The World Organisation for Early Childhood Education (OMEP) is an international, interdisciplinary, non-governmental organisation (NGO) founded in 1948 in Prague, to benefit children under the age of 8 years throughout the world. World OMEP provides a meeting ground for representatives from a range of professions and nationalities, all concerned with the wellbeing, education and rights of young children and their families. OMEP is represented in more than 70 countries. It is affiliated to the United Nations (UN), working collaboratively with UNICEF, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

We have chapters in Auckland, Waikato, Wellington, Canterbury and Otago. We draw members from Early Childhood Centres (privately owned, community-based and home-based), Initial Training Establishments (Private Training Establishments, Polytechnics and Universities) Professional Development Contractors, students in training and others completing higher degrees, and others interested in the Early Years. OMEP seeks to promote research and the dissemination of knowledge about quality early childhood education. It acts as an advocate for children, their rights and their best interests.

The aims of OMEP Aotearoa New Zealand (OMEP Aotearoa) include fostering wellbeing and the optimum development of every child; promotion of quality early childhood education in all its forms; promotion of a bicultural approach to the provision of ECE; furthering the development of multicultural values and practices in ECE; support for research; and fostering of international communication and cooperation.

We note that your direction for the Draft Report came from the previous Minister of Finance, Steven Joyce who scoped the overview with directions

'To pay particular attention to specific sectors and service types, namely the core services in the health, education, justice, and social development sector: “teaching, hospitals and primary health care, policing, courts, corrections and work and income services.”

He asked you to report on:
a) How to measure efficiency/productivity in each of the identified core public service sectors: health, education, justice, social support. This should focus on meso (sector) and micro (function or service) level measures. Guidance should consider key measurement and accuracy issues, and how imperfect measures are most appropriately and usefully employed.

b) The appropriate role of identified efficiency/productivity measures in public sector performance frameworks, with the goal of improving assurance to Ministers and incentives on agencies for improvement. This should draw on theory and evidence of incentive and disincentive effects of measurement and other performance approaches on different workforces.

c) Developing the capability, culture and systems that can support agencies to better measure, understand and improve productivity.

It is with such aims in mind that we make this submission on your December 14 2017, Draft. Many of our concerns are similar to the OMEP Aotearoa National Executive submission notably:

- The apparent misunderstandings of the historical uses of Early Childhood Education (ECE), and the responses to proposals deemed inappropriate.

- The proposed measurements which use technological and quantitative measures of public services suggested by the report. Valuing relational outcomes, where individuals and communities are enabled, we suggest, is to be preferred.

- The paper by Green which uses ECE as an example of state services (education) inputs and outcomes.
The apparent misunderstandings of the historical uses of Early Childhood Education (ECE), and the responses to proposals deemed inappropriate.

Your Draft Report used ECE as a proxy for the education section: ‘As an example, the Commission’s case study into Early Childhood Education (Green, 2017) sought to understand what has happened to the overall productivity of the ECE sector over the past decade’, where you report that ‘multi-factor productivity in the ECE sector has fallen by an average of 3.4% per year between 2001/02 and 2014/15’.

The ECE sector has always been diverse. It’s diversity can be plotted to the emergence of ECE as an initial adjunct to the ‘home as natural environment’. It was offered to the poor, needy, and later those whose mothers need a ‘break’ from the intensive job of parenting. The Education Act 1989 introduced regulatory measures to treat ECE Services the same: regulations, bulk-funding on per child: funded spaces allocation; and qualifications. This Act with Amendments and regulatory measures governs the ECE sector. Significant changes have been the differential funding that Teacher-led and Parent-led services receive; and the growth of privately-owned services.

ECE have responded to a number of attempts to manage their sector as an ‘industry’ in past decades.

1. For example, in 1995 academics in tertiary institutions, and others fought against the establishment of an ECE ITO (industry training organisation) and won.

2. We have fought too, to have pay parity across the sector, as between sectors, and continue this push.

---

1 See
See too:
Rather than as you suggest, competition has not strengthened the ECE sector:

Creating competition between public sector delivery units, either by allowing the entry of private sector providers, or giving consumers greater choice in where they receive their services; however, it notes that a new unit may be less effective in the short term, and this driver depends on units being able to grow or reduce capacity in response to changes in demand’.

We note that the Review of the Education Portfolio Work Programme announced 21 February 2018, aims to remove competition as a driver of education.
The proposed measurements which use technological and quantitative measures of public services suggested by the 14 December Draft Report.

Public Choice and Human Capital theory emerged post World War Two from the Chicago School of Economics. Economic theorists such as Buchanan and Tulloch, Gary S Becker, together with James Heckman\(^2\) have largely been responsible for the technological management of everything. In our experience, education is far from, and has never been a ‘natural market’ in economic terms.

[The] family investment model … indicates that, where parents face borrowing constraints against the future earnings of their children, there will be a relationship between their income and their child’s adult income and other long-term well-being outcomes. Poor parents have more limited means than rich parents to finance the human capital accumulation of their children. (OECD, 2009, p. 167)\(^3\)

States have had to adjust the supply-side to finance parents’ access to ECE for their children (working for families is an example; as is the access to 20 hours). The observable outcomes of the entry of private providers are that corporate ECE and private providers tend to cluster around the higher socio-economic demographics, leaving the care of more ‘vulnerable’ children to community and church-based ECE\(^4\).

Nesta Devine\(^5\) gives a recent critique of such economic theories as they apply to education, notably Public Choice and Human Capital.

---


\(^4\) ‘imperfect capital markets that result in weaker private than social incentives for human resource investments are likely to be important constraints primarily for the poor … the poor are less likely to have access to information (either through their own previous experience or through social networks) about the value of ECI investments than do higher income groups’ Deutsch, R. (1998). *How early childhood interventions can reduce inequality: An overview of recent findings*. Inter-American Development Bank. You note ‘New Zealand Kindergartens Te Pūtahi Kura Puhou o Aotearoa submitted that the existence of for-profit provision of early childhood education represented the diversion of public funds for personal gain, and away from children’s learning (sub. 10)’.

Currently, the political dominance of neo-liberalism suggests economic aims which are dictated by the neo-classical economics that underpins neo-liberalism. There is an inherent contradiction in the way neo-liberal economics is understood even by its advocates. On the one hand, they claim adherence to the ‘Invisible Hand’ (Smith, 1910/1759), that is, to the ultimately beneficial results of individual market choices, but, on the other hand, neo-classical economics is expressed in government management by ‘monetarism,’ that is, managing the control of money in order to manage the economy. To a large extent, monetarism is a riposte to Keynesianism. Keynes believed in altering other aspects of the economy to take into account differing issues at any one time, so manipulation could occur through taxation, wages, job creation etc. These are seen as creating government debt, hence more taxation, hence limiting the freedom of the taxpayer to spend his own money (Buchanan & Tullock, 1965; Devine, 2004).

Neo-liberalism however is not at all confined to the economic sphere. The drive to free the taxpayer from the burden of taxation impels the adherent towards political action and hence political theory. There are two major political theories which inform neo-liberalism, with regard to education, and both of them lay claim to the sanctity of economics, which in turn claims the authority of ‘science’ (Devine, 2004). As Thomas Piketty puts it:

> For far too long economists have sought to define themselves in terms of their supposedly scientific methods. In fact, those methods rely on an immoderate use of mathematical models, which are frequently no more than an excuse for occupying the terrain and masking the vacuity of the content. (Piketty, 2014, p. 574).

The last three decades of economic management of the public services through such theories, and Principal Agency Theory, has ruptured any trust between the recipients of such service, and those charged with delivering and advising on education and other social matters. We are aghast at your recommended further incursions into this relationship. Input and outputs/outcomes may simplify matters for ministers and accountability under the Public Finance Act. Education schools and ECE are not ‘firms’, highly productive or otherwise, operating in a competitive marketplace; nor places for socialising future compliant workers. They are places of learning, places where children acquire their cultural, social and national identities. Education is no longer seen as a public good, but as a private investment for individual gain. Public service presented in your Draft as serving the minister, rather than the public. The public is made up of right-bearing individuals, who have a social contract with their government, adults and children. As Marope and Kaga (2015) suggest:


---


7. Investing against Evidence The Global State of Early Childhood Care and Education
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002335/233558E.pdf
meaning every human being under the age of eighteen or majority – the CRC reinforced the 1960 UNESCO Convention and Recommendation against Discrimination in Education which should have covered young children in any case. With its moral force and near universal ratification, the CRC formally recognized children as holders of rights to survival and development, to be heard and to participate in decisions affecting them in accordance with their evolving capacities with their best interests and non-discrimination as overarching principles. While the CRC in Article 18 also recognizes the primary role of parents and legal guardians in the upbringing and development of children, it obliges States Parties to help them carry out these duties (see also Lee et al., in Chapter 1). To further clarify the obligations of States Parties vis-à-vis young children, and to provide guidance in the implementation of the rights enshrined in the CRC, the Committee on the Rights of the Child issued General Comment 7: Implementing Child Rights in Early Childhood (2006). The committee interpreted ‘the right to education during early childhood as beginning at birth and closely linked to young children’s right to maximum development’ (Paragraph 28, art. 6.2). Therefore, States Parties’ obligations include the development of comprehensive policies for young children and the need to assist parents and carers through, for instance, quality childcare services and parenting (see Lee et al., in Chapter 1).

We draw your attention to Statement by Kishore Singh, Special Rapporteur on the right to education at the 29th session of the Human Rights Council\(^8\) Geneva, 18 June 2015

At the Twenty-ninth session of the United Nations Human Rights Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh Protecting the right to education against commercialization, Agenda item 3. Singh concludes ‘Provision of education as the State’s responsibility:

**Regulatory framework centred on education as a public good**

Education is a fundamental human right and a core obligation of States. It is not a privilege of the rich and well-to-do, it is an inalienable right of every person. Principal responsibility for the direct provision of education lies with the State. However, education as a public function of States is being eroded by market-driven approaches and the rapid growth of private providers, with scant control by public authorities. …

112. Education benefits both the individual and the society and must be preserved as a public good; social interest in education must be protected against its commercialization. …

113. Guided by principles of social justice and equity, as well as human rights law, regulating private providers is essential to mitigate the potentially deleterious and negative effects on students, education systems and societies. In this, Governments can be inspired by numerous decisions by courts and emerging jurisprudence.

115. The State remains primarily responsible for fulfilling the right to education on account of its international legal obligations. ... The provision of basic education free of cost is not only a core obligation of the State, it is also a moral imperative. The State must discharge its responsibility as guarantor and regulator of education as a fundamental human right of every child.’

We refer you to the Cabinet Paper Education Portfolio and Work Programme\(^9\), where the incoming government seeks a ‘high-trust model’\(^{10}\). Valuing relational outcomes, where individuals and communities are enabled, we suggest, is to be preferred.

Your *Draft* (p. 34) suggested

‘*Productivity measurement case study: Early childhood education* – uses publicly-available information to construct raw measures of productivity in the ECE sector, and discusses options for quality-adjusting ECE outputs to provide a more accurate and complete picture of changes in early childhood productivity’.

The Labour Coalition has been firm in its vision that seeks to address the neoliberal effects and the narrowing of education. Grant Robertson noted\(^{11}\) (8 February) ‘Too many people are missing out, and New Zealanders want to see that change. We have heard that message, and as a government we are committed to addressing it’. The *speech (February 13, 2018)* to your Commission\(^{12}\) by Finance Minister Grant Robertson, noted that success as a country includes seeking a social dividend, rather than purely gross domestic product measures and more being done in each hour. Many have been asking about the future of work, and its social implications. Theories from the Chicago School take paid work outside the home as a ‘given’. Robertson\(^{13}\) later, (15 February) referred to the Living Standards Framework and how it will support ‘the health of the four capitals – natural, human, social, and physical/financial - and whether or not they are growing and likely to be sustained.

We note the Review of the Education Sector announced\(^{14}\) where Minister Hipkins stated ‘Too many of the policy settings for the education portfolio, particularly those focused on accountability and compliance, are rooted in a 20th Century mind set. “A focus on standardisation and measurement over the past few years has worked against an ability to future-proof education. It was backward looking and simply won’t cut it in the future.” We suggest your *Draft Report* can be seen in the suggested efficiencies you recommend.


The paper by Green which uses ECE\textsuperscript{15} as an example of state services (education) inputs and outcomes.

The Commission conducted its own analysis for some services (courts, schooling, early childhood education), based on publicly-available information. These analyses revealed gaps in the quality and coverage of data, and highlighted the need to capture better information on changes in the quality of inputs and outputs\textsuperscript{16}.

a) **OECD International Early Learning and Child Well-being Study (IELS)**

Green discusses the OECD IELS

‘while New Zealand chose not to participate in the IELS, he states (p.17), ‘it could join at a later stage, if the study becomes an established OECD tool’ … ‘[u]nderstanding the impact of ECE on children and parents is ... important for fully assessing productivity changes in the [public service] sector. Assessments of child development or measures of parental employment are potential indicators that could be used to quality-adjust ECE outputs’

As noted in the OMEP Aotearoa submission, there has been both international and national objection to the *OECD International Early Learning and Child Well-being Study*. We are particularly anxious about Green’s comments (p.16) as number of international and national academics have written about their concerns about IELS. There has been a concerted reaction to the OECD’s suggestion of such assessments.\textsuperscript{17} We have quoted Urban and Moss at length, and their concerns of the development of a global testing tool.


\textsuperscript{16} Measuring and improving state sector productivity - draft report, PDF 3.6MB
Productivity measurement case study: Courts, 364KB
Productivity measurement case study: early childhood education, 515KB
Knopf, E. *History of Efficiency Measurement by the New Zealand Health Sector Post 2000*, 788KB
Pickens, D. *Efficiency and Performance in the New Zealand State Sector*
Staff perceptions of performance and effectiveness in the New Zealand State Sector Productivity measurement case study: Police, 404KB
Understanding Health Sector Productivity, 780KB
Measuring and improving state sector productivity - issues paper, PDF, 690Kb
Terms of reference - state sector productivity, PDF, 84Kb

For example, OMEP executive members wrote \(^1\) of their view in *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood 17(3)*; and ‘PISA’ for five year olds?: A position paper on OECD plans for a global testing tool

Alan Pence (2016), a Canadian academic wrote

> Following publication of the Moss et al. article and efforts to have the OECD respond to the four proposals, the IELS issue subsequently expanded to another venue for critique and action, being raised at the Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Education (RECE) conference that took place in Aotearoa/New Zealand October 30 – Nov. 3, 2016. The presentations and discussions taking place within the RECE were complemented by debates and discussions within other Aotearoa/New Zealand organizations, including the New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE). In one of two related motions the NZARE approved: ‘That members of the NZARE call on the New Zealand Government to not participate in the OECD IELS and urge Government instead to continue the work already begun with the MOE early Childhood Research Policy Forum, designed to produce appropriate outcome measures for early childhood education linked to the principles and strands of Te Whāriki.’ (Proposed: Alex Gunn, Seconded: Linda Mitchell, 2016).\(^2\)

Margaret Carr, Linda Mitchell and Lesley Rameka (2016)\(^3\) believe the greatest danger in such an instrument is ‘a one-world view’, and puts at risk rich socio-cultural perspectives such as those assessments developed for use with *Te Whāriki*.

Members of OMEP Waikato Bay of Plenty Chapter both signed the Urban and Swadener Reconceptualising ECE paper, and supported the NZARE proposition.

b) ECE Outputs: Using *Te Whāriki* to measure progress

We are especially concerned about Green’s analysis of ECE outputs

> So, what could be used to quality adjust ECE outputs? Any quality adjustment should have a close causal and empirically-demonstrated link to early childhood activities, be relevant to the entire sector,\(^2\) and avoid overlaps with other parts of the education system (eg, by measuring gains to longer-term life outcomes, where it may be difficult to distinguish the impact of ECE participation from the impact of schooling). Two possible candidates for quality adjustment are child

---


development and increased parental employment resulting from ECE participation.

Child development

There is a broad range of studies which links ECE participation to positive child development. Mitchell et al’s (2008) literature review found evidence of “positive outcomes (cognitive, learning dispositions, and social-emotional) of ECE participation for learners in the short and long term.” (p.7) Cognitive outcomes associated with ECE participation included “gains in mathematics and literacy, school achievement, intelligence tests, and also school readiness, reduced grade retention, and reduced special education placement”, and the learning dispositions included “attitudes of perseverance, curiosity, confidence, and social competence such as the ability to work with others.” (p.2) In New Zealand, the Competent Children, Competent Learners longitudinal study found evidence of continued positive impacts from ECE participation on young people’s educational performance at ages.

2 Some studies cite benefits from early childhood participation that are specific to particular types of ECE. For example, Mitchell et al (2008) note studies which report improvements in parenting practices following participation in ECE with intensive levels of parental involvement (Wylie et al, 2006; Hodgen, 2008). These impacts included improved numeracy and logical problem-solving competencies and social abilities. However, studies in other jurisdictions suggest that the academic benefits from ECE participation may be low or “fade out” relatively quickly. (Lefebvre & Merrigan, 2002; Kay & Pennucci, 2014).

One approach therefore would be to collect information on children’s cognitive, attitudinal and social competencies either during their participation in early childhood, or after their entry into school. Relative changes in competency levels in those who attended ECE (compared to those who didn’t) could then be used to adjust the funded child hour outputs. Something similar was proposed by Te Rito Maioha, who noted in their submission that to ascertain the quality of the outputs – that is the quality of the ECE services that 96.7% of children attended or the quality of the educational experience of that cohort – would require measures for assessing such things as children’s self-regulation and school readiness. (sub.2, p.2)

Such information could potentially be based on the national early childhood curriculum document, Te Whāriki, which includes a number of learning outcomes, such as: Showing respect for kaupapa, rules and the rights of others | te mahi whakaute Recognising mathematical symbols and concepts and using them with enjoyment, meaning and purpose | he korero pāngarau Using a range of strategies for reasoning and problem solving | te hīraurau hopanga (Ministry of Education, 2017) However, the learning outcomes in Te Whāriki are provided for guidance only, and early childhood centres have flexibility in the degree to which their local curricula reflect these outcomes. Using Te Whāriki as the basis for learner competencies would most likely require changing the legal status of the learning outcomes to make them mandatory.

Green appears to have ‘cherry-picked’ outcomes which suit his purpose of measuring value of ECE as an outcome. Members of our Chapter have written and presented internationally of the curriculum Te Whāriki is a nonprescriptive curriculum, where the ‘how of teaching’ is set out in the principles. The strands set out the possibilities of ‘what children learn’. The goals are aspirational, to be worked on collaboratively, building relationships with parents and family as well as the wider community. They were never intended as a checklist of Human Capital Theory skills.
We refer you to the work by OMEP chapter members, Wendy Lee on learning through the ECE curriculum\textsuperscript{21}. Jayne White, ex Waikato president, and past president OMEP Aotearoa has published widely on quality for infants and toddlers.\textsuperscript{22} We refer you too, to work by Sonja Ardnt, also a past president of our chapter and Lynley Tulloch\textsuperscript{23}.\textsuperscript{24} Some of us were involved in the Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa study \textit{Early Childhood Teachers’ Work in Education and Care Centres}.\textsuperscript{25} Chapter members were involved in the Ministry of Education (2015) Advisory Group on Early Learning.\textsuperscript{26}

The narrow evaluative measures sit strangely within your \textit{Draft Report}. Child development as a measure is nowadays seen as an imperfect way of assessing children. Socio-cultural assessments can evaluate the child developing, nested in her cultural identity, language and knowledge.


\textsuperscript{22} E.g. Working in infant childcare centres: Final research report to Ministry of Education

AB Smith, VE Ford, PM Hubbard, EJ White - 1995


M Tesar, B Pupala, O Kascak, S Arndt. Teachers’ voice, power and agency:(un) professionalisation of the early years workforce \textit{Early Years} 37 (2), 189-201


\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Report on the Advisory Group on Early Learning}. (June 215).

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to make a submission. We are heartened by the incoming government’s emphasis on relational values and measures. Our members include academics published in a range of international journals and publishing houses. We are happy to support your staff in a greater understanding of our discipline as qualitative, innovative and focused on the needs of communities.

On behalf of the Waikato Bay-of Plenty OMEP Chapter
National Executive member

Margaret Stuart