a National Government. Under Prime Minister Jim Bolger, the National government announced the Economic and Social Initiative. Based on principles of fairness (i.e. targeted programmes), self reliance, efficiency, and greater personal choice, the new initiative had far-ranging impacts on ECE policy.¹¹⁰ Helen May describes the shift in early childhood politics from one of an equity gaze to an economic one.¹¹¹ Under the equity gaze, ECE provided a chance to be equal by supporting the rights of women, children, and minority groups. Under the economic gaze, the frame shifted to ECE quality. The new logic, which was shared in the US as well as New Zealand,¹¹² is based on the research linking high quality ECE to improved outcomes. Through this gaze, ECE provides foundational skills that are essential to the success of a knowledge-based economy. If children do not attend ECE then they are ‘at-risk’ for future academic failure.

In 1991 the National Government halted the implementation of the *Before Five* staged plan intended to create an equitable funding formula across the early childhood sector and also the planned increase in funding. The National Government favoured increased targeted funding and a new Parents as First Teachers programme.¹¹³ The *Before Five* bulk funding plan was a five-year staged increase in the hourly funding rates. Initially set at \$2.25 per hour for children over two (for up to 30 hours per week) and \$7.25 per hour for children under two, in the 1991 budget the National Government reversed course and cut the funding for under twos to \$4.50 per hour. Other decisions were made that reduced the staff to child ratios required for chartered centres and required ratios in mixed-age centres,¹¹⁴ and reversed the quality conditions for receipt of bulk funding.¹¹⁵ The government halted the funding of the kindergarten staffing, removed regulation preventing kindergartens from charging fees, and conducted three reviews targeted to early childhood education funding, staffing and properties.¹¹⁶ As the *Before Five* plan unravelled, it was a crushing blow to all who had worked to create the momentum for policy change.¹¹⁷

¹⁰⁷ Government Review Team (1988), p.47

¹⁰⁸ Meade and Podmore (2002), p.22

¹⁰⁹ May (2001)

¹¹⁰ Wells (1998)

¹¹¹ May (2001), (2002)

¹¹² see Bushouse (forthcoming 2009)

¹¹³ Meade and Dalli (1992)

¹¹⁴ Mitchell (2001)

¹¹⁵ Meade (1994)

¹¹⁶ Early Childhood Education Project (2000), p. 14

¹¹⁷ Anne Meade, personal communication, (20 May 2008)

The 1990s also brought changes for both childcare workers and kindergarten teachers. In 1991 the Employment Contracts Act became law and changed the union participation of early childhood workers and employers.¹¹⁸ The New Zealand National Childcare Award was a blanket coverage award providing minimum rates of pay for childcare workers, but the award expired a few months after the Employment Contract Act took effect. The result was that the award coverage went from 1500 childcare workers and 350 employers, to 50 workers and 8 employers.¹¹⁹ Because of this change, teachers employed by centres not part of the Consenting Parties (CP) agreement now had to negotiate directly for individual or site-based contracts with their employers. There was no protection of childcare workers from employers outside the CP that refused to pay above the minimum wage. Later in 1997, kindergarten teachers were removed from the State Sector Act thereby decentralising teacher pay negotiations to the kindergarten associations.¹²⁰

The Rise of Future Directions

Frustration with the policy changes, as well as lingering opposition to bulk funding, led to the creation of the Early Childhood Education Project. Initiated by Linda Mitchell and Clare Wells of the NZEI, membership included representatives from NZEI, Pacific Islands Early Childhood Council Aotearoa, Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, New Zealand Free Kindergarten Association, New Zealand Playcentre Federation, New Zealand Family Day Care Association, and Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa – New Zealand Childcare Association (NZCA). The project team began meeting in April 1995 and through a consultative process among the organisations represented on the team, published *Future Directions* in 1996. The report states, “The approach enabled the project team to develop proposals that build on existing arrangements while discarding unsatisfactory policies”.¹²¹

One of the Project’s concerns was the lack of accountability mechanisms for ensuring that bulk funding was spent in ways that improve quality. Specifically, the concern centred on private owners who could use government funding for the improvement of their own assets, rather than improving quality of ECE. “Private providers are required only to prepare audited financial statements showing the contribution that government money has made to their operations. Private providers do not have to report income from parent fees or other income sources or how those are spent”.¹²² The Project also noted that private providers had no requirement to involve parents and caregivers as decision-makers on management, whereas community-based services had that requirement. The theme throughout the *Future Directions* report is that the market should not be the mechanism guiding the early childhood education sector, but rather the government should take a leading role to assure safe, culturally appropriate, and high quality services.

The main aims of the *Future Directions* report were to align early childhood policies so that they improved quality and access, and for the early childhood education sector to be treated on an equitable basis with the schools sector.¹²³ The proposed funding formula would provide a base rate for staffing, operations, and volunteers with equity funding for Māori immersion,

¹¹⁸ In May 1990, prior to the election, the Early Childcare Workers Union and the Kindergarten Teachers’ Association amalgamated to form the Combined Early Childhood Union of Aotearoa (CECUA). Through the formation of CECUA it provided greater opportunity for combined political organising but kindergarten teacher salaries were still negotiated separately from childcare workers. In 1994 CECUA merged with the New Zealand Educational Institute Te Tiu Roa, the primary teachers union.

¹¹⁹ Mitchell (2001), p. 12

¹²⁰ May (2001), p. 228

¹²¹ Early Childhood Education Project (2000), p.1

¹²² *ibid.* p. 3

¹²³ *ibid.* p. 51

Pacific Islands immersion, special needs of communities, remoteness, and special needs child education. To be eligible for funding, the Project recommended a formal requirement to include parents/whānau as democratically elected representatives on management committees.

The NZCA raised a dissenting voice to some of the Project's recommendations because of the negative impacts on for-profit providers, as would be expected from a membership organisation that includes for-profit and community-based ECE services. The NZEI, as well as some kindergarten teachers, supported replacing bulk funding with direct funding of teachers' salaries; however, this view was not shared across the Project team and was left out of the final recommendation. The final report also did not include a recommendation to phase out the Department of Social Welfare means-tested subsidy programme because of competing views. One view was that the subsidy should be phased out as the universal funding of ECE was implemented. NZCA's position was that as long as fees can be charged, the subsidy should be available to assist parents/caregivers who are in training and/or paid work. Others opposed the elimination of the means-tested subsidy for other reasons.¹²⁴

The report included cost estimates for implementing the recommendations. The final recommendation included a three-stage implementation with:

- An immediate 12.5 percent increase (to cover increases in the Consumer Price Index from 1990 to 1996);
- Hourly rate increases; and
- A funding formula to cover full costs of meeting quality criteria.¹²⁵

There was no explicit mention of free early childhood education for three and four-year-olds but the concept of universal funding that met the costs of quality provision was the message that provided the ideological basis necessary for the creation of the 20 Hours Free Programme.¹²⁶

The *Future Directions* report was launched at Parliament on 23 September 1996, one month before the election. It was met with little enthusiasm by the Minister of Education Bill English who stated that the report, "ignored all the positive developments in the sector for children and their parents."¹²⁷ The Leader of the Opposition, the Right Honourable Helen Clark, congratulated the Early Childhood Education Project team stating:

This is far and away the best summary of the issues at stake since 'Before Five' was launched in 1989. What makes the report highly credible is that the project team itself was broadly based, and there was very extensive consultation throughout the sector. You have identified the problems and mapped a pathway through them.¹²⁸

The group worked to promote the report with a two part strategy. The first step was to encourage early childhood education organisations to adopt the report. The report was presented at the Ministry of Education Early Childhood Advisory Council. Second, the NZEI led a campaign to influence government policy. After the 1996 election and formation of a

¹²⁴ Early Childhood Education Project (2000)

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Linda Mitchell, personal communication (5 May 2008)

¹²⁷ Wells (1998), p. 52

¹²⁸ Clark (1996)

new National coalition government,¹²⁹ the report was sent to all members of parliament. The NZEI launched a campaign in early 1997 aimed at influencing government to increase funding rates to early childhood services. To achieve this they devised a “10 Day Plan” for lobbying that included a petition, and a national day of action (1 May 1997). The over 14,000 signatures on the petition called on the government to adopt the *Future Directions* recommendations. People signing the petition were encouraged to deliver the completed petition to their local Member of Parliament who in turn was obliged to present it and read it in full to Parliament.¹³⁰ In response to the lobbying, hearings were held around the country by the Education and Science Select Committee.¹³¹ According to Clare Wells, a main organiser of the lobby group, the Minister of Education’s testimony to the Select Committee focused on the absence of the Early Childhood Council and therefore private providers from the *Future Directions* report.¹³² The National Party favoured market-based approaches to early childhood education, which was the opposite of the NZEI-led position of increasing government’s role in the early childhood sector. Despite these differences, the 2000 edition of the *Future Directions* report notes that a broader level of consultation characterised the Ministry of Education’s policy development after the 1996 election and some gains were made in funding rates and the discretionary grants scheme. However while there was greater consultation with the sector, the recommendations in the report were largely unaddressed.¹³³

As the 1999 election drew near Linda Mitchell, who was the senior research officer of the *Future Directions* report, called for a ‘new debate about childhood’, in which: “Early childhood institutions [would] be conceptualised as community institutions playing an important role in fostering a democratic society.”¹³⁴ The focus on children’s rights was echoed by others particularly those concerned about poverty. The emphasis on ‘community institutions’ would eventually find its expression in the announcement of the 20 Hours Free Programme. By June 2000 the incoming Labour-Alliance coalition government “had announced a series of initiatives which are an adoption of critical recommendations of *Future Directions*”.¹³⁵

¹²⁹ For most of the 20th century, New Zealand’s MPs were elected through a First Past the Post (FPP) system. In 1993 New Zealand adopted the Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) representation electoral system. With the MMP system, voters cast two votes; one for their district preference and one for the party list. The impact of the electoral system change was that it created an incentive for new parties to form. With the FPP system, there were two dominant parties (Labour and National) with smaller parties on the periphery. After MMP, the number of parties on the ballot increased to eight including New Zealand First, Green Party, Māori Party, United Future, Act New Zealand, and Progressive. Adoption of MMP has also led to greater diversity in MP representation. For example, the 2005 election brought in 39 women, 21 Māori, four Pacific Islanders, and two Asian MPs (of 121 total MPs). In the first election using MMP in 1996, the National Party and New Zealand First, former adversaries, entered into a coalition to form a government. But the coalition collapsed and in 1999 Labour formed a coalition government and proceeded to win the 2002 and 2005 elections. The impact of MMP on the work of the Ministries is that there is a delay between the election and the formation of a governing coalition. During this time, ministries are caught betwixt and between waiting for the new government’s policy directions. In the 2005 election, the “lost” time as the coalition was formed was critical time for implementation planning of the 20 Hours Free Programme.

¹³⁰ Wells (1998)

¹³¹ Meetings were held in Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Christchurch, Dunedin and Wellington

¹³² Wells (1998)

¹³³ In 1998 the NZEI also launched a campaign for pay parity titled, ‘One Teaching Profession: One Teaching Pay Scale’. That activism was rewarded in the following decade when pay parity for kindergarten teachers was achieved.

¹³⁴ Mitchell (1999), p.1

¹³⁵ Early Childhood Education Project (2000), p. 67

3 THE DREAM REVISITED: ECE RISES ON THE AGENDA

When the Labour-Alliance coalition government came into power in 1999, Prime Minister Helen Clark selected Trevor Mallard, Labour Party MP from Hutt South (near Wellington), to become the Minister of Education. With a diploma in teaching and a long history of involvement in education, he came to the Ministry with a strong commitment to ECE: “I have had the view for a long time the best investment a country can make is in its early childhood education system.”¹³⁶ Mr Mallard came to the Ministry with a great deal of experience, having been first elected in 1972, and having held ministerial posts in Environment, Labour, Broadcasting, State Owned Enterprises, State Services, Industry and Regional Development, among other posts. As Associate Minister of Finance, Minister Mallard learned how the financing of government worked, which became particularly useful when he proposed the 20 Hours Free Programme.

Mr Mallard made early childhood education a central part of his agenda at the Ministry of Education. In his first keynote address (to the New Zealand Principals’ Federation) after becoming Minister, he raised ECE as the key investment to closing the social and economic gaps between Māori and Pasifika and other New Zealanders.¹³⁷ He retained ECE under his direct authority rather than appointing an Associate Minister to have responsibility for it, which sent a strong signal of ECE’s importance. As expected, ECE received tremendous attention in his first year with many policy changes and additional funding. One of his first acts was to announce in March 2000 that the Employee Relations Bill included a clause to include kindergarten teachers in the State Sector Act. Including kindergarten teachers in the NZEI provided, once again, collective bargaining rights that had been removed in 1996. Mallard stated: “By taking responsibility for the terms under which they are employed, the Government is taking leadership for setting benchmarks for standards”.¹³⁸ Second, standards for teacher education were raised to require a Diploma of Teaching in ECE, a three year degree, for all teachers and coordinators of home-based education and care services (Playcentre and Kōhanga Reo were excluded). Existing staff in ECE had until January 2005 to upgrade their qualifications but 90 percent of the services already had at least one staff member with the Diploma.¹³⁹ A challenge in raising the standards was to increase the number of qualified Māori and Pasifika teachers. Nearly half of the Pacific services did not have a teacher with an ECE teaching qualification.¹⁴⁰ To assist the transition, a new scholarship program, Teach NZ, was created to assist Māori and Pasifika students to become qualified ECE teachers.¹⁴¹

In April an additional \$3+ million in Discretionary Grants were provided to improve and construct ECE buildings (thus allowing the services to become licensed and eligible for additional government funding).¹⁴² The funds ultimately assisted 38 centres, including nine Pasifika centres that had been denied funding the previous year.¹⁴³ To expand the number of centres, there was also a policy created to include space for new ECE centres when the MOE purchased land for new school sites.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁶ Trevor Mallard, personal communication (17 April 2008)

¹³⁷ Mallard (18 February 2000)

¹³⁸ Mallard (13 March 2000)

¹³⁹ Mallard (24 April 2000)

¹⁴⁰ Mallard (26 September 2000)

¹⁴¹ Mallard (30 November 2000)

¹⁴² Mallard (27 April 2000)

¹⁴³ Mallard (1 June 2000)

¹⁴⁴ Mallard (13 October 2000)

The same April announcement included \$150,000 to be spent over the next two years to develop an ECE strategic plan and \$60,000 for a working party to develop criteria and costing scenarios for equity funding for the early childhood sector.¹⁴⁵ Both of these actions stem directly from the *Future Directions* report. The funding for the strategic plan proved to be critically important for mapping out ECE policy changes in the years that followed (discussed fully below).

In May the Minister announced \$400,000 to create the Education Council (renamed the Teachers Council), a new professional body for teachers with jurisdiction over compulsory school and early childhood education sectors.¹⁴⁶ Established by the Education Standards Act of 2001, this body registers teachers, provides professional leadership, determines standards for teacher registration and certificates, and determines and maintains standards for the qualifications that lead to teacher registration. The Teachers Council's governance structure consists of 11 Council Members, supported by a director and staff. Four Council Members are elected by teachers; three are nominated by the New Zealand Educational Institute (teachers' union representing primary teachers and ECE teachers), the Post Primary Teachers Association (union representing mainly secondary teachers) and the School Trustees Association (and confirmed by the Ministry of Education); and four, including the Chair, are appointed by the Minister of Education.

In June, Mr Mallard announced an extra \$13 million for Pasifika-specific initiatives, most of which was targeted toward increasing participation in ECE. The new funding for ECE included a \$7.25 million increase in the Pasifika pool of the Discretionary Grants scheme for capital investment (i.e. new buildings), \$3,584 for Pasifika teacher supply initiatives, \$2 million for Pasifika language materials, and \$340,000 for licensing support for ECE services.¹⁴⁷

At the end of the year, the Minister announced a new government policy to increase participation in ECE by Māori, Pasifika, low-socio-economic, and other underrepresented groups.¹⁴⁸ The Promoting ECE Participation Project aimed to get 3,500 more children annually into ECE by contracting with nongovernmental organisations within these communities to develop local solutions for increasing ECE participation. The volume of releases published in the Minister's first year attest to his commitment to early childhood education.

The Strategic Plan

In August the Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan working group began preparation of a report on early childhood education strategic goals and a framework for early childhood education policy. The plan's chief aims were to:

- Improve quality and access to early childhood education for all New Zealand children;
- Identify and take into account relationships between government policy in early childhood education and other government policy goals, particularly those in labour market, health, welfare and Closing the Gaps policies; and
- Give stability to the sector as to the future direction of early childhood education in New Zealand.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ Mallard (27 April 2000)

¹⁴⁶ Mallard (30 May 2000)

¹⁴⁷ Mallard (28 June 2000)

¹⁴⁸ Mallard (20 December 2000)

¹⁴⁹ Mallard (23 August 2000)

Dr Anne Meade, who had previously chaired the working group that developed the *Before Five* plan, chaired the 28-member working group. The working group developed a consultation document and circulated it throughout the country in November 2000. Meetings were held in rural and urban areas, with several specific for Māori and Pasifika. The 390 written responses from individuals and groups were generally positive and constructive.¹⁵⁰ In June the Minister of Education established a small technical planning group to take the working group's report and develop a staged strategic plan. Along with Anne Meade, seven members of the working group worked alongside government officials and an independent facilitator on the technical planning group. This led to the publication of a second consultation document. Whereas the first was open-ended, the second was far more developed. The document had two broad aims: to improve access to, participation in and quality in ECE; and to reduce disparities in participation rates between Māori and Pasifika children as compared to non-Māori and non-Pasifika children.¹⁵¹

To achieve the aims, the document described four major directions with success benchmarks:

1. Participation, access

- Strategies to address disparities in participation rates, access to services both because of inability to pay or unavailability of services.

2. Quality early childhood services

- Essential aspects of quality included both process (e.g. guided participation of children, time for child to explore and reflect) and structural dimensions (e.g. ratios, group size, etc.).

3. Sustainable early childhood services

- Funding: The report stated that funding increases had not matched rising costs, thereby affecting both service viability and affordability for families. It also raised the issue that the discretionary grants scheme (in which the government built new centres for ECE services) may not be targeted to areas most in need, and that the childcare subsidy was an administrative burden. The success benchmark would be when a transparent, equitable funding system was responsive to the diverse needs of EC services.
- Support: The report stated that there was no consistent infrastructure for supporting ECE services, which led to problems of low quality and viability problems. Success benchmarks included easy-to-access, coherent and coordinated support services for practitioners, managers, and those in governance roles.
- Planning: The report was critical of a market-based approach because it leads to patchy provision with oversupply in some areas and undersupply in others. Success benchmarks would be the alignment of funding levels, models and arrangements to achieve the vision and Government objectives for ECE (described above).

4. Collaborative relationships

- The report identified missing links between ECE services and the compulsory education sector. Successful benchmarks required coordinated knowledge and action to meet diverse needs effectively, creating and strengthening communities of learning,

¹⁵⁰ Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (n.d.)

¹⁵¹ Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (September 2001)

and streamlined requirements in Government agencies to provide coordinated and consistent advice and support to ECE services.¹⁵²

The report provided the what, why, and process for achieving each of the four major directions. The working group presented the main points of the consultation document, pointing out thematic shifts in what was proposed, and engaging in question and answer sessions. Dr Anne Meade participated in 30 meetings in 14 towns and cities. Members of the wider working group and or technical planning group attended meetings in their locations. Those face-to-face meetings included five hui for Māori attended by approximately 150 people, and three Pasifika fono attended by approximately 120 people. Cumulatively there were 33 meetings held, which involved over 1,500 people. The Ministry of Education arranged additional fono in three cities with members of the Pacific caucus leading discussions. The request for written responses included space for responding to each of the four main directions. Analysis of the 948 written responses revealed that “The overall tone was one of support for the proposed strategic plan”.¹⁵³ The meetings revealed that the top priority for implementing the plan should be the teacher supply issue. In the report released by the Ministry of Education in October 2001, *Pathways to the Future: Nga Hurarahi Arataki*, the strategies were reordered but remained virtually the same.¹⁵⁴ The main addition was a section on implementation of the strategies, which reflected the preferences conveyed through consultation.

During the development of the strategic plan the working group tried to include a universal entitlement to free, high quality ECE.¹⁵⁵ The Minister's first response was that this was “blue skies” thinking and that the working group needed to go back and work out fiscally responsible policy options.¹⁵⁶ The Ministry of Education removed any reference to the idea of free early childhood education; however, the plan did include a review of early childhood funding in the final version.

Implementation of Policy Changes

In 2002 several of the new policy changes were implemented. From 1 January all new persons responsible at a centre were required to hold a Diploma of Teaching in ECE. To increase the supply of teachers, new scholarships were available for Māori and Pasifika to pursue Diplomas of Teaching in ECE. The Promoting Participation in ECE programme was underway; in Auckland, Waikato, Wellington, and Canterbury organisations were working with communities to overcome barriers to ECE participation.¹⁵⁷ The New Zealand Teachers' Council had been created.¹⁵⁸ The equity funding system was implemented and budgeted to deliver an extra \$30 million over the following four years to eligible community-based services.¹⁵⁹ The Minister, with reference to the work of a Pay Parity Working Group, stated: “I look forward to the phasing in of pay parity from 1 July 2002 as part of the next Kindergarten Teachers Collective Agreement.”¹⁶⁰ That promise, however, took several more years to be realised. To assist with the additional costs that ECE services would incur, additional funding for rate two centres, which employ higher numbers of qualified staff, was

¹⁵² *ibid.*

¹⁵³ Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (September 2001)

¹⁵⁴ Carter (2007)

¹⁵⁵ Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group October (2001)

¹⁵⁶ Helen May, personal communication (5 May 2008)

¹⁵⁷ Mallard (14 March 2002)

¹⁵⁸ Mallard (19 February 2002)

¹⁵⁹ Mallard (14 March 2002)

¹⁶⁰ Mallard (14 March 2002)

provided. Most importantly the 2002 budget included \$775,000 to undertake a comprehensive review of the regulatory and funding systems for ECE.¹⁶¹

¹⁶¹ Mallard (29 April 2002)

4 POLITICAL GAZE SETTLES ON 20 HOURS FREE

While the strategic plan did not include free ECE, the Minister of Education supported universal ECE: “Early childhood is a time to ensure that opportunity is given to all by having a universal, quality ECE”.¹⁶² He also said that when the strategic plan was being developed the time was not yet right; however, documents released through the Official Information Act indicate that by 2003 Ministry of Education staff had started to cost out options for providing free ECE.¹⁶³ Utilising annual (S61) data for each service and taking into account increased costs due to the implementation of the strategic plan (adult-child ratio changes, flow-on effects of kindergarten parity and registered teacher pay increases), Ministry staff calculated the total cost per hour at each service type for the under two and over two age categories.¹⁶⁴ The Treasury’s response to the costing was that the MOE had underestimated the cost of free ECE,¹⁶⁵ and advised a targeted approach. After consulting with the Ministry of Social Development, which also supported a targeted approach, a paper was developed for Cabinet to propose an increase in ECE subsidies within the 30 hour per week cap, and the creation of 20 hours per week of free ECE for three- and four-year-olds in community-based services.¹⁶⁶

Ministry of Education documents indicate discussion regarding the exclusion of private, for-profit organisations from participation in Free ECE. One sector advisor who commented on the draft consultation document stated that: “private services will oppose the proposal on the ground that it would reduce choice for parents and discriminate against children in private services.”¹⁶⁷ Another commented that: “free ECE should be available in corporate ECE services, including privately-owned services.”¹⁶⁸ Ministry staff also advised Minister Mallard that limiting provision to community-based providers would limit the supply of services and therefore not meet the demand for Free ECE.¹⁶⁹ The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Ministry of Social Development also raised this concern. However, the Minister had a strong commitment to community-based ECE and believed that community-based services would be able to increase supply over time.¹⁷⁰ In the consultation document itself the justification was that “community-based ECE services belong to their communities and are governed by the communities. This proposal recognises and supports that role”.¹⁷¹

A second issue related to the exclusion of private, for-profit services, was the potential impact on government goals for labour force participation, parental choice, and the cost-drivers approach to funding. Treasury, Ministry of Social Development, Labour Market Policy Group, and the Ministry of Women’s Affairs commented that these goals may be compromised by lower funding for private services compared to community-based services, especially if it leads private services to close.¹⁷² The Labour Market Policy Group noted that the increased cost for ECE greater than 30 hours combined with the 20 hours of free ECE may encourage part-time labour market participation.¹⁷³ The Ministry of Education responded that the proposal would increase labour force participation, especially when combined with other

¹⁶² Trevor Mallard, personal communication (17 April 2008)

¹⁶³ Ministry of Education (29 May 2003)

¹⁶⁴ Ministry of Education (30 July 2003)

¹⁶⁵ Treasury (3 October 2003)

¹⁶⁶ Ministry of Education (18 November 2003)

¹⁶⁷ Name withheld by Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), p. 2

¹⁶⁸ Name withheld by Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), p. 2

¹⁶⁹ Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), section 7c

¹⁷⁰ Trevor Mallard, personal communication (17 April 2008)

¹⁷¹ Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), p. 11

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, section 7d-f

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, section f

proposals for childcare assistance.¹⁷⁴ The final Cabinet and Consultation paper was submitted in February 2004 but withdrawn by the Minister¹⁷⁵ The proposal would have typically been considered by the Cabinet Social Development Committee but it was moved to the Cabinet Policy Committee.

Minutes of the Cabinet Policy Committee indicate that it instructed the Ministers of Education and Social Development and Employment to submit a paper addressing, among other issues, “how private providers of ECE are likely to be affected by the 20 hours of free ECE to be made available to community-based teacher-led ECE services” and the extent the ECE funding policy (combined with other policies) would increase labour force participation.¹⁷⁶ The response from the ministers was that exclusion of private services could potentially reduce their market share but that no private ECE service would be worse off for each funded child hour under the ECE proposals; however, the paper included options to extend Free ECE to private providers.¹⁷⁷ The response related to the impact of ECE proposals on labour force participation was to point out the strong interrelationship between quality ECE and labour market participation and to identify options to extend the focus on labour market participation (i.e., extending the hours, increasing subsidy rates, among others).¹⁷⁸

Ultimately these discussions resulted in the 2004 budget including major new funding for ECE and significant changes to the way the government funded ECE services.¹⁷⁹ The budget included \$307 million of new funding over four years to improve accessibility and affordability to families. Part of the funding was to be used to improve teacher qualifications and raise adult to child ratios. Under the new system ECE services receive higher funding rates if they have qualified teachers and some funds were allocated to assist teachers in gaining qualification. A guide to funding changes was published in June 2004 and the changes related to teacher quality were implemented in April 2005 (see Appendix B for funding review information). The budget also provided a new top-up system for small rural ECE services to assist in maintaining access to quality ECE in rural areas. The new system provides supplemental funding so that isolated ECE services have a guaranteed minimum level of funding. The most ambitious aspect of the budget was the announcement that from 2007 all three- and four-year-olds would be eligible for up to 20 hours free ECE each week in community-based, teacher-led services.

Reactions to 20 Hours Free

Some representatives from the ECE sector had been consulted during the initial development, at the Minister’s request, but the consultation paper was never released to the public. Therefore, when the 2004 budget was announced it took many in the sector by surprise. The NZCA publicly supported the new programme. With a membership heavily weighted by organisations with qualified teachers and with a philosophical perspective that qualified teachers are important, Free ECE was viewed as a positive new policy that would increase parental choice by removing cost barriers to participation.¹⁸⁰ However the teacher-led requirement was not greeted by enthusiasm from parent and whānau-led ECE services. Similarly, private providers did not take too kindly to being exempted from participating in 20 Hours Free. These two exclusions created challenges both politically and for sector relations.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., section f

¹⁷⁵ Cabinet Social Development Committee (11 February 2004)

¹⁷⁶ Cabinet Policy Committee (24 March 2004), p. 1

¹⁷⁷ Ministry of Education (30 March 2004), section 6

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., sections 3 and 7

¹⁷⁹ On 5 April 2004 Cabinet agreed to a new ECE funding system for 20 hours of free ECE for three- and four-year-olds in community-based ECE services (CAB min (04) 11/4A).

¹⁸⁰ Nancy Bell, personal communication (16 May 2008)

Teacher-led Requirement

The teacher-led requirement meant that licence-exempt playgroups, Playcentres, Kōhanga Reo and parent/whānau-led education services would not be permitted to participate. The 2003 draft version of the sector consultation document (that was never released to the sector) does not provide a clear rationale for the teacher-led requirement but rather states: “This approach recognises that families contribute to these ECE services by giving their time to educate their children, so the services are not ‘free’ to families” and then hints at increased funding to these types of providers.¹⁸¹ The decision to limit participation in Free is a logical extension of adopting a cost-driver approach. If there are no labour costs incurred beyond voluntary labour, then it is not a cost-driver of provision and therefore cost is not a barrier to participation of children in these types of services. The implications for the different types of services were clearly outlined in the consultation document. For Te Kōhanga Reo the dividing line would be between kaiako/whānau-led and whānau-led, with the latter not able to participate in the Free ECE Programme. The consultation document presents Kōhanga Reo participation in Free ECE as a choice but the reality is that if a Kōhanga Reo wanted to participate in Free then it has to be led by a qualified kaiako.¹⁸² The Ministry clearly articulated that playcentres would not be eligible.¹⁸³ Whereas in the past there were funding differences among the different types of services, the 20 Hours Free Programme created a sharper division.

The reaction to Free ECE from Kōhanga Reo was anger, partly because they had not been consulted prior to the announcement of the programme. While the Trust supports improving qualifications, the 20 Hours Free Programme created hierarchy. Māori culture is group oriented and the Kōhanga Reo approach draws on parents, whānau and kaiako (when employed) to collectively provide for the children. To the Trust, the 20 Hours Free Programme represented reductionist thinking that cut deeply against the grain of the underpinnings of Māori practice. The response from Arapera Royal Tangaere, someone who had been integrally involved in the movement since 1982, was that they had lost 15 years of hard early childhood work with Free ECE because it introduced hierarchy between kaiako and parents and whānau.¹⁸⁴ This concern about hierarchy was initially felt with the implementation of the new funding system in 2005 because funding rates increased for teacher-led services. Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust prefers an ‘incentives to improve quality’ funding system that recognizes the many contributing factors to quality including:

- High quality te reo Māori;
- Presence of kaumatua (elders fluent in te reo Māori and cultural values);
- Participation of all parents/whānau in the management of the kōhanga;
- Qualified (Tohu Whakapakari) kaiako who are fluent/competent in te reo;
- Whānau-based learning whether for a qualification or professional development (for parents and employed staff);
- Financial and kaupapa accountability;
- A well run mokopuna learning programme through Te Whāriki a Kōhanga.¹⁸⁵

A similar concern about equating teacher-led with quality was voiced by members of the Playcentre Federation. In a letter to the Minister of Education, one member stated: “The implication of this [20 Hours Free Programme] decision is that Playcentre does not provide

¹⁸¹ Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), p. 11

¹⁸² The kaiako can be in their final year of Whakapakari Tohu.

¹⁸³ Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), p.11

¹⁸⁴ Arapera Royal Tangaere, personal communication (11 June 2008)

¹⁸⁵ Arapera Royal Tangaere, personal communication (13 June 2008)

quality ECE, because it is not a teacher-led service”.¹⁸⁶ The writer goes on to note the previous research on the quality in playcentres, and raises the issue that having a Diploma of Teaching in ECE is not the only pathway to quality ECE. This issue had been raised previously by the Early Childhood Council, when the three-year Diploma of Teaching was made a requirement.¹⁸⁷ Playcentre requested that their centres be allowed to participate in Free ECE and “receive sufficient funding for 3 and 4 year-olds to allow centres to cover normal costs of operation, including administrative and support functions, so that parents can focus more on educating their children rather than meeting Ministry requirements”.¹⁸⁸ These concerns were reiterated by Marion Pilkington, current president of the New Zealand Playcentre Federation.¹⁸⁹

The main goal of Free ECE was to increase participation and the policy tool was to provide funding to cover the costs that drive fees for ECE. The biggest cost in ECE is labour and therefore the dividing line was between services that have paid teachers and those that rely on volunteer labour. Because Playcentres and Kōhanga Reo are led by unpaid volunteers, they do not incur labour as a significant cost to provide ECE. But the link between paid teachers and volunteer labour is entwined with quality improvements in the strategic plan. The cost driver approach was linked with quality improvements. With that linkage, services with higher proportions of qualified teachers get higher funding rates. The higher government funding for services with qualified teachers is easily perceived to be a statement by government that teacher-led is higher quality than parent/whānau-led and that is an issue that has yet to be resolved.

Community-based Limitation

When the Free ECE Programme was announced in the 2004 Budget, the exclusion of private services from participation in Free ECE set off mobilisation. Both the NZCA and the Early Childhood Council are membership organisations representing community-based and private childcare centres; however, as noted above, the NZCA welcomed the proposal whereas the ECC opposed it. The ECC began a campaign against the 20 Hours Free Programme. Media releases blasted the Minister for the exclusion of private services. “This move represents the triumph of ideology over the public interest. Any institution delivering quality education is working for the national good and so is providing a public service, regardless of its ownership structure”.¹⁹⁰ Sue Thorne, Chief Executive Officer, stated: “It’s not the centres that miss out when funding policies discriminate, it’s children and their families who miss out”.¹⁹¹ With nearly one-third of all enrolments at privately owned centres, private providers had become a large segment of the sector and therefore had the potential to unleash a backlash from affected providers and parents with children in private centres.

The Minister had a strong commitment to community-based provision of early childhood education which he maintains. Had the limitation remained, he believes the community-based services would have expanded over time to meet the demand.¹⁹² The NZEI, as well as influential former NZEI employees and union members, strongly supported the exclusion of private providers on the grounds that profit should not play a role in the delivery of early childhood education. However, as the 2005 election drew near, pressure mounted for the Labour-led government to expand Free ECE to include private providers. Despite the

¹⁸⁶ Name withheld by Ministry of Education (2006)

¹⁸⁷ Sue Thorne, personal communication (12 May 2008)

¹⁸⁸ Name withheld, Ministry of Education (2006)

¹⁸⁹ Marion Pilkington, telephone communication (27 May 2008)

¹⁹⁰ LaRocque quoted in ECC media release (27 May 2004)

¹⁹¹ Sue Thorne quoted in ECC media release (14 November 2004)

¹⁹² Trevor Mallard, personal communication (17 April 2008)

Minister's commitment to limiting Free to community-based providers, the position became politically untenable. The Labour Party manifesto shifted the eligibility for 20 Hours Free to include all teacher-led services; thereby, ending the limitation on participation by private ECE services.¹⁹³

Views on the expansion to private-led ran the gamut from praising the Prime Minister's political acumen to decrying Trevor Mallard's "roll" on the issue. Advocates for limiting Free ECE to community-based services were not sympathetic to the political constraints of the 2005 election. For those advocates who wanted to end or curtail the private provision of ECE, this was not only a setback but actually had the potential to achieve the opposite goal by creating a government incentive for expansion of private provision. This concern was heightened with the timing of Australian Macquarie Bank's purchase of 20 New Zealand centres.¹⁹⁴ Newspaper coverage (published after the election) highlighted KidiCorp's shift in business strategy from buying up centres to building purpose-built new centres in "strategic sites likely to earn a profit."¹⁹⁵ Chief Executive Wayne Wright was quoted as saying: "There's plenty of opportunity for growth in the childcare market".¹⁹⁶ The blatant role of profit as a motivator was antithetical to a large portion of the ECE policy community, especially the NZEI.

For the ECC, it was "pleased" that Labour expanded the 20 Hours Free programme to private services but it supported National's policy of tax rebates and increased targeted funding saying: "We believe this replacement policy gives parents three times more in dollar terms and delivers it 12 months earlier than the discriminatory 20 free hours".¹⁹⁷ National offered a tax deduction to working parents for childcare (33 percent of out-of-pocket costs up to \$5,000 per child) in services and license-exempt arrangements (e.g. nannies, home-based).¹⁹⁸ The ECC was joined by the Child Forum in favouring National's policies over Labour's. Essentially a one-person organisation that has surprising traction in the New Zealand early childhood policy community, Child Forum released an online critique of both parties criticising the 20 Hours Free Programme because it placed government in the position to make decisions about care of children rather than parents. Child Forum concluded that the National Party's tax rebate plan was preferable because it gave parents the power to decide the best arrangements for children.¹⁹⁹

Other ECE Issues in the 2005 Election

In addition to the controversy over Free ECE, the impacts of the strategic plan were being felt. The new funding model differentiated rates based on teacher qualifications as a means of linking quality to higher funding levels (see Appendix B). The phase-in of teacher registration had commenced. This too created turmoil within the sector because private childcare owners, articulated through the Early Childhood Council, challenged the connection between qualifications and quality for all age groups.²⁰⁰ But this was a position long fought for by professional, academic, and union early childhood advocates. The issue of extending pay parity across the teaching sector, rather than only for kindergarten teachers, had been actively discussed. Pay levels had been a long standing sore spot between the unions and the private childcare providers. In March 2005 the Ministry of Education dismayed activists advocating

¹⁹³ Labour Party of New Zealand (n.d.)

¹⁹⁴ Quirke (2005)

¹⁹⁵ Sheeran (2005)

¹⁹⁶ Sheeran (2005)

¹⁹⁷ ECC media release (7 July 2005)

¹⁹⁸ Party Vote National (2005)

¹⁹⁹ Farquhar (2005)

²⁰⁰ Sue Thorne, personal communication (12 May 2007)

for pay parity by releasing Circular 2005/5 that allowed services to access the higher funding levels if they met entry level pay rates, but did not require employers to pay salaries on a path toward pay parity by 2008.²⁰¹ However, while there was no mechanism to ensure that staff would be paid at the Consenting Party levels, July 2005 marked the first stage of pay parity for centres participating in the agreement.²⁰²

²⁰¹ May (2006b)

²⁰² May (2005)

5 LAUNCHING FREE

The 2005 election returned a Labour-led coalition. Former Minister of Social Development Steve Maharey was appointed Minister of Education shortly before the election. In his former post he had preferred a targeted programme to universal. But once he became Minister of Education he had the responsibility for successfully implementing the new, universal programme. In a memo to the Cabinet Social Development committee he stated:

Free early childhood education will increase children's participation in quality early childhood education services, by signalling a good amount of participation for all children and by lowering the cost of participation. More participation in quality early childhood education services will improve educational outcomes for children, and will open a wider range of choices for parents to work, study or parent. The policy will contribute to the government's goals of economic transformation and ensuring that families, young and old, are able to be secure and have the opportunity to reach their full potential.²⁰³

On a pragmatic level, expansion to private services increased the number of services that could potentially offer free ECE by 952 centres and 95 home-based services.²⁰⁴ This change increased the potential number of services offering Free ECE by around half and thereby reduced the risk of a shortage of Free ECE spaces. The Minister noted that the expansion to include private providers would increase the cost and it could also increase the risk that the price paid for free provision would not be seen as adequate. He was right on both counts. The Ministry of Education estimated that the manifesto commitment would cost \$148 million over the 2007-2010 budget cycle,²⁰⁵ and media and sector attention shifted to determining the funding rates.

Early on in the development of the Free ECE programme, the Ministry advised the Cabinet to fund free ECE based on average costs for meeting licensing standards without charging parents. Ministry of Education staff advised then Minister Trevor Mallard that funding based on average cost would not cover all the costs of every service. They advised that the proposal would need to be carefully positioned to signal that the funding rate would not cover all costs but also to signal that government would continue to "subsidise" rather than "fund" ECE.²⁰⁶ MOE staff also warned of significant fiscal risks from a government commitment to meet the costs of the strategic plan. Because the government does not set fees for early childhood services, it was exposed to claims from services for funding increases. The MOE staff advised careful communication of the proposal to ensure that the government would not necessarily respond to every cost increase or respond in full.²⁰⁷ This indeed became a divisive issue in the implementation of the programme.

Strategic Plan Quality Improvements

Changes related to the strategic plan were made in parallel with the 20 Hours Free Programme. In October 2006 the Minister of Education announced that "Early childhood centres will be required to have 50 percent qualified teachers in all centres from December next year [2007]." He continued: "Cabinet has also agreed to improvements to adult to child

²⁰³ Minister of Education (March 2006), p.1-2

²⁰⁴ Minister of Education (March 2006), p. 6

²⁰⁵ Minister of Education (March 2006), p.6

²⁰⁶ Ministry of Education (December 2003), section 7a

²⁰⁷ Minister of Education (December 2003), section 7b

ratios from 2009."²⁰⁸ Improvements to adult to child ratios will begin in July 2009, and be phased in over 12 months. From 2010, adult to child ratios for children two and a half years and over, in sessional teacher-led services, will change from 1 to 15 to 1 to 14.²⁰⁹ The introduction of a new regulatory system in 2008 sets clear minimum standards for all early childhood services receiving government funding.

With these increased costs for teachers and regulatory changes in the works, the sector became uneasy with the yet to be announced funding levels for Free ECE; however, the 2006 budget included investment to lower the cost of early childhood education and boost the number of qualified early childhood teachers. The Minister stated:

Quality and participation in early childhood education have increased significantly in the last five years as a result of investments by Labour-led governments. Around 94 percent of all New Zealand children now take part in early childhood education. Overall funding for early childhood education has more than doubled since 1999, and the number of qualified teachers has increased by 50 percent.²¹⁰

The 2006 budget included increased funding rates for providers of almost \$30 million over four years, to enable the early childhood sector to “move more rapidly towards its goal of all teachers being registered by 2012.”²¹¹ The budget provided all-day services with an up to 13 percent increase and sessional services with an up to 11 percent increase. The budget also included a nine percent increase for Playcentre that was intended to support the cost of administration in order to free volunteers to spend their time with children.²¹²

Subsidy or Free?

The budget increases did not dispel concerns about the 20 Hours Free Programme. An issue that quickly received media attention was whether services could charge ‘top up’ fees in addition to the 20 Hours Free funding. The subsidy programmes that existed prior to 20 Hours Free provided funding that could then be supplemented by fees. However, the 20 Hours Free programme was designed to cover the cost of providing 20 hours of ECE at the regulated quality level. In other words, it was not a subsidy and therefore services would not be allowed to ‘top up’ the Free ECE rate. The Early Childhood Council took issue with this decision by pointing out that centres would be forced to downgrade quality of services if they could not top up fees.²¹³ The Ministry clarified that centres could only ask for voluntary donations for the 20 hours of free ECE; however, they could charge fees for hours above 20 hours. The Ministry’s definition of a donation is: “a voluntary contribution (monetary or otherwise) for which there is no obligation to pay/contribute, and payment/contribution is not enforceable.”²¹⁴ The Ministry stipulated that there could not be any consequences imposed for non-payment of donations and included a guideline in the toolkit for services to ensure ECE services make parents aware donations are not compulsory. In New Zealand, the practice of donations is well accepted in the public school sector where parents pay donations for their children to attend ‘free’ public schools.

²⁰⁸ Maharey (19 October 2006)

²⁰⁹ Maharey (19 October 2006)

²¹⁰ Maharey (18 May 2006)

²¹¹ Maharey (18 May 2006)

²¹² Maharey (27 June 2006)

²¹³ ECC (23 January 2005)

²¹⁴ Ministry of Education (2006), p. 14

Controversy erupted on whether the new programme was actually free. National ECE spokesperson Paula Bennett lambasted the Minister in parliamentary questions.²¹⁵ However, the Minister sought to clarify this issue by stating that the kind of funding the government is offering could not cover everything a centre might want to offer its parents, but the Government is funding 20 hours of early childhood education to the accepted quality standard. He likened the programme to the funding for schools and denied that the programme was a subsidy.

With the clarification that donations, not fees, could be charged, the focus intensified on the per child allocation for 20 Hours Free. The root concern was that a system based on average costs would not meet funding levels desired by services that have above average costs. The Early Childhood Council turned up the volume on this issue with the January 2006 release of an ECC commissioned report by the New Zealand Institute for Economic Research titled, *Early Childhood Participation Is '20 Hours Free' the Answer?* The report criticized the 20 Hours Free Programme's reliance on a set fee structure because of the potential to have adverse effects on quality and access, and for creating a "deadweight cost" of providing Free ECE to families who are already paying fees. It recommended abandoning the programme in favour of a targeted approach.²¹⁶ In this politically charged environment, the Ministry of Education moved forward with the implementation of the Free ECE Programme.

Setting the Funding Rates

The implementation of the new 20 Hours Free programme required a new administrative structure and a plethora of implementation details to be worked out. ECE Services already receive base-funding and they also receive funding from the Ministry of Social Development if they serve Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ)-eligible children. Through a series of meetings with sector representatives, the Ministry of Education staff worked through the eligibility rules, relation and priority to WINZ subsidies, adaptation of RS7 data collection forms, and a host of detailed issues. The Ministry developed the 'Free Early Childhood Education Training Plan' that included three phases. Phase 1, completed in September/October 2006 focused on readiness with an information road show and toolkit, four web conferences and regional seminars. There were 28 presentations around the country during the road show phase. Phase 2 focused on preparation with workshops and web conferences. The final phase, wash-up, included more workshops and web conferences.²¹⁷

The Ministry set the Free ECE rates based on a survey of operating costs conducted in 2005 and 2006.²¹⁸ Typically the rates would have been announced in May 2007 along with the budget but because of the controversy over funding rates, the Ministry was allowed to release the Free ECE rates on 21 December 2006, a full six months early. There are 15 different rates with the highest for all-day, centre-based ECE with 100 percent registered teachers (\$10.60 per child per hour, see Table 4). The variation in funding among the services reflects the different costs of supplying ECE in all-day, sessional, home-based, and Kōhanga Reo. These rates were increased in July 2007 to reflect updated cost data.

Sector Response to Funding Rates

The response from the sector ranged from full support to adamant opposition, with many undecided. The NZCA immediately voiced its support of the Free programme in a media

²¹⁵ Parliamentary questions are available online at www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/Debates/QOA.

²¹⁶ de Raad and Davies (2005)

²¹⁷ Name withheld by Ministry of Education, personal communication, 29 May 2008

²¹⁸ Name withheld by Ministry of Education, personal communication, 29 May 2008

release stating: “The Association supports the policy of 20 hours free education because more parents will be able to afford to send their children to early childhood care and education services”.²¹⁹ Barnardos New Zealand, responsible for 1800 enrolled children and half of the home-based providers announced its participation in January 2007. Chief Executive Murray Edridge stated, “...as an organisation with the guiding principle ‘Ko nga tamariki i te tuatahi, Children come first’, Barnardos supports the Government initiative.”²²⁰

Kindergarten Associations were undecided. The New Zealand Kindertartens Incorporated, which represents two-thirds of the kindertartens (approximately 400) raised concerns about whether the Ministry of Education would consider the full-range of costs kindertartens incur. The Early Childhood Leadership (formerly the Federation of Free Kindertartens), which represents the other third of kindertartens (approximately 200) mainly in the Auckland area, criticised the Ministry’s reliance on operating costs because it did not include the potential growth costs.²²¹

Organisations opposed to Free ECE included higher cost providers such as the Montessori Association of New Zealand (approximately 80 services) that did not plan to participate because the funding rates were too low. But the most vociferous and media savvy opposition came from the Early Childhood Council. Media headlines announced “Thousands Face Missing out on Free Pre-school”²²² and “Early Childhood Education Plan Causing Problems.”²²³ The tone of print media coverage throughout the six months leading up to Free ECE was decidedly negative. The media frenzy was in large part a reaction to media releases by the Early Childhood Council. In February 2007, the Council released the results of an email member survey in which only 23 percent of its services planned to participate in the Free ECE programme and 31 percent planned not to participate, and the undecided were leaning towards not participating. The survey was sent to 615 members with a 43 percent response rate.²²⁴ Countering the ECC’s message, the NZCA released a member survey in early February 2007 indicating that “over 90 percent of early childhood centres surveyed will either offer the government’s 20 Hours Free service or are still considering the issue.”²²⁵ The survey was sent to its 470 members with a 35 percent response rate (n=162). The two organisations sent out competing brochures. The ECC’s brochure was aimed at parents telling them that centres would not participate in the programme because the government rate would not cover costs of centres with above average costs. The main message was that participation in Free ECE would force centres to lower quality because the government rate was too low and centres were not allowed to charge additional fees. The NZCA countered by releasing an official statement “Free ECE – Get the Facts Right.” The release stated: “ECC is promulgating a number of myths. We want to set the record straight for our members”.²²⁶

One of the main points of the ECC survey media release was to criticize the funding rates levels for not being high enough to provide quality ECE.²²⁷ The NZCA countered that 56 percent of their members planned to offer Free ECE without any significant changes, despite many operating above the government’s regulated standards.²²⁸ It also featured a lead article, “20 Hours Free—Will it Work?” in its member publication *Iti Rearea*. The article explained

²¹⁹ NZCA (21 December 2006)

²²⁰ Barnardos (19 January 2007)

²²¹ Hotere (2005)

²²² Oliver (18 January 2007)

²²³ NZPA and Lewis (9 February 2007)

²²⁴ ECC (1 February 2007)

²²⁵ NZCA (8 February 2007)

²²⁶ Nancy Bell (24 April 2007)

²²⁷ ECC (1 February 2007)

²²⁸ Bell (2007)

how one organisation (operating five services) made it work,²²⁹ and another featured a question/answer section.²³⁰ It is important to note that because the Ministry of Education released the rates six months earlier than the budget, they were based on the prior year's data. By the time Free ECE was to be implemented, an adjustment to the rates would be made to reflect updated cost data. Even after the increased rates were released, the Minister sought to assuage concerns over funding rates by committing to studying the early effects of the programme so that the operational policy settings could be fine tuned. He stated: "If we find that there are different cost drivers, and we haven't got the rates right (even though they come from fully auditing the accounts of the sector), then we will change them, because we have to get this right."²³¹

The ECC continued its campaign against the programme and received ongoing media attention. It urged members not to participate,²³² and National ECE Spokesperson Paula Bennett concurred stating: "We've been telling this government for so long that to offer 20 free hours centres are going to have to cut quality and parents will be appalled."²³³ Eight Auckland parents formed the group 20 Hours Free Please and circulated a petition calling on government to increase the funding for the programme so that the centres their children attended would participate in the programme.²³⁴ The ECC stepped up its rhetoric calling 20 Hours Free 'dangerous' and called on the government to allow top up fees.²³⁵ The Minister shot back with a statement to commercial childcare chains that they could not expect to deliver a return to shareholders funded by the government ECE programmes.²³⁶ In June the KidiCorp childcare chain, which had initially committed to participating, sent a letter to parents requesting an optional fee with the implication that if it was not paid, KidiCorp would not participate in Free ECE. Chief Executive Wayne Wright was quoted in the media as saying, "The reality is that it's not a 'free' 20 hours that the Government is offering. It's a subsidy – that's what it is".²³⁷

While the media covered the take up "controversy", the Ministry of Education staff received a different message as they toured the country leading workshops on the Free Programme. A Ministry of Education official involved stated that: "On the whole, we were met with audiences who were nervous about the changes but positive about what it would mean for the families and children they serve."²³⁸ The services participating in the Ministry of Education workshops were sending positive messages about the take up rate, as well as the process of implementing the programme. The Minister responded to the ECC's campaign by stating: "It would appear for this particular group there is a philosophical debate going on inside the organisation with the majority of people wanting to go with the policy and a small group not wanting to go".²³⁹ The New Zealand Educational Institute, the teachers union representing some early childhood teachers, fully supported the 20 Hours Free Programme and published positive articles with titles such as "20 Hours Free ECE is a Great Advance, say Centres."²⁴⁰

²²⁹ Lloyd Jones (2007)

²³⁰ Vercoe (2007)

²³¹ Maharey (7 July 2007)

²³² ECC (30 March 2007), (26 April 2007)

²³³ One News (26 April 2007)

²³⁴ 20hoursefree.please (1 June 2007); McKenzie-Minifie (28 April 2007); Radio New Zealand (28 April 2007)

²³⁵ Trevett (2007)

²³⁶ Laugeson (2007)

²³⁷ Trevett (2007b)

²³⁸ Name withheld, Ministry of Education, personal communication (26 June 2008)

²³⁹ One News (26 April 2007)

²⁴⁰ NZEI (6 May 2007)

As the 24 June deadline approached for services to declare participation in the Free Programme, the tides started to turn. The Auckland Kindergarten Association (AKA) which had been undecided about participating in Free ECE, announced its decision to participate in June 2007.²⁴¹ The indecision centred round the AKA's decision to allow fees. Although kindergartens were allowed to charge fees long before the Free ECE programme was developed, the AKA had not instituted them. In its media release, the AKA indicated that it was instituting a \$.50 per hour optional fee but would consider withdrawing if its financial position was threatened.²⁴² It was with baited breath that all involved, waited to see whether the implementation would be a success or failure.

²⁴¹ Radio New Zealand (13 June 2007)

²⁴² *ibid.*

6 FIRST YEAR IMPLEMENTATION AND THE FUTURE

The Minister of education announced the initial implementation to be a success: “1703 services will be offering 20 Hours Free ECE from day one, which is a great start. More centres are still coming on board so the take up rate of 62 per cent of providers will increase further.”²⁴³ He added that since the cut off date of 24 June another 34 services covering 785 children applied to participate. Prime Minister Helen Clarke stated at the launch of the 20 Hours Free Programme: “A child who attends ECE has a much better chance of succeeding in school and later in life. Our Labour-led government recognises the importance of funding public education from the age of three.”²⁴⁴ The Minister referred to the new programme as a “watershed policy.” He stated: “20 Hours Free early childhood education is the most significant expansion of the education system since the rollout of free secondary education by the first Labour government in the 1930s. For the first time in history, the state is recognising the need to provide free quality education for under five year olds.”²⁴⁵ He took pains to emphasise that the 20 Hours Free Programme symbolised recognition that taxpayers see education of three- and four-year olds as essential; however, opponents continued to answer that 20 hours was a subsidy and not free. The ECC put out three media releases on 2 July taking issue with characterising the programme as free, as well as including ECC survey data on take up rates.²⁴⁶ But the media coverage dwindled after the implementation of Free. With an initial take up rate of 62 percent of services, it was high enough for the Ministry and the Prime Minister to claim success thereby removing the source of controversy. By January 2008 take up rates increased to 76 percent.²⁴⁷ As evidence of the turnaround in media attention, the New Zealand Herald published a column by political analyst Colin James crediting Trevor Mallard for Labour’s “most important initiative, its biggest idea.” James likened the 20 Hours Free Programme to investing in infrastructure, just like building roads, that would provide the path through which individuals’ capacity to acquire skills and lift their earning power would ultimately contribute to their socioeconomic mobility. He then directed the government to do more for children from birth to three.²⁴⁸ Clearly 20 Hours Free, despite all the controversy leading up to its implementation, had secured its place in New Zealand early childhood policy.

To assess the impacts of the 20 Hours Free on participating services, the Ministry of Education contracted with the Martin Jenkins consulting firm to produce the *Early Effects of Free ECE* report. The Ministry also conducted an in-house survey to assess the impact of Free ECE on playcentres. Unfortunately, neither of these reports was released in time for inclusion in this study. However, the New Zealand Council for Education Research conducted a survey in October 2007 on early childhood education services.²⁴⁹ Findings mirrored the official statistics on take up rates for kindergartens but had higher take up rates for the other types of teacher-led services. Survey findings indicated that 34 percent of services asked parents to pay optional charges, with the majority asking for \$5 or less per week. Optional charges were mainly for resources (52%), additional staffing (50%), regular excursions (46%), and food (38%). The survey of parents at 209 services indicated that: “Implementation of free ECE had little effect on the type of service parents were using”; only four parents had changed services.²⁵⁰ The findings were positive about the savings per week on ECE: 56 percent of responses had positive comments about the impact of Free ECE on family finances.

²⁴³ Maharey (2 July 2007)

²⁴⁴ Cited in Maharey (2 July 2007)

²⁴⁵ Maharey (7 July 2007)

²⁴⁶ ECC (2007a,b,c)

²⁴⁷ Ministry of Education (February 2008)

²⁴⁸ James (19 February 2008)

²⁴⁹ Mitchell (2008)

²⁵⁰ Mitchell (2008), p. 3

The latest data available on the programme indicate that in July 2007, 76 percent of eligible services participated, which represents 83 percent of total enrolment for three- and four-year-olds.²⁵¹ Auckland (70%) and Canterbury (73%) had the lowest take up rates but all the other regions had take up rates over 80 percent. Private services participate at a lower rate (64%) than community-based services (86%). Rural centres (population 300-999) had the highest take up rate (91%), followed by minor urban (population 1,000-9,999, 88%), and secondary urban (population 10,000 – 29,999, 86%). Main urban areas with populations of 30,000 or more had the lowest take up rate (74%). Auckland is the largest population centre in New Zealand with the highest proportion of private services. The ABC chain of education and care centres, which has 123 centres mainly in urban areas of New Zealand, did not choose to participate in Free ECE. As Chris Carter was appointed as Minister of Education in January 2008, the 20 Hours Free Programme was considered successfully implemented.

The Future

With the 20 Hours Free Programme the New Zealand government expanded the public responsibility for funding early childhood education. Because it is designed to cover the average cost of provision, rather than providing a subsidy, it is an expansion of government's role. There are segments of the policy community that decry what they see as a shrinking of the private sphere and this is articulated by different voices with different political agendas. But while 20 Hours Free ECE creates an obligation for the government to fund all teacher-led services that decide to participate in the programme, a child's participation is entirely a private decision. A parent can choose for his or her child to participate or not to participate. A family that chooses, and can financially afford, for a child to remain at home with a parent until age six, the compulsory school age, can still retain the full early childhood years within the private sphere. I would argue that though the public responsibility expanded, it has not reduced the private sphere. Rather, the public funding of the education of three- and four-year-olds increases parental choice in how they care for and educate their children.

The sticking point for some opponents of the 20 Hours Free Programme is its impact on female labour force participation and a perceived devaluing of parents' role in childrearing. Increasing female labour force participation was at the forefront of the Government's mind when the decision was made to include 20 Hours Free in the 2004 budget.²⁵² Her focus on labour force participation clashed with those who want society to value the private realm of the family and the rearing of children. This is an old issue that has come to the fore again. At the 1975 Early Childhood Conference, early childhood researcher and activist Anne Smith presented a paper arguing for universal provision of publicly funded, community-based childcare, with parent involvement, professional support and trained staff.²⁵³ At that time opposing voices from Playcentre decried the pressure for women to enter the formal labour force to 'free' themselves of the care of their children. The 20 Hours Free Programme, by limiting participation to teacher-led services is causing a reaction that once again raises this issue. Playcentre advocates, and others, say that ECE policy has tilted too far in creating the incentive, some would say pressure, for women of small children to participate in the formal labour force. A separate voice raising the issue of parental choice is Child Forum, a one-person organisation led by Dr Sarah Farquhar. At Child Forum's February 2008 meeting, *The Future for Children's Early Care and Education*, Farquhar brought together panellists who collectively questioned placing children in teacher-led ECE in order for women go back to work. The general message of the conference was that government should subsidise parental choice rather than providing incentives for all parents to place their children in teacher-led

²⁵¹ Ministry of Education (4 February 2008)

²⁵² See discussion in Chapter Four

²⁵³ Smith (1978) cited in May (2003), p. 172

early childhood education.²⁵⁴ The 20 Hours Free Programme, in my view, does not create an incentive for parents to return to the formal labour force earlier than they would otherwise. By reducing the financial pressure on parents to pay for ECE, it may actually result in the opposite incentive. This latest opposition should be viewed as part of an ongoing struggle to clarify the boundary between the private and the public realm.

The larger issue for the government is that it has committed itself to fully funding the cost of quality ECE. With a demand driven programme and no control over the supply, Free ECE approaches being an entitlement programme. The challenge with any entitlement programme is that the government cannot control the budget allocation. The cost of Free ECE combined with the increases due to the quality improvements included in the ECE strategic plan continue to impact the budget and the question is whether future governments will continue to absorb those increases. An interesting aspect of this issue, from an American perspective, is that there is no backlash from anti-tax advocates. In the US the public versus private debate usually hinges on whether taxes or private revenues should be used to fund a programme. The anti-tax lobby in the US constantly argues for a reduced public realm. But the tax argument is completely absent in New Zealand. Opponents to 20 Hours Free would prefer different ECE policy rather than no government policy; however there are wedge issues in New Zealand over the direction of future ECE policy-making.

Wedge Issues

This report places the creation and implementation of the 20 Hours Free Programme within the broader context of early childhood policy-making over the last fifty years. The reason for providing that history is to see where the pendulum has swung and what forces pushed it in the 20 Hours Free direction. In the section below, I raise two “wedge” issues that I see as forces that could push the next swing of the pendulum. Wedge issues are divisions in the early childhood policy community that are likely to impact the direction of future policy advocacy, and ultimately policy-making. The first is the gulf between advocates for and against private services. The second is the schism created with the distinction between teacher-led versus parent/whānau-led services.

Private Services

Many people I interviewed in the course of this research voiced a strong desire to severely curtail the private service presence in New Zealand. That view has been publicly stated in the 2020 Vision published by the NZEI. I must admit that I did not understand that position at first. In the US there is a decidedly market-based approach to early childhood and public funding does not discriminate based on auspice. The private sector is seemingly a permanent feature of the US delivery system for ECE and there is solid research indicating that auspice is not a good predictor of quality.²⁵⁵ But the New Zealand history between some private providers and the teachers’ union is bitter and creates a serious wedge issue in New Zealand. It is not unusual that employers and the representatives of the employed are on opposing sides of issues, but the intensity of the anti-private position creates a divide that will not be easily bridged. Geographic proximity is another factor; Australia’s ECE policy led to a rapid increase in corporate businesses providing ECE.²⁵⁶ For those who support community-based ECE, Australia’s experience provides a cautionary tale.

²⁵⁴ NZEI (2007)

²⁵⁵ Peisner-Feinberg et al. (2000)

²⁵⁶ Gittins (19 March 2008)

What is missing in New Zealand's policy community is a middle ground. The reality is that not all private childcare centres place profit above all else, and not all community-based providers are responsiveness to their communities. Lynne Bruce of NZEI conceded this middle ground with the phrase "private with heart" to refer to the private ECE businesses run by owners who place the needs of children above their profit margins.²⁵⁷ There is a valid concern over the increased presence of publicly traded childcare chains, but greater concern might be given to the potential market volatility that they can create in service provision. While I was in New Zealand, the ABC chain encountered severe financial difficulties due to a situation that can only be labelled corporate piracy.²⁵⁸ ABC's financial troubles raised concerns about the crisis that would occur if their New Zealand centres were to close. The emphasis of the anti-private interests in New Zealand is focused on the role of profit, rather than volatility. Advocates for community-based ECE clearly oppose private services distributing profits to shareholders from the 20 Hours Free or any other government ECE programme. While profit may be an uncomfortable topic, private providers have responded to parent demand by creating centres that meet the needs of working parents. Sessional or school-day programmes have not met that need and, without a large infusion of funding, community-based providers will not be able to expand supply fast enough to meet parental demand if private centres cease to exist.

The strategy New Zealand's government has taken since the 1980s has been to improve quality through raising the regulatory bar rather than regulating the auspice of the service. The 20 Hours Free Programme funding rates are based on the average operating costs for providing ECE at the regulated quality level. If New Zealand continues to regulate quality, then private sector expansion will be limited to those businesses that can do both: provide quality and make profit. If the profit margins are not high enough for corporate businesses, they will not invest.

Teacher-led versus parent/whānau-led

An unintended consequence of limiting participation of parent and whānau-led services in Free ECE was the implicit message that they were of lesser quality. As discussed in Chapter 4, this is the sticking point for both Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust and the Playcentre Federation. Had the consultation document been released as intended in 2004, the sector responses may have resulted in a softening of this impact or inclusion of provisions that recognise multiple pathways to quality. But politics trumped policy-making, as is a common reality in budget announcements leading into an election year. However the communication strategy for the 20 Hours Free programme exacerbated the perception that parent/whānau-led were lesser quality because of its overarching message: "Quality early childhood education builds the lifelong foundations of successful learning for our children and for New Zealand".²⁵⁹ If Free ECE is equated with quality and it excludes parent/whānau-led then the immediate inference is that any service that is not teacher-led is lesser quality. The Playcentre Federation and Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust want the recognition, expressed in policy, that there are multiple pathways to quality and, on that basis, participation in Free ECE.

Both Playcentre Federation and Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust want to participate in Free ECE but they do not want to change aspects of their programmes that they feel are fundamental. For Kōhanga Reo, kaiako-led services are able to participate in Free ECE but parent/whānau led services are not. Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust could institute a policy that would move Kōhanga Reo toward kaiako-led but they are concerned about the hierarchy

²⁵⁷ Lynne Bruce, personal communication (15 May 2008)

²⁵⁸ Main (2008)

²⁵⁹ Ministry of Education (2006b), p.6

created when the kaiako are perceived to be the key ingredient to quality and thereby more important than parents and whānau. Playcentre provides training for parents and it could institute changes so that the training could be recognized as a level 7 diploma by the NZQA. But they argue that playcentres already provide quality and that the government should allow them to participate in Free ECE without changing their parent training programme. Government policy has made a clear one-to-one connection between a teacher with a diploma in ECE and quality by linking funding rates based to the proportion of qualified teachers.

Free ECE can easily become a scapegoat for parent/whānau-led programmes. But it must be noted that the declining enrolments for both Kōhanga Reo and Playcentres were evident in the data long before the 20 Hours Free Programme was created. From 1995 to 2007 enrolments in Kōhanga Reo decreased by 52 percent and Playcentre enrolments decreased by 30 percent (see Table 1). This indicates that there are broader demographic and social shifts that are occurring that will push playcentres and Kōhanga Reo to adapt to the changing needs of their target populations. An emerging Māori middle class and the high proportion of women in the formal labour force are realities and families with small children will choose services that best meet their complex set of needs. However, the long and unique history of Playcentre in New Zealand and the role of Kōhanga Reo in preserving Māori culture are important reasons for future policy-makers to be mindful of the impacts of policy changes on these organisations. These services are important options for parents among the diverse ECE service types. The question is whether there are adaptations within each of these services and in government policy that can resolve or reduce the parent/whānau-led and teacher-led service distinction.

Evaluation of Free ECE

The Ministry of Education completed, but has not released, two assessments of the impacts of 20 Hours Free: one on participating services and a second on playcentres. What would be useful for future policy-making is a longitudinal study on the impacts of ECE participation on child outcomes. Ideally this study would have begun before the implementation of Free ECE so that there could be data points before the policy change that could be compared with data points after the policy change. But there are robust research designs, such as a regression discontinuity design, that can be utilised that will yield unbiased estimators. It is absolutely necessary for a robust longitudinal study to have a unique identifier for each child. Currently such a system exists for school-age children but a decision in 2003 was made not to implement it for early childhood education.²⁶⁰ While this may have been politically and administratively the correct choice at the time, it has several negative consequences. First, without unique identifiers, the opportunity to track children over time is not available. Second, while the Ministry has ample data to track how the services change over time, it does not have accurate data on the number of children participating. Because children often attend more than one service and can divide their 20 hours per week among multiple services, the enrolment data overestimate participation rates. This is particularly important to remedy because the goal of 20 Hours Free was to increase participation. Having an accurate outcome measure for the programme's success is fundamental. Third, without unique identifiers, the Ministry of Education is forced to rely on parents signing an attestation form stating that their children are not participating in more than 20 free hours of ECE. There is no easy way for the Ministry of Education to monitor the veracity of the attestation forms. Only with unique identifiers will the Ministry be able to design a robust evaluation of the programme, collect accurate data on participation, and have an accountability mechanism to detect fraud.

²⁶⁰ Minister of Education (December 2003), section g

Concluding Thoughts

Every policy change shifts incentive structures, which in turn shifts behaviour. The intended shift of 20 Hours Free was to increase participation of young children in quality ECE. But as the new incentive structure takes hold, the ripple effects create winners and losers. The challenge for New Zealand is to find a way to navigate beyond the wedge issues and move early childhood policy forward. A decisive factor in determining the immediate future direction of ECE policy will be determined by the voters when the new government is elected in the coming months. At the time of this report, no parties had released their 2008 manifestos; however, the National party, which has been highly critical of the 20 Hours Free Programme, is stating that ECE policy has left the ‘care’ out of early education and care.²⁶¹ In the last election, National supported targeted over universal programmes but it remains to be seen what policies will be proposed in 2008. For the 20 Hours Free ECE programme, regardless of the new government coalition, it is unlikely the programme could be abolished. This is because once a benefit has been provided to a broad socioeconomic group of parents it would be politically unwise to take it away.

The next government will make a fundamental decision about whether the paradigmatic shift toward universal provision will continue or whether it will revert back to a subsidy programme. As Minister Trevor Mallard envisioned Free ECE as a new era in early childhood policy in which the government committed to paying for quality ECE for all three- and four-year-olds. Prior to the Free ECE programme, government subsidised the cost of ECE but allowed services to charge additional fees. Assuming that the programme would not be abolished or access limited by family income, there are three possible scenarios for the government to consider. First, the government continues with a commitment to fund ECE at the regulated quality level and provides budget allotments to meet the demand. This achieves the quality and universal access objectives but has high fiscal risk for the government. Second, the government continues with the commitment to fund ECE for all children enrolled but reduces fiscal risk by limiting funding rate increases. This scenario retains the universal access and manages fiscal risk to the government, but quality may be sacrificed. Third, the government reverts to subsidising ECE and allows services to charge top up fees. This scenario reduces the fiscal risk to government and has the potential to maintain quality, but the charges may decrease accessibility for families who cannot afford the fees. Of the three scenarios, the second is the least preferred because it creates the potential for a programme that could actually decrease the quality of ECE provided by services. Free ECE would become an under funded programme that restricts services from charging for the full costs of quality ECE. The other two scenarios represent a choice about the public realm: is Free ECE a universal or a subsidy programme? If it is the former, then New Zealand continues on the pathway for a paradigmatic shift in government responsibility for ECE. If it is the latter, then New Zealand reverts to the strategy of subsidising the cost of ECE. Either way, New Zealand has achieved tremendous growth in public funding for ECE.

²⁶¹ Paula Bennett, personal communication (15 April 2008)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnardos (19 January 2007), 'Barnardos to Offer Free Early Childhood Education', Wellington: Barnardos

Bell, Nancy (24 April 2007), 'Free ECE – Get the Facts Right', Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa NZ Childcare Association

Bushouse, Brenda K. (forthcoming in 2009), *Universal Preschool in the United States: Policy Change, Stability, and the Pew Charitable Trusts*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

Cabinet Policy Committee (24 March 2008), 'Early Childhood Education Funding: Proposed New System', Minute of Decision

Cabinet Social Development Committee (11 February 2004) 'Review of Early Childhood Education Funding: Public Consultation', Minute of Decision

Carter, Chris (2007), 'Pathways to the Future: Nga Huarahi Arataki – 2007 Report to Cabinet', ED05/30/00/1. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Clark, Helen (23 September 1996), Speech notes for Launch of Early Childhood Education Project Report, Beehive Theatre

Cleave, Laurel and Deverell, Beverley (1998), 'Voices from the Heartland of the Treaty: Māori and Pākehā Playcentre Pioneers Remember', in Stover, Sue (ed.) *Good Clean Fun: New Zealand's Playcentre Movement*, Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation, pp. 63-76

Corry, Jenny (1998), 'Bicultural Developments: Playcentre Talks Treaty', in Stover, Sue (ed.) *Good Clean Fun: New Zealand's Playcentre Movement*, Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation, pp. 123-126.

Dalli, Carmen and Te One, Sarah (2002), 'Early Childhood Education in 2002: Pathways to the Future', *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 12, 177-202.

Dalli, Carmen (1993), 'Is Cinderella Back Among the Cinders? A Review of Early Childhood Education in the 1990s', *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 223-252.

Department of Education (1988), *Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand*, Wellington: Department of Education.

De Raad, Jean-Pierre and Davies, Preston (2005), *Early Childhood Participation: Is '20 Free Hours' the Answer?* New Zealand Institute for Economic Research, Wellington: NZIER

Duncan, Judith (2007) 'Kindergarten Parents Reflecting on their Kindergartens 2006-2007: Discussion of Findings – Work in Progress'. Draft document.

Duncan, Judith, (2004) 'Misplacing the Teacher? New Zealand Early Childhood Teachers and Early Childhood Education Reforms, 1984-96', *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 5:2, pp.160 – 177

Duncan, Judith, Dalli, Carmen, Lawrence, Julie (2006), 'The Changing Face of Kindergarten: A National Picture of Two-Year Olds Within Kindergartens'. *New Zealand Review of Education Te Arotake A Tau O Te Ao O Te Matauranga I Aotearoa* 16, pp. 119-140

Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group (August 1988), 'Education to be More.' Wellington: Ministry of Education

Early Childhood Council (2008), Home. Retrieved 15 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz>

Early Childhood Council (2 July 2007), 'Community Centres'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=1034>

Early Childhood Council (2 July 2007), 'Centres Opt in by Transferring Charges'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=1033>

Early Childhood Council (2 July 2007), 'Parents Paying for 'Free' ECE by a Variety of Methods'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=1032>

Early Childhood Council (26 April 2007), 'Early Childhood Council Recommends 20 Hours Free be Resisted by both Early Childhood Services and Preschoolers'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=999>

Early Childhood Council (30 March 2007), 'Uptake of 20 Hours Free Low and Likely to Get Lower'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=977>

Early Childhood Council (1 February 2007), 'Survey Reveals Many Set to Miss Out on Free Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=950>

Early Childhood Council (26 March 2006), 'New Research Says 20 Free Hours Should Focus on Disadvantaged'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=732>

Early Childhood Council (1 February 2005), 'Survey Reveals Many Set to Miss Out on Free Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=950>

Early Childhood Council (22 August 2005), "'Free" for a Few'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=634>

Early Childhood Council (24 July 2005), 'Labour's Extension of 20 Hours Free Policy Praised by Former Critics'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=649>

Early Childhood Council (16 July 2005), 'ECE Policy Differences Patently Clear'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=624>

Early Childhood Council (7 July 2005), 'Families Better Off Under Nats Policy'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=617>

Early Childhood Council (23 January 2005), 'Fee Cap Will Reduce Quality and Choice'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=542>

Early Childhood Council (14 November 2004), 'Fair Funding for Children Welcomed'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=513>

Early Childhood Council (27 May 2004), 'Free Childcare for Some Will Cost Us Plenty'. Retrieved 12 May 2008 from: <http://www.ecc.org.nz/mediareleases/index.hph?rt=20&rid=426>

Early Childhood Education Project (2000), *Future Directions: Early Childhood Education in New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand Education Institute

Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (n.d.), 'Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education Consultation Results'. Retrieved 8 April 2008 from: <http://bbb.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=5751&indexid=7689&indexparentid=10943>

Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (n.d.), 'Second Stage of the Development of the Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 8 April 2008 from: <http://bbb.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=6065&indexid=7689&indexparentid=10943>

Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (October 2001), 'Final Report of the Working Group for the Development of the Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education.' Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://bbb.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=6413&indexid=7689&indexparentid=10943>

Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (September 2001), 'Analysis of submissions received on the Consultation Document for the Development of the Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://bbb.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=6524&indexid=7689&indexparentid=10943>

Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (August 2001), 'Consultation Document for the Development of the Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 8 April 2008 from: http://www.minedu.govt.nz/print_doc.cfm?layout=document&documentid=6151&CFID=18028807&CFTOKEN=31735824&fromprint=y

Early Childhood Education Strategic Plan Working Group (November 2000), 'Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education Consultation Document'. Retrieved 8 April 2008 from: <http://bbb.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=5335&indexid=7689&indexparentid=10943>

Education Counts (2007), 'Glossary of Early Childhood Education Terms'. Retrieved 20 June 2008 from: http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/__data/assets/excel_doc/0003/17841/ECE_Time-Series_-_Enrolments_2007.xls

Education Review Office (1999), 'Confirmed Accountability Review Report Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust'. Retrieved 19 May 2008 from: <http://www.ero.govt.nz/ERO/Publishing.nsf/Print/>

- Elections New Zealand (n.d.), 'From FPP to MMP'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.elections.org.nz/study/history/history-mmp.html>.
- Farquhar, Sarah-Eve (2005), 'Behind the Early Childhood Policies—Some Thoughts', *Child Forum*. Retrieved 7 September 2005 from: http://www.childforum.com/article_details.asp?REF_NO=7
- Froese, Natalie (30 April 2008), *Early Effects of Free ECE Draft Summary Report*. Wellington: Martin Jenkins
- Gittins, Ross (19 March 2008), 'Child-Care Rebate Bad for Kids'. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved 1 April 2008 from: <http://business.smh.com.au/childcare-rebate-bad-for-kids/20080318-2087.html>
- Government Review Team (1988), *Government Review of Te Kōhanga Reo*, Wellington: Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust
- Grey, Lex (1998), 'This was the Kaha that Prevailed: From the Springboard of Playcentres, Māori Leadership Shaped History in Australia and Aotearoa' in Stover, Sue (ed.) *Good Clean Fun: New Zealand's Playcentre Movement*, Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation, pp. 22-29
- Hill, Diti et al. (1998), 'More than Educating Children', in Stover, Sue (ed.) *Good Clean Fun: New Zealand's Playcentre Movement*, Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation, pp.30-38
- Hotere, Andrea, 'Kindys say 'Free' Will Cost', *Southland Times*, 25 September 2005.
- James, Colin, 'Learning to Learn Vital Part of Childhood', *New Zealand Herald*, 19 February 2008, p. 11
- Kettl, Donald F. (1997), "The Global Revolution in Public Management: Driving Themes, Missing Links," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16, pp. 446-462
- Labour Party of New Zealand, (n.d.) 'Early Childhood Education Policy.' Retrieved 19 February 2008 from: <http://staging.labour.org.nz/policy/education/2005policy/P05-ece-050822/index.html>
- Lange, David (December 1988) *Before Five: Early Childhood Care and Education in New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry of Education
- Laugeson, Ruth (6 May 2007), 'Childcare Centres Warned Not to Profit from Subsidy', *Sunday Star Times*. Retrieved 6 May 2007 from: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/northland/4050155a13.html>.
- Lloyd Jones, Kay (2007), '20 Hours Free—Will it work?' *Iti Rearea*, Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa NZ Childcare Association. February, 11, pp. 1-2
- Maharey, Steve (9 October 2007), 'More funding for early childhood centres'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech>
- Maharey, Steve (27 September 2007), 'Early Childhood Convention Dinner'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech>

Maharey, Steve (7 July 2007), 'Early Childhood Education: A New Era Begins'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech>

Maharey, Steve (2 July 2007), 'Celebrate the start of 20 Hours Free ECE'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Maharey, Steve (17 May 2007), 'Funding boost for kōhanga reo'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Maharey, Steve (21 December 2006), 'Rates for Free Early Childhood Education', Ministry of Education Media Statement

Maharey, Steve (20 December 2006), 'Helping more kids into early education'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Maharey, Steve (19 October 2006), 'Government sets timeframes to lift quality in early childhood education'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Maharey, Steve (27 June 2006), '\$30m to boost number of qualified ECE teachers'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Maharey, Steve (18 May 2006), 'Budget 06: Quality and access in early childhood education'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Maharey, Steve (7 November 2005), 'Early Childhood sector to advise on roll-out of 20 hours free'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>.

Main, Andrew (1 March 2008), 'Winning a Losing Game in Was as ABC', *The Australian*. Retrieved 3 March 2008 from: <http://www.theaustralian.new.com/au/story/0,25197,23298146-5001942,00.html>

Mallard, Trevor (13 October 2004), 'New School Sites to Include Early Childhood Provision'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Mallard, Trevor (27 May 2004), 'Budget 2004: Landmark budget for educating young kiwi kids'. Retrieved 2 April 2008 from: Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Mallard, Trevor (29 April 2002), 'Budget 2002 – Regulatory and Funding System Review for Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Mallard, Trevor (14 March 2002), 'New Zealand Kindergarten Senior Teachers' Conference'. Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Mallard, Trevor (5 March 2002), 'Equity Funding for Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

Mallard, Trevor (19 February 2002), 'Launch of Teachers' Council'. Retrieved 9 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>

- Mallard, Trevor (20 December 2000), 'Minister Promoting Greater Participation in Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (30 November 2000), 'Teaching Qualifications for Early Childhood Education Licensing'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (26 September 2000), 'Scholarships for Māori and Pacific ECE Teachers'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (23 August 2000), 'Early Childhood Strategic Planning Working Group'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (14 August 2000), 'Early Childhood Education Equity Funding Working Group'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (28 June 2000), 'A Better Education Deal for Pacific Peoples'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (1 June 2000), '38 Early Childhood Centres Benefit from Funding Boost'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (30 May 2000), 'Government Moves to Establish Education Council'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (13 March 2000), 'Kindergarten teachers to return to State Sector'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (27 April 2000) 'Boost for Early Childhood Education'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (24 April 2000), 'Qualification key to quality'. Retrieved 3 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release>
- Mallard, Trevor (18 February 2000), 'Speech to the New Zealand Principals' Federation'. Retrieved 14 April 2008 from: <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech>
- May, Helen (2006), "'Being Froebelian": An Antipodean Analysis of the History of Advocacy and Early Childhood', *History of Education* 35(2), pp. 245-262
- May, Helen (2006b), 'Election Year Politics and the "Nanny State"', *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 15, pp. 133-151
- May, Helen (2005), *Twenty Years of Consenting Parties: The Politics of 'Working' and 'Teaching' in Childcare 1985-2005*, Wellington: NZEI Te Riu Roa
- May, Helen (2004), 'Towards Citizenry Rights in the Early Childhood Sector 1930s – 2000s', *Delta Policy and Practice in Education* 56(1), pp. 75-91
- May, Helen (2003a), 'An Overview of the Early Childhood Education Landscape', *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 13, pp. 169-188

May, Helen (2003b), *Concerning Women Considering Children: Battles of the Childcare Association 1963-2003*, Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa – New Zealand Childcare Association

May, Helen (2002), “Blue Skies” Talk in the “Playground”, *Delta Policy and Practice in Education*, 54, 1 & 2, pp. 9 – 28.

May, Helen (2001), *Politics in the Playground: The World of Early Childhood in Postwar New Zealand*, Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books with the New Zealand Council for Educational Research

May, Helen (2000), ‘The “Playground” of Early Childhood Policy: Social and Political Change Versus Social and Political Order’, NZEI Te Riu Roa Early Childhood Millennium Conference Proceedings, Wellington: NZEI Te Riu Roa

McKenzie-Minifie, Martha (28 April 2007) ‘Protest over Child-Care “Double Hit”’. Retrieved 29 April 2007 from: http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/1story.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10436610

Meade, Anne (1994), ‘Before Five – Five Years On’, Keynote address to NZARE Special Seminar, University of Auckland

Meade, Anne and Dalli, Carmen (1992), ‘Review of the Early Childhood Sector’, *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 1: pp.113-132

Meade, Anne et al. (1995), ‘Competent Children and their Teachers: Learning About Trajectories and Other Schemas’. A Report from The Action Research Component Of The Competent Children Longitudinal Research Project, NZCER and Faculty of Education, Victoria University

Meade, Anne and Podmore, Valerie (2002), ‘Early Childhood Education Policy Coordination under the Auspices of the Department/Ministry of Education: A Case Study of New Zealand’, Paris: Early Childhood and Family Education Section, UNESCO.

Minister of Education (March 2006), ‘Implementing Free Early Childhood Education’, Paper submitted to the Cabinet Social Development Committee by the Office of the Minister of Education. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Minister of Education (December 2003), ‘ECE Funding Review: Draft Cabinet and Consultation Papers’. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Ministry of Education (February 2008), *The ECRE Indicator Report*, Wellington: Ministry of Education, Volume 2, Number 1

Ministry of Education (4 February 2008), *Free ECE Monthly Monitoring Report*. Retrieved on 26 June 2008 from: http://www.minedu.govt.nz/web/downloadable/dl11253_v1/free-takeup-report-20080204-nolinks.xls

Ministry of Education (13 December 2007), ‘ECE Funding Changes’. Retrieved 2 April 2008 from: <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=9637&data=1>

Ministry of Education (2006), ‘Expectations of Free ECE: Rules and Guidelines; Roles and Responsibilities’. Free ECE Sector Advisory Group Meeting 20-21 April 2006, slide #2

Ministry of Education (2006b), *Provision of 20 Hours Free Early Childhood Education Communications Strategy*, Wellington: Ministry of Education

Ministry of Education (30 March 2004), 'Joint Report-Back on ECE and Childcare Funding', Memo to Minister of Education and Minister for Social Development and Employment

Ministry of Education (19 December 2003), 'ECE Funding Review: Draft Cabinet and Consultation Papers', Memo to Minister of Education

Ministry of Education (18 November 2003), 'ECE Funding Review: Timing for Cabinet Consideration'. Memo to Minister of Education

Ministry of Education (30 July 2003), 'Meeting to Discuss the Review of Early Childhood Education Funding', Memo to Minister of Education

Ministry of Education (12 May 2003), 'Update on Funding and Regulatory Reviews of ECE)

Ministry of Education (2001), *Review of the Relationship Between the Crown and Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust*. Retrieved 19 May 2008 from: http://www.minedu.govt.nz/print_doc.cfm?layout=document&documentid=6158&ind.

Ministry of Education (1996), *Te Whāriki He Whāriki Mātauranga mō ngā Mokopuna o Aotearoa Early Childhood Curriculum*, Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (1971), *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Pre-School Education*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Mitchell, Linda (2008), *Provision of ECE Services and Parental Perceptions. Results of the 2007 NZCER National Survey of ECE Services*, Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Mitchell, Linda (2006), *Evaluation of Initial Uses and Impact of Equity Funding*, Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Mitchell, Linda (2004), 'Putting Children First: A Well Qualified Teaching Workforce', Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Mitchell, Linda (2002), 'Difference Between Community Owned and Privately Owned Early Childhood Education and Care Centres: A Review of the Evidence'. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Mitchell, Linda (2001), 'Bulk funding of New Zealand's Early Childhood Services: An Analysis of the Impact'. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Mitchell, Linda (1999), 'A New Debate about Childhood. Can it Make a Difference?' Ph.D. Proposal, Wellington: Victoria University

Mitchell, Linda and Brooking, Keren (2007) *First NZCER National Surveys of Early Childhood Education Services*, Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Mitchell, Linda et al. (2006), 'Quality in Parent/Whānau-led Services Summary Research Report', Wellington: Ministry of Education

Morrison, Andrew (23 June 2008), 'Impact of Free ECE on Playcentres', Powerpoint presentation, Wellington: Demographic and Statistical Analysis Unit, Ministry of Education

New Zealand Childcare Association Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa (8 February 2007), '20 Hours Free Optimistic – New Survey' Media Release, Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa – New Zealand Childcare Association

New Zealand Childcare Association Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa (21 December 2006), "20 Hours Free Rates Announcement Welcomed" Media Release, Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa – New Zealand Childcare Association

New Zealand Council for Educational Research (2008), About NZCER. Retrieved 12 March 2008 from: <http://www.nzcer.org.nz/default.php?cPath=21>.

New Zealand Educational Institute (2008), About NZEI. Retrieved 20 June 2008 from: http://www.nzei.org.nz/about_nzei/about.htm

New Zealand Educational Institute (29 February 2008), 'Government Should Buy up Troubled ABC Learning Centres', Wellington: New Zealand Educational Institute

New Zealand Educational Institute (2007), 'Quality Public ECE: A Vision for 2020', Report to the NZEI Annual Meeting 2007, Wellington: NZEI

New Zealand Educational Institute (20 June 2007), '20 Hours Free ECE is a great Advance, say Centres', *NZEI Rourou* vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 1-2

New Zealand Educational Institute (6 May 2007), 'Research Questions Wisdom of Taxpayer Funding of Private Sector, NZEI Te Riu Roa Says', Wellington: New Zealand Educational Institute

New Zealand Parents Association and Lewis, John, 'Early Childhood Education Plan Causing Problems', *Otago Daily Times Weekend*, 9 February 2008, p.?

New Zealand Teachers Council (n.d.) About Us. Retrieved 5 April 2008 from: <http://www.teacherscouncil.govt.nz/about/>.

Nichols, Lane (27 April 2007), 'Preschools Reject Free Hours Policy', *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved 29 April 2007 from: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/4039491a7694.html>.

Oliver, Paula, 'Thousands Face Missing out on Free Preschool', *The New Zealand Herald National Education*, 18 January 2007, p. 1

One News (26 April 2007), 'Free Child Care Snub'. Retrieved 29 April 2007 from: <http://tvnz.co.nz/view/page/411749/1083941>

Pacific Islands Early Childhood Council Aotearoa (2008), Home. Retrieved 26 June 2008 from: <http://www.piecca.org.nz/PIECCA%20MAIN%20PAGE.htm>

Party Vote National (6 July 2005), 'National's Plan for Childcare'. Retrieved on 19 February 2008 from: <http://www.national.org.nz/article.aspx?ArticleID=4660>

Peisner-Feinberg, E. S. et al. (2000). *The Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study go to School: Technical Report*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center

Playcentre (n.d.), 'SPACE Programme'. Retrieved 25 June 2008 from: <http://www.playcentre.org.nz/space.php>.

Quirke, Michelle (2005), 'Aussie Bank Buys Kiwi Preschools', *Dominion Post*, 30 September 2005, p.?

Radio New Zealand (13 June 2007) 'Auckland Kindergarten Association to Join 20 Free Hours Scheme'. Retrieved from: http://www.radionz/news/latest/200706131409/auckland_kindergarten_assn_ti_join_20_free_hours_scheme.

Radio New Zealand (28 April 2007), 'Parents Support Boycott of Free Childcare Scheme'. Retrieved 29 April 2007 from: www.radio.co.nz/news/latest/200704281414/parents_support_boycott_of_free_childcare_scheme.

Renwick, W (1978), 'Early Childhood Education: A Moving Frontier,' in B. O'Rourke and J. Clough (eds.), *Early Childhood in New Zealand Auckland*: Heinemann Educational Books, pp. 231-237

Reynolds, Arthur J. and Judy A. Temple (2006), 'Economic returns of investments in preschool education,' in E.F. Zigler, W.S. Gilliam and S.M. Jones (eds.), *A Vision for Universal Preschool Education*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37-68

Sheeran, Garry (2005), 'Kidicorp Growing Up Fast', *Sunday Star Times Business Section*, 20 November 2005, p.?

Smith, Anne (1978), 'The Case for Quality Day Care in New Zealand – Liberation of Children and Parents,' in B. O'Rourke and J. Clough (eds.), *Early Childhood in New Zealand Auckland*: Heinemann Educational Books, pp. 248-252

Statistics New Zealand (October 2007), 'Not Off the Press', Wellington: Statistics New Zealand

Stover, Sue (ed.) (1998) *Good Clean Fun: New Zealand's Playcentre Movement*, Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation

Stover, Sue (1998), 'The History and Significance of the Playcentre Movement', in Stover, Sue (ed.) *Good Clean Fun: New Zealand's Playcentre Movement*, Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation, pp. 1-21

Team Up (n.d.-a), 'About Early Years'. Retrieved 25 June 2008 from: <http://www.teamup.co.nz/earlyyears/about/About+early+childhood+education+services/Home+based+education.htm>.

Team Up (n.d.-b), 'ECE Listing'. Retrieved 25 June 2008 from: http://www.teamup.co.nz/earlyyears/about/ECE_Listing/default.htm?page=10.

Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust (n.d.), 'About Us'. Retrieved 20 June 2008 from: <http://www.kohanga.ac.nz/aboutus.html>.

Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa NZ Childcare Association (8 February 2007), '20 Hours Free Optimistic – New Survey, Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa NZ Childcare Association

Treasury (3 October 2003), 'Treasury Report: Options for ECE Funding – Meeting with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Social Development'.

Trevett, Claire (27 April 2007), 'Preschool plan "Dangerous"', *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved 29 April 2007 from : http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/1/story.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10436368.

Trevett, Claire (16 June 2007) 'Parents Told to Pay Extra or Lose Out' *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved 17 June 2007 from: http://www.nzherald.co.nz/category/story.cfm?c_id=35&objectid=1-446003.

Tu Tangata (1986), 'Kohanga Challenging Pre-School Movement,' *Tu Tangata*, 29, pp. 11-13

20 hours free please (1 June 2007), 'Blog Archive'. Retrieved August 19, 2007 from: <http://www.20hoursfree.blogspot.com>

Vercoe, Rachel (2007), 'Questions and Answers', *Iti Rearea*, Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa NZ Childcare Association. February, Issue 11, pp.?

Wells, Clare (1998), 'Future Directions: Shaping Early Childhood Education Policy for the 21st Century – A Personal Perspective', *New Zealand Review of Education Te Arotake A Tau O Te Ao O Te Matauranga I Aotearoa* 8, pp. 45-60

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1
Number of Early Childhood Education Services by Type of Service (1990, 1995, 2000 - 2007)

| TYPE OF SERVICE | YEAR | | | | | | | | | | % Change 1990 - 2007 | % Change 2003 - 2007 |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | | |
| <i>Licensed ECE services</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kindergarten | 575 | 591 | 600 | 603 | 606 | 609 | 614 | 618 | 619 | 618 | 7.5% | 1.5% |
| Playcentre | 621 | 562 | 517 | 503 | 492 | 482 | 481 | 482 | 474 | 466 | -25.0% | -3.3% |
| Education and care centres ¹ | 719 | 1,093 | 1,476 | 1,558 | 1,612 | 1,673 | 1,730 | 1,754 | 1,842 | 1,932 | 168.7% | 15.5% |
| Te Kōhanga Reo | 616 | 738 | 583 | 562 | 545 | 526 | 513 | 501 | 486 | 470 | -23.7% | -10.6% |
| Homebased networks | 40 | 112 | 180 | 184 | 194 | 190 | 192 | 201 | 202 | 227 | 467.5% | 19.5% |
| Correspondence School | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Casual-education and care | ... | 36 | 45 | 39 | 38 | 42 | 43 | 41 | 41 | 36 | N/A | -14.3% |
| Sub-total | 2,572 | 3,133 | 3,402 | 3,450 | 3,488 | 3,523 | 3,574 | 3,598 | 3,665 | 3,750 | 45.8% | 6.4% |
| <i>Licence-exempt groups</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Playgroups ³ | 192 | 473 | 592 | 561 | 541 | 562 | 599 | 641 | 667 | 608 | 216.7% | 8.2% |
| Ngā puna kōhungahunga ³ | ... | ... | ... | 20 | 24 | 32 | 43 | 49 | 41 | 30 | N/A | -6.3% |
| Pacific EC Groups ³ | 126 | 173 | 127 | 127 | 133 | 121 | 113 | 106 | 93 | 62 | -50.8% | -48.8% |
| Playcentres ^{3,4} | .. | 9 | 25 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 31 | 22 | 22 | N/A | -26.7% |
| Te Kōhanga Reo ² | .. | 36 | 29 | 24 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 7 | N/A | -41.7% |
| Sub-total | 318 | 691 | 773 | 763 | 740 | 757 | 800 | 838 | 831 | 729 | 129.2% | -3.7% |
| TOTAL | 2,890 | 3,824 | 4,175 | 4,213 | 4,228 | 4,280 | 4,374 | 4,436 | 4,496 | 4,479 | 55.0% | 4.6% |

¹ Includes Pre-School ECE classes held at State Primary and Private schools which were disestablished in January 1993.

² Information for 2004 is a snapshot of the last week in May. In 1999, 21 Te Kōhanga Reo were excluded from the total count.

³ Early Childhood Development (ECD) groups were integrated with the Ministry in October 2003. Data for July 2003 were collected by ECD. In 2003, six Pacific Groups were excluded from the total count.

⁴ Included in ECD Playgroup totals prior to 1995. In 1995, information was only available on nine (of 22) licence-exempt playcentres.

Source: Education Counts http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/data_collections/ece_staff_return.

Table 2
Number of Enrolments in Early Childhood Education by Type of Service 1995 and 2007

| TYPE OF SERVICE | 1995 | % of Sector | 2007 | % of Sector | % Change 1995-2007 |
|----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Kindergarten | 47,208 | 33% | 43,695 | 26% | -8% |
| Playcentre | 19,108 | 14% | 14,664 | 9% | -30% |
| Education and care centres | 53,769 | 38% | 91,733 | 54% | 41% |
| Te Kōhanga Reo | 14,015 | 10% | 9,236 | 5% | -52% |
| Homebased networks | 6,114 | 4% | 11,073 | 6% | 45% |
| Correspondence School | 901 | 1% | 737 | <1% | -22% |
| Total | 141,115 | 100% | 171,138 | 100% | 18% |

Source: Adapted from Early Childhood Enrolments Time Series Data, Sheet 7. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/data_collections/ece_staff_return.

Table 3
Children on the regular ECE roll as at 1 July 2007 by type of service, form of ownership, and age

| Service Type | | No. with Regular Roll | AGE at 1 July 2007 | | | | | | TOTAL | % of Roll |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | | Under 1 | 1 Year | 2 Years | 3 Years | 4 Years | 5 Years | | |
| Free Kindergarten | Community Based | 618 | 25 | 37 | 1221 | 16079 | 25973 | 360 | 43695 | 26% |
| Playcentre | Community Based | 465 | 1731 | 2891 | 3896 | 3590 | 2465 | 91 | 14664 | 9% |
| Education & Care Service | Community Based | 794 | 1422 | 5113 | 9006 | 11881 | 10307 | 443 | 38172 | 22% |
| | Privately Owned | 1133 | 2800 | 9247 | 13841 | 15387 | 11986 | 300 | 53561 | 31% |
| Homebased Network | Community Based | 83 | 284 | 915 | 994 | 889 | 616 | 39 | 3737 | 2% |
| | Privately Owned | 137 | 934 | 1828 | 1843 | 1452 | 1137 | 142 | 7336 | 4% |
| Te Kōhanga Reo | Community Based | 470 | 607 | 1751 | 2235 | 2351 | 2181 | 111 | 9236 | 5% |
| Correspondence School | Other | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 289 | 392 | 51 | 737 | 0% |
| TOTAL | | 3701 | 7803 | 21783 | 33040 | 51918 | 55057 | 1537 | 171138 | 100% |

Note: In 2007, data was not available for nine services (five Education & Care, three Homebased Network and one Playcentre). In addition, four licensed services were newly opened at the time of the census week and therefore had no enrolments. These services are excluded from the number of services with a Regular Roll. Excludes casual-education and care

Source: Data Management Unit, Ministry of Education

Table 4
Free ECE Funding Rates*

| | 2006 ECE Funding Subsidy rate (age 2 and over) | Free ECE Rate |
|---|---|---------------|
| All-day teacher-led, centre-based services | | |
| 100% registered teachers | \$6.00 | \$10.60 |
| 80-99% registered teachers | \$5.40 | \$9.87 |
| 50-79% registered teachers | \$4.41 | \$8.65 |
| 25-49% registered teachers | \$3.74 | \$7.83 |
| 0-24% registered teachers | \$3.36 | \$7.36 |
| Sessional teacher-led, centre-based services | | |
| 100% registered teachers | \$5.30 | \$6.32 |
| 80-99% registered teachers | \$4.32 | \$5.66 |
| 50-79% registered teachers | \$3.70 | \$4.90 |
| 25-49% registered teachers | \$3.29 | \$4.39 |
| 0-24% registered teachers | \$3.03 | \$4.09 |
| Protected rate (former Quality Rate) | \$3.26 | \$4.28 |
| Teacher-led, home-based early childhood services | | |
| Quality | \$3.77 | \$7.96 |
| Standard | \$3.33 | \$7.52 |
| Eligible Te Kōhanga Reo (except those recognised as teacher-led for funding) | | |
| Quality | \$3.48 | \$7.09 |
| Standard | \$3.05 | \$6.66 |

Source: Ministry of Education, Free ECE Funding Rates, December 2006.

* The funding rates were increased before the launch of 20 Hours Free ECE between \$.20 and \$.60 per hour.

APPENDICES

Appendix A - List of ECE Teacher Training Institutions

Diplomas:

- University of Auckland, Faculty of Education (ECE and with Pasifika specialisation)
- Auckland University of Technology (ECE Pasifika)
- Unitec Institute of Technology (ECE)
- Wintec – Waikato Institute of Technology (ECE)
- Waiariki Institute of Technology (ECE with Māori content)
- Eastern Institute of Technology (ECE)
- Open Polytechnic of New Zealand (ECE)
- University of Victoria, College of Education (ECE Māori)
- Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/New Zealand Childcare Association (ECE Pasifika)
- University of Canterbury, College of Education (ECE)
- New Zealand College of Early Childhood Education (ECE)*

Degrees in Bachelor of Education in Teaching:

- University of Auckland, Faculty of Education (ECE, Pasifika specialisations)
- Auckland University of Technology (ECE, Montessori, Steiner)
- Manukau Institute of Technology (ECE)
- Unitec Institute of Technology (ECE)
- University of Waikato School of Education (ECE)
- Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi (ECE in Māori language)
- Massey University, College of Education (ECE)
- Victoria University, College of Education (ECE, ECE specialisation)
- Whitireia Community Polytechnic (ECE)
- University of Canterbury, College of Education (ECE)
- University of Otago, College of Education (ECE)
- New Zealand Tertiary College (ECE)*
- Bethlehem Tertiary Institute (ECE)*

Graduate Diploma in Teaching:

- University of Auckland, Faculty of Education (ECE specialisation)
- University of Waikato School of Education (ECE)
- Massey University, College of Education (ECE)
- University of Victoria, College of Education (ECE Māori)
- University of Canterbury, College of Education (ECE)
- University of Otago, College of Education (ECE)
- Bethlehem Tertiary Institute (ECE)*

* These providers' students are not eligible for a TeachNZ scholarship.

Source: TeachNZ Akona a Aotearoa Education (2008), *Is There a Place for you in Early Childhood Education? Teacher Education Qualifications*, Wellington: Ministry of Education

Appendix B - Guide to the New Early Childhood Education Funding System

The funding review was published in June 2004 and reflected the cost-drivers approach discussed in early cabinet papers. The new system was implemented in April 2005 and provided a base rate common to all types of services (administration, educational resources, professional services, utilities) and a variable rate that takes into account the cost-drivers (operating, labour, property) for the different types of services. The new funding only affects the ECE Funding Subsidy and funding for license exempt playgroups, which accounted for 84 percent of ECE funding in 2003. Equity funding (2%), Discretionary Grants (2%), and the Childcare Subsidy through the Ministry of Social Development (12%) were not affected.²⁶² The new system continued to bulk fund on a per child per hour subsidy. It was intended to ensure that regulatory changes and increases in the cost of service delivery associated with the ECE strategic plan, would not lead to fee increases. This was important because the qualified teacher targets and other regulatory changes associated with the strategic plan would increase the costs of providing ECE for chartered ECE services, and would contribute to operating costs by paying for a part of each hour each child spends in ECE, up to a maximum of six hours per day and 30 hours per week.

The Working for Families package increased the amount paid in targeted childcare subsidies and the number of families able to receive them. This subsidy is limited to fee-charging services and available for 50 hours to parents who work or are in training or have a medical disability, and nine hours for other parents.

In addition the funding review included discussion of the Free ECE programme, to be created in 2007. Ministry of Education officials indicated that the funding review process was fully cognisant of Free ECE programme and developed a funding system that could accommodate the ECE Funding Subsidy and the Free ECE Programme.

The government pledged \$307 million in new ECE funding over a four-year period. Combined with the targeted ECE funding changes the sector received a significant funding increase.

Source: Ministry of Education (June 2004), *Guide to the Early Childhood Education Funding System: Implementing Pathways to the Future: Nga Huarahi Arataki*. Wellington: Ministry of Education

²⁶² Ministry of Education (June 2004)