TERTIARY EDUCATION UNION
Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa

Project Whitestreaming:

A report on the generalising of Māori specialist staff positions in the tertiary education sector

Prepared for the Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa

Helen Potter & Lee Cooper

March 2016

He tohu whakamaumahara tēnei pūrongo ki a

Whaea Mereiwa Broughton (1938-2016).

"Awhi atu, awhi mai, tātou, tātou e"

Aroha tino nui nā tō uniana, Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa.

Ko te whakapapa o tēnei tohu e pā atu ana ki te wai Māori, ki te puna waiora, ā, ko "Kōpua Kānapanapa" tōna ingoa. Koia te kaitiaki o tēnei pūrongo rangahau. Ko tēnei tōna whakataukī:

"Ahakoa tāku iti, he iti nō roto mai i te kōpua kānapanapa".

Ko Te Kanawa Ngarotata te ringatoi, he uri ia ō Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Porou,

me Ngāti Kahungunu.

Acknowledgements

The research team especially thanks the survey respondents and interview participants in the project for generously sharing their time and experiences. The project has been greatly enriched and strengthened by their contribution and kōrero. Mihia ki tēnā, ki tēnā o koutou i takoha mai i ō whakaaro, ō wheako; nā koutou te rangahau i hōhonu ai, i haumako ai hoki.

We also thank members of Te Toi Ahurangi, the TEU national Māori committee, for spearheading the commissioning of the project and their feedback and input into the report. Mihia ki a koutou ngā kaitautoko, ngā kaihāpai o te kaupapa mai i te tīmatatanga ki tōna whakamutunga.

We acknowledge, too, the invaluable support with the project provided by Cassandra Pierce (TEU), Jessica Hutchings (Te Wāhanga, New Zealand Council for Educational Research), and Kirikowhai Mikaere (independent kaupapa Māori statistician). Mihia ki ngā ringaringa raupā, mei kore ake koutou, ka kore ake te rangahau i rewaina.

Executive summary

This report presents the findings of a Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa (TEU) research project that sought to investigate "whitestreaming" in universities, and institutes of technology and polytechnics (ITPs), that is, where specialist Māori positions have been changed to generalist positions. In particular, the project sought to investigate whether whitestreaming has been a widespread practice across these institutions or whether it has been isolated to particular institutions and positions. The project also sought to investigate the impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students.

The project has been informed by a kaupapa Māori approach which is concerned with supporting Māori self-determination. As such, the report makes a number of recommendations for ways in which the TEU might support and contribute to the self-determination of their Māori members in their workplaces.

Background to the research

The objectives for this research were to generate evidence of whitestreaming, its drivers and wider impacts, and to use these findings to inform TEU policy development and its industrial relations strategy to address whitestreaming and its impacts on Māori staff in particular. The overarching research question was, "What whitestreaming practices have been happening in universities and ITPs and what have the impacts of it been?"

The project included a survey of 884 TEU Māori members and interviews with 17 Māori staff working, or previously working in, Māori positions to support the participation and achievement of Māori students in tertiary institutions.

The research team collected the survey data using survey monkey, and interview data using semi-structured interviews. The data was analysed according to themes identified during project hui. These themes came from the data and were informed by the expertise and experience of the research team. Further themes and insights emerged in the writing and feedback stages of the project.

Key findings

The main findings from the survey were that:

1. Whitestreaming has not been isolated to particular institutions or positions. Instead, since 2008 when the ring-fenced SSG Māori fund was superceded by a contestable, generalised equity fund, it has become a widespread practice across the tertiary sector – occurring in all eight universities, at least 13 of the 18 ITPs, and in one wānanga. It has also become a widespread practice across many different specialist Māori positions, and has been most prevalent in teaching, academic student support, pastoral student support, staff support, and research positions.

2. Whitestreaming has mostly been driven by departmental or institutional-wide reviews or restructures, and when institutions seek to cut their operational costs. In some cases it has happened as a result of Māori staff resignations, where vacated positions are simply not refilled. In some instances, no reasons have been given for whitestreaming changes.

3. The impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students have been overwhelmingly negative. The negative impacts on Māori staff have included a loss of collegiality, increased workload, decreased job satisfaction, with nearly half wanting to leave their job and work elsewhere. The negative impacts on Māori students have included being less likely to use student support services and leaving the institution altogether which, in turn, impacted negatively on Māori student achievement.

4. Māori staff who have been the most affected by whitestreaming have been academic staff employed on permanent, full-time contracts. Māori women aged over 35 years have also been the most affected by whitestreaming, reflecting the demographics of Māori in the tertiary sector in general.[1]

The main findings from the interviews were that:

1. Whitestreaming has not simply been a widespread practice across universities and ITPs nor confined to specialist Māori roles, but has also manifested in a multiplicity of ways from the disestablishment of positions and Māori teams and units, to the whitestreaming of kaupapa Māori pedagogies, course content and programmes, and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It signals the failure of many institutions to adequately invest in and implement their obligations to Māori under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

2. Whitestreaming has been driven by both financial reasons and by an ideology that posits whitestreaming as best-practice for Māori students, despite the now large body of evidence that demonstrates Māori student participation and success in tertiary education is best supported by culturally-specific recruitment initiatives, learning support services,

---

[1] As reflected in the TEU Māori membership database.

kaupapa-based teaching and learning approaches, and the inclusion of Māori curriculum content and programmes. Other, more covert drivers included a desire to promote a "one New Zealand" worldview, consistent with dominant racist discourses, and to rid institutions of Māori who challenged institutions to instead act in ways consistent with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

3. Processes to develop and implement whitestreaming were also found to be problematic, with no inclusion of Māori at the developmental stage of change and no or poor consultation processes once changes had been proposed. The interview findings also revealed the unsafe working conditions Māori staff often find themselves in when challenging whitestreaming practices, where they are often speaking out without the public support of other Māori staff who are fearful of making waves and losing their jobs. Māori leadership was generally found to be ineffective in preventing whitestreaming from taking place, partly because they too were isolated from institutional power bases, and sometimes because they were unwilling to challenge their senior managerial colleagues. These divisions had often caused tensions between Māori staff.

4. The impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff have also been negative and multiple with many experiencing uncertainty and stress, increased workloads, and a loss of autonomy, collegial support, and job satisfaction as a result – which has led to a large number of Māori staff resignations across institutions. In turn, the impact on Māori students has been significant, with a reduction in the availability of and access to quality kaupapa Māori-based learning support or learning approaches, and a subsequent reduction in their participation and learning achievement.

5. Instead of whitestreaming, the interview findings pointed to the need for greater institutional and government investment in and commitment to Māori student success and Māori staff more broadly. The vision for the future also included the transformation of institutional cultures and the existing power base through the development of Te Tiriti o Waitangi-based, power-sharing relationship arrangements with Māori.

Recommendations

The resesearch has generated a number of recommendations for ways in which the TEU might support and contribute to the self-determination of Māori tertiary staff in their workplaces:

1. Informed Māori staff:

   That the findings on whitestreaming be disseminated widely to TEU Māori members to ensure they are informed and aware of the ways in which whitestreaming occurs, both overtly via the whitestreaming of Māori positions, teams and units, initiatives, programmes, etc, and by stealth through incremental changes to job descriptions and when roles are changed or disestablished when Māori staff members resign. It is recommended that this work takes place throughout 2016.

2. Development of Māori staff rōpū and hui:

That the TEU works with Māori members to support the development of Māori staff rōpū and hui within institutions to strengthen communication and support networks to enable them to collectivise, strategise, and build the capacity to challenge whitestreaming practices. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

3. Professional development for Māori staff:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to increase and enhance the professional development opportunities for Māori staff, including for the development of strong and effective leadership and for career pathways and progression. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

4. Central role for Māori in decision-making:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to help develop power-sharing relationship arrangements with rūnanga of Māori staff, students and local iwi/hapū, requiring them to develop change proposals with Māori staff, students and local iwi/hapū, and where consent from such rūnanga is required for changes to be signed off. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

5. Processes for the appointment of senior Māori manager roles:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to embed processes for the appointment of senior Māori managerial staff, where Māori staff, students, and local iwi/hapū are involved in all aspects of such appointments to ensure a bold, pro-active person fills the role. This would extend to developing job descriptions, preparing advertising material, shortlisting and interviewing applicants, and determining who is appointed and the appointment process, including pōwhiri. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

6. Accountability mechanisms for senior Māori manager roles:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to develop robust accountability mechanisms for senior Māori managerial staff as part of their job descriptions, and for their offices. This would necessarily include attending regular separate and combined Māori staff and student hui. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

7. Support for senior Māori manager roles:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to ensure senior Māori manager roles have an appropriate level of financial and personnel support to carry out

their roles to develop and advance the aspirations and needs of Māori students, staff, and the communities the institution serves. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

8. Policy advocacy to government:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to urge government to increase support for Māori student learning, participation, and achievement, including by (1) setting numeric Māori staff targets, and (2) resourcing the targets by a specific funding mechanism.

1. Introduction

The project in brief

This report presents the findings of a Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa (TEU) research project that sought to investigate "whitestreaming" in universities, and institutes of technology and polytechnics (ITPs), that is, where specialist Māori positions have been changed to generalist positions. In particular, the project sought to investigate whether whitestreaming has been a widespread practice across these institutions or whether it has been isolated to particular institutions and positions. The project also sought to investigate the impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students.

The project has been informed by a kaupapa Māori approach which is concerned with supporting Māori self-determination. As such, the report makes a number of recommendations for ways in which the TEU might support and contribute to the self-determination of their Māori members in their workplaces.

Background to the project

Specialist Māori positions in universities and ITPs were originally created in response to the expectation that institutions should be actively working to support and increase the participation and achievement rates of Māori students. In addition to the establishment of specialist Māori staff positions in recruitment, teaching and/or student support teams, institutions thus variously adapted and/or developed course and programme offerings, built marae, set up Māori student spaces such as study rooms and student mentoring programmes, and so on. While different institutions developed different types or offered a different mix of support mechanisms, the overarching goal was to establish a clear Māori presence to make institutions more culturally-responsive to the learning needs of Māori students and impart a greater sense of comfort and belonging.

These initiatives were further supported by the introduction of a Special Supplementary Grant (SSG) Māori in 2001 to provide top-up funding to tertiary education institutions (TEIs) to help in developing Māori student support services, including the development of (additional) specialist Māori staff positions.[2] The establishment of these positions helped institutions comply with their Te Tiriti o Waitangi responsibilities to Māori by bringing about a specific focus on Māori student success that would be led and determined by Māori. In recent years, however, reviews and restructures at some institutions have resulted in some Māori specialist positions being reconfigured as generalist positions where the Māori focus of such roles has changed to that of

---

[2]   Ministry of Education (2001).

working with all students. The process of change has been termed by project team member, Margaret Taurere, as "whitestreaming".

Most recently, in 2015, Massey University and Unitec Institute of Technology have tabled proposals to whitestream specialist Māori positions.[3] The Massey University proposal seeks to whitestream and disestablish roles in Māori student recruitment at the Palmerston North and Wellington campuses in order to create a "more focused and agile team" and support the institution's plan to transfer recruitment resources to the Albany campus as part of their Grow North strategy.[4] The Unitec proposal seeks to "redesign" the provision of services to Māori students through the establishment of a Priority Groups Centre of Excellence for Māori, Pacific, International, and students aged under 25 years, where student support staff positions will be generalised and where there will be little or no specialist support in place for Māori students as a result. The rationale for change is that convergence will raise the visibility, status, and impact of the service, and that convergence is a positive development because the learning approaches that work for Māori students have been identified as important to all students.[5]

The impetus for the research project came from Te Toi Ahurangi and the TEU wanting to know if whitestreaming was happening more widely in other universities and ITPs. They also wanted to identify and generate evidence of the different ways in which whitestreaming was happening, the drivers for it, and the impacts of whitestreaming practices on Māori staff and students. A key concern for Te Toi Ahurangi and the TEU was that whitestreaming was having significant and detrimental impacts on Māori staff and students, as reported to them by their Māori members. Many Māori staff were struggling to continue to provide culturally-safe and -responsive recruitment services and support to Māori students in the face of the reduction or removal of such support mechanisms, which was leading to Māori staff burn-out and resignations. As such, a key objective for the research project was to generate a body of evidence to inform TEU policy development and its industrial relations strategy to better enable them to address whitestreaming practices and its impacts.

Policy context

In 2002, the government released the first tertiary education strategy which included enhanced educational outcomes for Māori students as a specific strategic priority.[6] Subsequent tertiary and Māori education strategies have continued to prioritise raising Māori participation and achievement rates.[7] These strategies recognise that both government and TEIs need to do more to

---

[3] Massey University (2015, 7 September) and Unitec (2015, August).

[4] Massey University (2015, 7 September).

[5] Unitec (2015, August, pp. 42-43, 70-71, 88).

[6] Ministry of Education (2002a).

[7] See: Ministry of Education (2007), Ministry of Education (2009), Ministry of Education (2010), and Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2014).

increase Māori achievement rates in general, and Māori participation rates in degree-level qualifications and higher.

Introduced in 2001, and foreshadowing the government's subsequent strategic focus on increasing Māori participation and achievement in tertiary education, SSG Māori funding was a mechanism to specifically improve Māori participation, retention, and completion rates by providing institutions with Māori EFTS-based top-up funding to help resource Māori student support initiatives, including to increase or create Māori staffing positions. A key feature of the SSG Māori was that institutions were required to consult with Māori staff, students, and communities in establishing how the fund was to be used.[8] A Ministry of Education review of the SSG Māori completed in 2003 showed that the fund had made an important difference for Māori students, and that targeting a specific pool of money aimed at increasing Māori student success was one of its major benefits.[9] While singular Māori and Pacific teams, offices, and programmes and initiatives have developed at some institutions, the 2003 review of the SSG fund also found that the development of SSG-funded initiatives needed to take into account that the needs of Māori and Pacific students were different and distinct.[10]

The government's approach to supporting Māori achievement has also included investment into the research and dissemination of best practice examples of support for Māori students.[11] To date, a significant body of research has been developed and disseminated which, collectively, has underscored the critical importance of culturally-specific "by Māori, for Māori" student support services, kaupapa Māori-based pedagogical approaches, and the inclusion of Māori curriculum content and programmes for Māori student participation and success in tertiary education.[12]

Despite the success of the SSG Māori funding mechanism in fostering Māori student success through helping fund Māori student support initiatives, and the importance of it being a ring-fenced fund, the government announced in 2005 that the SSG Māori fund would be discontinued from 2008. From 2008, supplementary funding to improve Māori participation and achievement would instead be provided to institutions as a generalised equity fund where institutions would determine their own appropriate target groups on the basis of socio-economic disadvantage.[13] The change to a non-ring-fenced fund essentially made the funding contestable, with Māori having to compete for funding as one 'special interest' group with others. The change has arguably contributed to the development of a whitestreaming, generalist approach as TEIs are no longer required to have a designated spend from their equity funding on Māori student support.

---

8   Ministry of Education (2001, p. 86).
9   Ministry of Education (2003, p. 90).
10 Ministry of Education (2004, p. 178).
11 Ministry of Education (2002b, p. 66).
12 See for example, Chauvel & Rean (2012), Curtis et al (2012), Greenwood & Te Aika (2008), May (2009), McMurchy-Pilkington (2011), Phillips & Mitchell (2010), Ross (2010), Tahau-Hodges (2010), Taurere (2010), Van der Meer et al (2010), and Williams (2011).
13 Ministry of Education (2006, p. 224).

The government's Māori Education Strategy, *Ka Hikitia*, stated that the application of the Treaty confers a duty on the Ministry of Education "to ensure the position of Māori is considered fairly when developing tertiary education policies and funding".[14] While the SSG Māori was not designed or promoted as a Te Tiriti o Waitangi-based funding initiative, it would seem that this duty was not adequately considered in the decision to change the SSG Māori fund to a generalised equity fund.

TEIs also have a duty under Te Tiriti o Waitangi to ensure Māori participation and achievement in tertiary education is supported and appropriately invested in, reflected in section 181(b) and (c) of the *Education Act 1989*. As such, the SSG Māori fund and the new equity fund are supplementary to the larger investment TEIs should be making into Māori student success. Indeed, the government's most recent tertiary education strategy states that increasing Māori student achievement is a particular priority focus for 2014-19, with the expectation that TEIs will invest in building on existing good practice and continuing successful policies and initiatives.[15] The strategy document makes very clear that best practice and success for Māori is tied to culturally-responsive provision in recruitment, student learning support, teaching practices, and programme content and delivery.[16]

Investing in and bedding down institutional best practice for Māori student participation and success is especially important in light of the fact that the Māori population is growing faster than New Zealand's population as a whole. It is estimated to nearly double in number by 2038 so that Māori will make up a significantly larger share of the population in the future.[17]

Overview of the research activities

The project included a survey of 884 TEU Māori members to which 242 responded, making the results statistically valid with a 90% degree of certainty.[18] The project also included 17 interviews with Māori staff working, or previously working in, Māori positions to support the participation and achievement of Māori students in tertiary institutions.

Research question and objectives

The research objectives were to:

- Determine whether whitestreaming was widespread across universities and ITPs;

- Identity and generate evidence of whitestreaming practices and the drivers for it;

---

[14] Ibid, p. 14.

[15] Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2014, p. 8).

[16] Ibid, p. 13.

[17] http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/NationalEthnicPopulationProjections_HOTP2013-38.aspx.

[18] www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size

- Identify and generate evidence of the impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students; and

- Use these findings and evidence to inform TEU policy development and its industrial relations strategy to address whitestreaming and its impacts.

The overarching research question was, "What whitestreaming practices have been happening in universities and ITPs and what have the impacts of it been?"

Kaupapa Māori methodological framework

The research project has been informed by and conducted within a kaupapa Māori methodological framework, which is necessarily grounded in a Māori worldview. This approach takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori me onā tikanga, and is located within a wider context of tino rangatiratanga, Māori self-determination. As such, working within a kaupapa Māori methodological framework places an onus on researchers to work in ways which are consistent with "being Māori", and for the research work to generate positive benefits for Māori.[19]

Research whānau

Participants

TEU Māori members were invited to participate in the project survey which was designed to: ascertain the prevalence of whitestreaming in universities and ITPs; identify key drivers for whitestreaming; identify the key impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students; and to identify which Māori staff have been most affected by it.

17 interview participants who work, or have previously worked in, a range of universities and ITPs were selected by the project team to generate in-depth data on: the ways in which whitestreaming has been happening in their institutions; the drivers of whitestreaming; the processes of change involved; and the impacts on Māori staff and students.

Research team

The research team consisted of four TEU staff members (Lee Cooper who was project leader, Jo Scott, Sharn Riggs, and Sandra Grey), a TEU Māori member in an advisory capacity (Margaret Taurere), and a contract researcher (Helen Potter) to undertake the interviews, analysis, and drafting of the research report.

Research team members contributed feedback to the draft report, and so too did members of Te Toi Ahurangi. Interview participants were also sent a copy of the draft report, and some contributed feedback which is incorporated here.

---

[19] Bishop (1996), Irwin (1994), Jackson (2011), and Smith, L. T. (1999).

How the data were gathered

Survey data was collected using survey monkey. Members were given 10 working days to respond to the survey.

Interview data was collected using semi-structured interviews, and were conducted either kanohi-ki-te-kanohi or over the telephone. Interview participants were first approached by the project leader who invited them to participate.

Analysis

The data was analysed according to themes identified during project hui. These themes came from the data and were informed by the expertise and experience of the research team. Further themes and insights emerged in the writing and feedback stages of the project.

2. Survey results

This section outlines the results of the whitestreaming survey undertaken by TEU Māori members. The results report on: the prevalence of whitestreaming in universities and ITPs, and which staffing positions have been most affected; the key drivers of whitestreaming; the key impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students; and which Māori staff have been most affected by whitestreaming.

Prevalence of whitestreaming

41.73%, or 101 of the 242 participants in the survey said that whitestreaming was happening in their institution.

Of the 242 survey participants, 57 (23.55%) said they have had their positions whitestreamed. Of those 57 participants:

- 24.56% have had their positions changed from a sole focus on Māori to a focus on Māori and Pacific;

- 26.32% have had their positions changed from a sole focus on Māori to a focus on Māori and others;

- 19.30% have had their positions changed from a sole focus on Māori to a focus on all; and

- 29.82% have had their positions changed from a part focus on Māori to a focus on all.

Of those who have experienced whitestreaming, almost all (93.33%) of the whitestreaming has taken place since 2008 when the ring-fenced SSG Māori fund was superceded by a contestable, generalised equity fund. Most (86.66%) has taken place since 2011, and 38.33% of whitestreaming took place in 2015.

Of those who have had their positions whitestreamed, two-thirds (68.42%) were aware it was also happening elsewhere in their institution.

In addition to this, a further 44 (19.00%) participants said that while whitestreaming had not happened to their position, they were aware of it happening elsewhere in their institution.

Thus, in total, 101 (41.73%) participants in the survey said that whitestreaming was happening in their institution. Of these 101 participants, 18.81% said whitestreaming had happened a lot in their institution and 63.37% said it had happened to some Māori positions. 59 (26.70%) of all survey participants said they did not know if whitestreaming was happening in their institution or not.

Whitestreaming across institutions

TEU Māori members employed in all eight universities participated in the survey. The survey results showed that whitestreaming has occurred in all of the universities.

TEU Māori members employed in 14 of the 18 ITPs participated in the survey. The results showed that whitestreaming has occurred in 13 of the 14 ITPs represented in the survey.

TEU Māori members employed in the wānanga sector also responded to the survey. The results showed that whitestreaming has also occurred in one of the two wānanga represented in the survey.

The project did not specifically include wānanga as it was assumed, erroneously, that such changes would not occur there. A further investigation into whitestreaming in wānanga may thus be warranted.

Whitestreaming across staffing positions

The survey results showed that whitestreaming has happened across a wide range of Māori staff positions, including those in the areas of student support, recruitment, staff support, management, administration, teaching, and research.

The positions that have been most affected by whitestreaming have been in: teaching (20.69%); academic student support (18.39%); pastoral student support (16.10%), staff support (13.79%), research (10.34%), and student recruitment (5.75%).

Drivers of whitestreaming

The survey results showed that the key drivers for whitestreaming were:

- Departmental reviews or restructures (52.56%);

- Institutional-wide reviews or restructures (47.44%);

- Staff resignations / vacant positions not filled (34.62%);

- Cost-cutting measure (32.05%);

- Loss of direct funding e.g. research grant (12.82%);

- No reason given (12.82%); and

- Response to staff/student feedback (8.97%).

Impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students

84.34% of survey participants responding to the question on whether whitestreaming had had a positive or negative impact on Māori staff and students said it had had a negative (55.42%) or somewhat negative impact (28.92%).

Impacts on Māori staff

Of those survey participants responding to the question on whether whitestreaming had affected them, 81.48% said it had affected them in a range of negative ways. The negative impacts were:

- 60.32% had experienced a loss of collegial support;

- 53.97% had an increased workload;

- 49.21% had experienced a loss of job satisfaction;

- 44.44% wanted to leave their job and work elsewhere; and

- 19.05% felt they were less well equipped for their new role.

Some (17.46%) also noted their concerns about the diminished support they were now able to give to Māori students, and the marginalisation and isolation experienced as a result of whitestreaming.

Impacts on Māori students

Of those survey participants responding to the question on the impacts whitestreaming has had on Māori students, 53.10% said it has, or would have, a negative impact on Māori student participation and achievement in some way.[20] 39.31% said it had had no impact on Māori students.

Of those survey participants who said whitestreaming has, or would have, a negative impact, the negative impacts were:

- Māori students were less likely to use student support services (58.44%);

- Māori students' grades and pass rates had decreased (37.66%); and

- Māori students had left the institution or enrolled elsewhere (29.87%).

---

[20] This result is quite different to that found in the earlier question on whether whitestreaming would have a positive or negative impact on Māori staff and students, where 84.34% of survey participants said it had had a negative impact. However, the raw figures are not that different. 70 survey participants said that whitestreaming would have a negative impact on Māori staff and students, and 77 participants listed negative impacts on Māori students in response to the student specific question. The difference stems from the fact that nearly twice as many survey participants responded to the Māori student question than the earlier question on Māori staff and students (145 compared with 81).

A further 18.18% said that because whitestreaming changes had yet to take place, they were unable to comment on actual negative impacts, but said they anticipated the changes would have a negative impact on Māori student learning success.

Māori staff most affected by whitestreaming

Conditions of employment

Of those experiencing whitestreaming, more than two-thirds (69.23%) have been academic staff.

Most (82.69%) of those experiencing whitestreaming have been permanent, full-time members of staff.

Gender and age

Over two-thirds (72.00%) of those who have experienced whitestreaming have been Māori women.

Almost all (96.00%) whitestreaming has happened to Māori staff aged 35 years and over. Of those experiencing whitestreaming, nearly half have been aged 35-49 years while just over half have been aged 50 years and over.

Summary of survey results

The survey results have clearly shown that whitestreaming has not been isolated to particular institutions or positions. Instead, since 2008 when the ring-fenced SSG Māori fund was superceded by a contestable, generalised equity fund, it has become a widespread practice across the tertiary sector – occurring in all eight universities, at least 13 of the 18 ITPs, and in one wānanga. It is also been a widespread practice across many different specialist Māori positions, and has been most prevalent in teaching, academic student support, pastoral student support, staff support, and resesarch positions.

The survey results have also shown that whitestreaming has mostly been driven by departmental or institutional-wide reviews or restructures, and when institutions seek to cut their operational costs. In some cases it has happened as a result of Māori staff resignations, where vacated positions are simply not refilled. In some instances, no reasons have been given for whitestreaming changes.

The impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff and students were considered by nearly all survey participants to be negative. The negative impacts on Māori staff included a loss of collegiality, increased workload, decreased job satisfaction, with nearly half wanting to leave their job and work elsewhere. The negative impacts on Māori students included being less likely to use student support services and leaving the institution altogether which, in turn, impacted negatively on Māori student achievement.

Māori staff who have been the most affected by whitestreaming have been academic staff employed on permanent, full-time contracts. Māori women aged over 35 years have also been the most affected by whitestreaming, reflecting the demographics of Māori in the tertiary sector in general.[21]

---

[21] As reflected in the TEU Māori membership database.

3. Interview findings

This section outlines the findings of interviews undertaken with Māori staff who work, or have worked in, a range of universities and ITPs. The findings report on: the multiplicity of ways in which whitestreaming has been happening in institutions; the drivers of whitestreaming; the processes of change involved in whitestreaming; and the impacts of it on Māori staff and students.

Whitestreaming practices

Whitestreaming of Māori positions, teams and units

Interview participants talked of the many ways in which Māori specialist positions had been or were being whitestreamed. For many, the Māori focus of such positions had changed from a sole- or part-focus on Māori to include a focus on all, or all "equity groups" in general[22] – particularly in the areas of Māori student recruitment, faculty-based teaching support and support services more widely. For some, whitestreaming had involved the disestablishment of specialist and autonomous "by Māori, for Māori" teams and units and the integration of their specialist Māori positions into generalist teams, and in one instance, whitestreaming had been preceded by the removal of the Māori studies department at their institution. In another instance, whitestreaming had happened by attrition, where the Māori student support space had been underfunded to the point of no longer holding any significant relevance for Māori students. In yet another instance, specialist Māori roles had been filled by non-Māori.

In some cases, whitestreaming had included the disestablishment of some Māori specialist positions, and where specialist Māori positions were turned into generalist positions when Māori staff vacated such roles. A number of interview participants also talked of a more generalised failure of their institution to invest in increasing the number of Māori teaching staff, particularly at the senior level, and in Māori student support roles, despite stated institutional commitments to do so.

Indeed, the new institutional focus on "equity for all" meant there was no longer any particular focus on Māori. Working with Māori could no longer be taken for granted, with Māori staff now having to negotiate working with Māori students or other Māori staff. The subsequent loss in autonomy had meant significantly more institutional interference in their roles, with institutions determining the approach to be taken rather than Māori staff. As such, many of those interviewed said that whitestreaming had re-positioned Māori as one "special-interest" equity group amongst many rather than as a Te Tirtiti partner, and thus significantly eroded implementation of their institution's Te Tiriti o Waitangi responsibilities and commitments to Māori.

---

[22] Equity groups variously include Māori, Pacific, students with disabilities, students aged under 25 years, and students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds.

For all of those interviewed, whitestreaming had not been a one-off event. Instead, it was seen as an on-going process that had been happening over a number of years. Many of the interview participants anticipated further whitestreaming changes at their institutions.

> *"Management want more whitestreaming. They want to get rid of all Māori equity initiatives and whitewash the lot, while Māori staff are fighting for autonomous Māori positions."*

Whitestreaming of institutional marae

In some instances, interview participants said that whitestreaming had also extended to institutional marae. This included a change to marae being managed by institutions' managerial services rather than by Māori staff or Māori Studies, and where the function of marae had or was changing to more of a commercial conference centre than the focal point for Māori students and staff and communities to gather and be Māori.

Whitestreaming of Māori pedagogies

Many of the interview participants talked of the whitestreaming of kaupapa Māori pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning, including the whitestreaming of kaupapa Māori student mentoring programmes and initiatives. One key way in which this had happened was via the transfer of a kanohi-ki-te-kanohi approach to an on-line approach, both in teaching and in student learning support. Many interview participants talked of a generalised institutional push for less contact with Māori students, or where whitestreaming had reduced or removed their capacity for relationship-building with Māori students. Others said that kaupapa Māori student mentoring programmes and initiatives had been disestablished, or were under review, because of a lack of institutional commitment and investment into them.

Whitestreaming of a Māori worldview

A number of the interview participants talked specifically about the whitestreaming of mātauranga Māori and te reo Māori me onā tikanga in the content of courses and programmes of study at their institutions, and of the failure of their institutions to invest in the capability of their faculties to appropriately provide for and support the learning aspirations and needs of Māori students, such as those wanting to submit assignments and thesis work in te reo Māori.

> *"The teaching programme does nothing to enhance the knowledge Māori students come in with and it is soul destroying to see."*

This failure to invest in Māori also extended to a failure to invest in the professional development aspirations and needs of Māori staff.

More widely, other interview participants talked of the lack of institutional understanding or commitment to a kaupapa Māori approach and what that entails to properly support Māori students to reach their full potential, and that there was no flexibility to recognise a Māori

worldview. This lack of understanding had meant there was often a lack of recognition of the range of skills, both academic and cultural, that were needed in Māori specialist positions, which resulted in them being underpaid as a result – and, in some instances, less equitably than general student support and teaching staff.

As a consequence, many of the interview participants saw whitestreaming not as a new practice per se, but as an embedded institutional norm to maintain colonial power over Māori that needed to be constantly fought against and challenged. Instead of a Te Tiriti-based relationship where Māori would be in a determining role for Māori, interview participants said that institutions wanted to assume full control of things Māori and for it to fit with their worldview.

Whitestreaming of Te Tiriti o Waitangi

When talking about their institutions' commitment to and implementation of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, all of the interview participants said they were tokenistic at best or that it was ignored or sidelined altogether, particularly at senior management levels where buy-in was seen as critical to promote investment in Māori student success and Māori staff development. As such, Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations and responsibilities to Māori had not featured or been considered in any whitestreaming changes or in any proposal documents.

> *"The institution has lost all focus on Te Tiriti. It's very much a white institution for white students that tinkers on the edges for Māori."*

Interview participants said that whitestreaming had also led to a reduction in a Te Tiriti focus at their institutions as whitestreaming had led to less Māori staff numbers in general to drive and fight for it.

> *"If you get rid of the Māori staff who challenge the institution to be consistent with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, you don't have to recognise it."*

Māori and Pacific

None of the interview participants raised the development of collective Māori and Pacific teams, offices, and student support programmes and initiatives as an issue, although one saw the development of a shared Māori and Pacific space as a precursor to whitestreaming. Indeed, one interview participant said he had deliberately bought Pacific students under the Māori office because they were not being well served under the institution's generalist approach.

Drivers of whitestreaming

Reasons for change

In the main, interview participants said that whitestreaming changes have been part of institutional-wide or departmental reviews and restructures. Many said the reviews and restructures were driven by the need for some form of cost-cutting or efficiency measures, and

particularly in light of the financial pressures being faced by some institutions, but questioned why Māori were often the first to be targeted to reduce costs.

Many also said that whitestreaming was driven and justified by a clear shift in the ideological approach to equity. Instead of a focus on Māori students and other groups of students as distinct groups, with Māori positioned as a partner to Te Tiriti, the new ideological approach focused on equity for all students as a collective. The view here is that Māori student learning and support can be successfully undertaken by generalist positions, which justifies removing or reducing the number of specialist Māori positions. This is despite the wealth of evidence that has underscored the critical importance of culturally-specific "by Māori, for Māori" student support services, pedagogical approaches, and learning environments to Māori student success.[23]

Some interview participants also said that whitestreaming had been driven by a desire for Māori teams and units to share their successful kaupapa Māori-based practices within generalist teams for the benefit of all students, but that this change had not been followed by any commitment to ensuring these practices were maintained in generalised teams and units. Indeed, in some instances the kaupapa-based practices that generated their success with students was cut from their roles.

Wider reasons for change

Many of the interview participants talked of other, more covert reasons for whitestreaming, where it was driven by a desire to rid the institution of anything Māori, and instead present and promote a "one New Zealand" approach consistent with dominant racist discourses.

> *The institution views itself as innovative, but it's just following others and the trend at the moment is to get rid of Māori roles and staff. They're buying into the politics of the day."*

Some of the interview participants felt that this racism had taken the form of professional jealousy, where those Māori staff, who in expressing their rangatiratanga and achieving success for Māori students and themselves in terms of professional development, needed to be reined in. Others said it reflected a corporatised approach where institutions did not want to invest in or attract Māori students, just those who would be low-risk and low-cost, high achievers.

A number of interview participants also said that a key driver behind restructures and reviews was to target the disestablishment of roles held by Māori staff the institution found too challenging in terms of their advocacy for kaupapa and tikanga Māori, and consistency with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

---

[23] See for example, Chauvel & Rean (2012), Curtis et al (2012), Greenwood & Te Aika (2008), May (2009), McMurchy-Pilkington (2011), Phillips & Mitchell (2010), Ross (2010), Tahau-Hodges (2010), Taurere (2010), Van der Meer et al (2010), and Williams (2011).

Process of whitestreaming changes

Consultation processes

Some interview participants said that whitestreaming was often introduced without any formal consultation process, with one noting that changes were sometimes subtle, where incremental changes were made to job descriptions, so that many people did not know whitestreaming was happening. Others noted that Māori staff, including senior Māori staff, were excluded from involvement in developing change proposals and discussing and canvassing options other than whitestreaming. Many said that, once tabled, there was no capacity for Māori staff to have input into whitestreaming changes proposals outside of formal submission processes.

Many also commented on the poor handling by management of whitestreaming changes, where Māori staff were isolated and ostracised, where there were no meetings or discussions of what was to happen, and where the outcome of planned changes, including the disestablishment of roles, were kept under wraps.

Unsafe working environments

Many of the interview participants talked about the difficulties they encountered in challenging whitestreaming practices. Those who directly questioned or challenged whitestreaming were often sidelined and excluded, and many felt speaking out put them in an unsafe position where they were labelled as radical and problematic. They said that, in general, Māori staff were in a very unsafe position to be able to speak up and assert their Māoritanga or rangatiratanga, or provide ideas and advice due to the threat of job loss. Some of the interview participants said that their speaking out about whitestreaming practices had directly contributed to their roles being whitestreamed (disestablished).

> *"The only way we are liked is to be invisible as a Māori."*

Many of the interview participants said the unsafe working environment and the constant threat of whitestreaming meant that many Māori staff did not speak up against whitestreaming practices or advocate for other Māori staff and students, including Māori managers of Māori staff, as they did not want to make waves and "end up on the chopping block themselves". A number of interview participants said this had caused significant tension between Māori staff. Some also noted that institutions limited Māori power by placing it in a small number of people and in limited spaces, and that this excluded other Māori staff from involvement in decision-making and advocacy for Māori, and was a further source of tension between Māori staff.

Māori leadership

Some of the interview participants said that some whitestreaming proposals have been able to be countered or lessened due to strong and fearless Māori leadership at the institutional or faculty level. These Māori leaders and senior managers had fostered strong relationships with other Māori and non-Māori institutional and faculty staff and managers which generated buy-in to fight

whitestreaming, and had had the ability to generate strong evidence of the success of their programmes and initiatives for Māori students.

For many, however, ineffective or complicit Māori leadership has meant that whitestreaming has been able to progress unabated. Some of the interview participants said that Māori leaders or senior managers in their institutions had tried to prevent or challenge whitestreaming but had also been sidelined or ignored as they did not have a sufficient power base or support at the senior level to do so. Others said Māori leaders or senior managers were unwilling to challenge institutional cultures and transform the existing power base because they did not want to get off-side with their Pākehā colleagues, were more interested in maintaining their status position, or were also fearful of losing their jobs. Others said that institutions were quite deliberate in appointing, or attempting to appoint, Māori leaders or senior managers that they could "manage" and who would not challenge, or not have the capability or knowledge to challenge, whitestreaming practices.

A number of interview participants said that whitestreaming had been pushed through when Māori leadership or senior management roles had been left vacant.

> *"Whitestreaming is a default position for the institution unless there is a person in the senior role to hold the line."*

Impacts on Māori staff

Uncertainty and stress

All of the interview participants talked of the uncertainty and stress that whitestreaming causes for Māori staff, and where the lack of job security made it difficult to plan for work and personal lives – all of which takes a toll on health and wellbeing. One interview participant said that no new initiatives for Māori students had been able to be introduced during their institutions long and drawn-out whitestreaming review process. Whitestreaming is often experienced as an exhausting and demoralising process, not just because the changes are sometimes long and drawn out, but also because of the time and energy required to fight against the constant threat of it.

Loss of autonomy

Many of the interview participants said that whitestreaming had resulted in a loss of autonomy over their work, where generalist managers determined the scope of their work, including the way in which Māori staff work with Māori students and run Māori events. In the face of contestable equity funding, working with Māori students was no longer a given but instead had to be constantly negotiated and fought for.

Loss of collegial support

Interview participants said that whitestreaming had resulted in a significant loss of collegial support, particularly for those Māori staff who had moved from Māori teams and units into generalist teams and units. This arose from a lack of unity in generalist teams/units where work spaces were characterised by competition and fragmentation, and where Māori staff were marginalised and subjected to increased monitoring, unreasonable expectations, harassment, bullying, and racism by non-Māori managers and colleagues. No value was placed on whakawhanaungatanga, and team morale had significantly reduced as a result – with some saying it was now non-existent.

Whitestreaming has also impacted negatively on the kotahitanga between Māori staff. Tensions and divisions have arisen both in the face of job insecurity, and because of frustrations that some Māori staff and managers have been unwilling to challenge whitestreaming practices or have been seen to be complicit in them.

Increased workload

Many interview participants said that whitestreaming had, or would increase already high workloads. This has been exacerbated by vacated Māori staff roles which have not been refilled. One Māori lecturer said that with so few Māori staff in their faculty it was not possible to take sabbatical leave and progress their own research work. Many also said that increased workloads meant much less time to spend with Māori students.

Other interview participants said that the time taken to challenge whitestreaming practices had also increased their workloads, taking time away from their own roles and from their focus on Māori students.

Loss of job satisfaction

Many of the interview participants also said they had experienced a loss of job satisfaction as a result of whitestreaming. While their impetus for working in a Māori specialist position was to work "for the kaupapa" and the advancement of Māori as a people, whitestreaming had thwarted that ambition. Some said their institutions were now unsafe, undermining places in which to work.

> *"I had so much fire and passion for the role when I started, and now it's been extinguished."*

Resignation

These negative impacts of whitestreaming, either singularly or collectively, have led to a large number of Māori staff resigning their positions and leaving their institutions. Some interview participants talked about the detrimental impact this had had on institutional capability for Māori.

> *"Whitestreaming is not fair and it's not just. It shows that Māori are not in a good place in the tertiary sector."*

Impacts on Māori students

Reduced access to kaupapa Māori-based student support

Most interview participants talked of the negative impacts of whitestreaming on the availability and quality of student support services for Māori, where there was, or would be, an absence of the kanohi-ki-te-kanohi, culturally-specific support services and learning approaches that were known to be critical for Māori student success.

> *"They will no longer have the cultural-based support they can relate to. They'll no longer have specialist staff who can understand them."*

Many said that whitestreaming meant they had much less time to spend with Māori students, which also impacted negatively on the quality of the support they received. Other interview participants said that without Māori specific support structures that Māori students would be much less likely to seek out and receive support.

> *"It is difficult to see how tauira will be supported in the new structure, and have a space in which to be Māori and feel confident in their learning."*

Reduction in Māori student participation and achievement

Many of the interview participants also said that Māori student participation and achievement in their institutions had or would suffer as a result of whitestreaming.

A vision for the future

Many of the interview participants said there needed to be much greater institutional and government investment in and commitment to Māori more broadly, to whakamana and build up: kaupapa Māori-based recruitment initiatives, and student support services and units; kaupapa Māori-based approaches to teaching and learning; and Māori curriculum content and programmes of study, including mātauranga Māori and te reo Māori me onā tikanga. They also wanted to see increased numbers of Māori staff at TEIs and investment into their professional development, including for the development of strong and effective leadership and for career pathways and progression.

The vision for the future also included the transformation of institutional cultures and the existing power base through the development of Te Tiriti o Waitangi-based, power-sharing relationship arrangements with Māori.

Summary of interview findings

The interview findings clearly show that whitestreaming has not simply been a widespread practice across universities and ITPs or confined to specialist Māori roles, but has also manifested in a multiplicity of ways from the disestablishment of positions and Māori teams and units, to the

whitestreaming of kaupapa Māori pedagogies, course content and programmes, and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It signals the failure of many institutions to adequately invest in and implement their obligations to Māori under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

The interview findings also show that whitestreaming has been driven by both financial reasons and by an ideology that posits whitestreaming as best-practice for Māori students, despite the now large body of evidence that demonstrates Māori student participation and success in tertiary education is best supported by culturally-specific recruitment initiatives, learning support services, kaupapa-based teaching and learning approaches, and the inclusion of Māori curriculum content and programmes. Other, more covert drivers included a desire to promote a "one New Zealand" worldview, consistent with dominant racist discourses, and to rid institutions of Māori who challenged institutions to instead act in ways consistent with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Processes to develop and implement whitestreaming were also found to be problematic, with no inclusion of Māori at the developmental stage of change and no or poor consultation processes once changes had been proposed. The interview findings also revealed the unsafe working conditions Māori staff often find themselves in when challenging whitestreaming practices, where they are often speaking out without the public support of other Māori staff who are fearful of making waves and losing their jobs. Māori leadership was generally found to be ineffective in preventing whitestreaming from taking place, partly because they too were isolated from institutional power bases, and sometimes because they were unwilling to challenge their senior managerial colleagues. These divisions had often caused tensions between Māori staff.

The impacts of whitestreaming on Māori staff have also been negative and multiple with many experiencing uncertainty and stress, increased workloads, and a loss of autonomy, collegial support, and job satisfaction as a result – which has led to a large number of Māori staff resignations across institutions. In turn, the impact on Māori students has been significant, with a reduction in the availability of and access to quality kaupapa Māori-based learning support or learning approaches, and a subsequent reduction in their participation and learning achievement.

Instead of whitestreaming, the interview findings pointed to the need for greater institutional and government investment in and commitment to Māori student success and Māori staff more broadly. The vision for the future also included the transformation of institutional cultures and the existing power base through the development of Te Tiriti o Waitangi-based, power-sharing relationship arrangements with Māori.

4. Discussion and recommendations

Concluding discussion

The survey results and interview findings clearly show that whitestreaming has and is occuring widely throughout universities and ITPs, and in a multiplicity of ways in a multiplicity of specialist Māori positions, with a host of detrimental impacts on Māori staff and students as a result. Whitestreaming has been enabled by the shift from a ring-fenced SSG Māori funding mechanism to a contestable, generalised equity funding mechanism in 2008, and by a marked reduction in institutional commitment to and investment in cultural responsiveness as critical to Māori student participation and achievement – and particularly over the last five years. The main drivers of whitestreaming were reviews, restructures and overt cost-cutting measures in the face of institutions' financial constraints and a widespread shift in ideology from a culturally-responsive to a culturally-blind ideological approach. Indeed, both drivers were often employed to reinforce and justify the other.

Officially, the government continues to support a culturally-responsive approach at the strategic level, which may signal that a reduced commitment to and investment in it by TEIs is reflective of government funding shortfalls across the tertiary education sector as a whole in recent years,[24] which has been exacerbated by the disestablishment of a ring-fenced fund to support Māori student success. Indeed, the disestablishment of the SSG Māori fund has been counter to and undermined the government's own stated strategic objective to raise Māori student participation and achievement in the tertiary education sector. As such, there is a clear need for a greater and specific financial investment by government into supporting Māori student learning success, including through increasing Māori staff numbers and supporting Māori staff development.

Significantly, however, the findings of this project have shown that in the face of financial constraints, institutions have made value judgements to whitewash things Māori, and seemingly ahead of considering and making alternative cost-saving changes. Instead, commitments to Māori student success and Māori staff development need to be absolute and treated as 'core business' funded from operational budgets, consistent with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and not dependent on 'special' funding top-ups or where they are able to be sidelined by the populist, racist beliefs of the day.

Whitestreaming occurs in the absence of a commitment to what is known to best support Māori student participation and achievement, and in the absence of Māori staff and student collectives in decision-making fora. A real commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi by TEIs is not only expressed via the availability of initiatives for Māori students, but also when Māori staff and students are in

---

[24] Grey & Scott (2012, pp. 7-8).

a determining role over their own specialist roles, teams, units, initiatives, programmes, and so on, and when Māori are fully included, as equal partners to a Te Tiriti o Waitangi relationship, in the development of proposals for institutional or departmental change.

Recommendations

Returning specifically to Māori staff, a key objective for the research project was to inform TEU policy development and its industrial relations strategy to better enable them to address whitestreaming practices and its impacts on their Māori members and on Māori staff in the tertiary sector in general. The report thus concludes with a number of recommendations for ways in which the TEU might support and contribute to the self-determination of Māori tertiary staff in their workplaces:

1. Informed Māori staff:

   That the findings on whitestreaming be disseminated widely to TEU Māori members to ensure they are informed and aware of the ways in which whitestreaming occurs, both overtly via the whitestreaming of Māori positions, teams and units, initiatives, programmes, etc, and by stealth through incremental changes to job descriptions and when roles are changed or disestablished when Māori staff members resign. It is recommended that this work takes place throughout 2016.

2. Development of Māori staff rōpū and hui:

   That the TEU works with Māori members to support the development of Māori staff rōpū and hui within institutions to strengthen communication and support networks to enable them to collectivise, strategise, and build the capacity to challenge whitestreaming practices. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

3. Professional development for Māori staff:

   That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to increase and enhance the professional development opportunities for Māori staff, including for the development of strong and effective leadership and for career pathways and progression. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

4. Central role for Māori in decision-making:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to help develop power-sharing relationship arrangements with rūnanga of Māori staff, students and local iwi/hapū, requiring them to develop change proposals with Māori staff, students and local iwi/hapū, and where consent from such rūnanga is required for changes to be signed off. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

5. Processes for the appointment of senior Māori manager roles:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to embed processes for the appointment of senior Māori managerial staff, where Māori staff, students, and local iwi/hapū are involved in all aspects of such appointments to ensure a bold, pro-active person fills the role. This would extend to developing job descriptions, preparing advertising material, shortlisting and interviewing applicants, and determining who is appointed and the appointment process, including pōwhiri. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

6. Accountability mechanisms for senior Māori manager roles:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to develop robust accountability mechanisms for senior Māori managerial staff as part of their job descriptions, and for their offices. This would necessarily include attending regular separate and combined Māori staff and student hui. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

7. Support for senior Māori manager roles:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to ensure senior Māori manager roles have an appropriate level of financial and personnel support to carry out their roles to develop and advance the aspirations and needs of Māori students, staff, and the communities the institution serves. It is recommended that, in 2016, the TEU develops a work plan to address this recommendation.

8. Policy advocacy to government:

That the TEU works with Māori members and their institutions to urge government to increase support for Māori student learning, participation, and achievement, including by (1) setting numeric Māori staff targets, and (2) resourcing the targets by a specific funding mechanism.

Bibliography

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Chauvel, F. & Rean, J. (2012). *Doing better for Māori in tertiary settings: Review of the literature*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Commission.

Curtis, E., Honey, M., Kelly, F., Kool, B., Lualua-Aati, T., Nepia, W., Poole, P., Ruka, M., & Wikaire, E. (2012). *Tatou tatou/success for all: Improving Māori student success*. Wellington: Ako Aotearoa.

Education Act 1989.

Greenwood, J. & Te Aika, L. (2008). *Hei tauira: Teaching and learning for success for Māori in tertiary settings*. Wellington: Ako Aotearoa.

Grey, S. & Scott, J. (2012, February). When the government steers the market: Implications for New Zealand's tertiary education system. Working paper presented at the National Tertiary Education Union's Higher Education Conference, University of Sydney, Sydney.

Irwin, K. (1994). Māori research methods and practices. *Sites, 28*, 25-43.

Jackson, M. (2011). Hui reflections: Research and the consolations of bravery. In J. Hutchings, H. Potter, & K. Taupo (Eds.), *Kei Tua o te Pae hui proceedings: The challenges of kaupapa Māori research in the 21st century*. Wellington: NZCER.

Jackson, M. (2015). *A Tiriti audit report for the TEU Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa*. Unpublished report, TEU Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa, Wellington.

McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2011). *We are family: Māori success in foundation programmes*. Auckland: Faculty of Education, University of Auckland.

Massey University. (2015, 7 September). *Proposal for change: Student recruitment advisory team external relations*. Palmerston North: Massey University.

May, S. (2009). *Hangaia te mātāpuna o te mōhio: Learning foundations for Māori adults*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2001). *Profile and trends 2000*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2002a). *Tertiary education strategy 2002/07*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2002b). *Profile and trends 2001*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2003). *Profile and trends 2002*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2004). *Profile and trends 2003*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2006). *Profile and trends 2005*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *Tertiary education strategy 2007-12, incorporating the statement of tertiary education priorities 2008-10*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2009a). *Ka hikitia: Managing for success: Māori education strategy 2008-2012*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (2010). *Tertiary education strategy 2010-15*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. (2014). *Tertiary education strategy 2014-2019*. Wellington: Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.

Phillips, H., & Mitchell, M. (2010). *It is all about feeling the aroha: Successful Māori and Pasifika providers*. Christchurch: AERU Research Unit, Lincoln University.

Ross, C. (2010). *Culturally relevant peer support for Māori and Pasifika student engagement, retention and success*. Wellington: Open Polytechnic.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.

Tahau-Hodges, P. (2010). *Kaiako pono: Mentoring for Māori learners in the tertiary sector*. Wellington: Ako Aoteaora and Te Puni Kōkiri.

Taurere, M. (2010). *Advocates for Māori students: The role of career advisors?* Unpublished Doctor of Education thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.

Unitec Institute of Technology. (2015, August). *Student services blueprint proposal for change*. Auckland: Unitec.

Van der Meer, J., Scott, S. & Neha, T. (2010). Retention of first-year Māori students at university. *MAI Review, 2*.

Williams, T. (2011). It's all about empowering the whānau: Māori adult students succeeding at university. *Waikato Journal of Education, 16(3)*, 57-68.