Out of scope	
and the Auditorial Artists of the surface of the su	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
From: Sent:	
To:	Wednesday, 8 April 2015 5:51 p.m. Brian Coffey 0.020(0) and 0.020(0)(0)
Cc:	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
Subject:	SAC Ed Report: follow-up
Attachments:	Briefing Dyslexia SAC FINAL FINAL(2) (2) (3) (4) (2) (4) (3).docx; 150323 Letter Hon
	REVISED (2).docx
	s 9(2)(a) OIA
Thank you Brian.	6 0(0)(a)
**	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
I have passed your lat	
	ou in the morning.
s 9(2)(a) and 9(2) Hope you have a good	(r)(iii) OIA
Trope you have a good	revening,
s 9(2)(a) and	9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
o o (m) (or) cirro	
s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
	ve and Ministerial Services
New Zealand Qualific	\cdot \sim \cdot
Mana Tohu Mātaurang	
	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(iii) OIA
Good planels are hard to fir	ul. Please consider the environment before printing tals e-mall
>>> Brian Coffey	8(04)2015 5:35 PM >>>
Here 'tis , s 9(2)(a) and 0(2)(1)(iii) Q(A)
Executive parts	
cloes NZQA hav	e data on the number of students in decile 1-3 school sitting NCEA levels 1,2 AND 3.
s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f	XIII) OIA
doolle de 2 mil 3 mil 17 mil	ny piece of information and context for Information on the number of students in
decile 1,2 mil 3 schools	who get a said.
Regards	
negaras V	
Brian Coffey Group Man	ager Special Education' Strategy and Service Improvement Sector Enablement and Support
Asimoto di Unione	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
Figure 51 a m	
From: Brian Coffey Sent: Wednesday, 1 Ap	1 201E 1/47 h m
To: David Wales:	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA
Subject: FW: SACEd Re	s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA Port: follow-up required please AND heads-up re NZQA briefing on SAC
atest version with redra	fted letter.
	· ·
lave taken out the medi	a release because timing for submission of the report makes that redundant

s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA

Brian Coffey | Group Manager Special Education: Strategy and Service Improvement | Sector Enablement and Support

From: Brian Coffey Sent: Wednesday, 1 April 2015 11:05 a.m. To: David Wales s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA Subject: FW: SAC Ed Report: follow-up required please AND heads-up re NZQA briefing on SAC David The most recent version of the report. Brian Coffey | Group Manager Special Education Strategy and Service Improvement | Sector Education Support s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) (NA From: Brian Coffey Sent: Monday, 23 March 2015 3:50 p.m. To: Parliament - 51 David Wales s 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA Subject: RE: SAC Ed Report: follow-up required please AND heads up to NZQA briefing on SAC HI S Draft copy for your information. Final copy to be processes through katrina and MK **CHEERS** see notes below. Attached report has been adjusted as per your request NZQA report - a heads-up The Minister's Office received the attached NXOA report on Thursday - PXI Natend to put it through for the Minister today - in tandem with the Minister SAC report. Grateful if your ream could please cast its eyes over NZQA's report and please advise if any further updates to the Ed Report should be made in light of it (NZQA seem to have a different analysis of the same SAC data?). Have added some wording on the data table confirming that the analysis we have ordinertekn of the state is different to NZQAs. There percentage analysis was the percentage of applications for each decile of school against all school deciles. The Ministry's analysis was the percentage change of SACs between 2013 and 2014 for each school decile. Have not updated the report with clata provided on Friday re how 2015 applications are tracking. (see below)

SAC APPLICATIONS COMPARISONS							SCHOOL BASED	
2013 SAC approvals	2014 SAC approvets	2015 SAC applications as at 20 March, and rising		2015 actual increase v 2014	% increase compared with 2013	% increase compared with 2014	2013 School based evidence	2014 school based evidence
3,818	4,708	4,746	928	38	24%	.0.8 %	296	523

Ed Report – a bit more work required please	
I think the Ed Report is nearly there, but there are a	few components in the package that need a bit more work
First is the letter from the Minister back to	Can you send me an electronic copy please? I
propose to redraft the letter here and then seek	a fact check from you later today. I hope that's ok.
Have sent an electronic clopy of the LETTER TO	for revision. s 9(2)(a) OIA

s 9(2)(a) OIA

Issues with appendix 1

Appendix 1 needs more work. The first recommendation makes it appear that the Minister has considered and rejected the idea of funding SAC – however the Minister has not taken any decisions on that matter. If I'm mistaken on that point please correct me. A more factual comment may be: a budget bid was drafted for Budget 2014 but that bid was not deemed a priority for receiving funding. The Ministry does not have a similar budget bid in Budget 2015 because... (I'm not sure why not). Note, including comments re budget renders this Ed Report "budget sensitive".

The other comments for the recommendations in appendix 1 also need a bit of tightening to I reckon. Please have another look at the table and redraft in particular the column "comment on progress" so it is cleared what actions have been taken and by whom (MoE/NZQA).

Have updated the table at the back.

For example rec 2, I suggest the ART comment could be redrafted to: "Completed. The Ministry's Achievement, Retention and Transition (ART) team now works with schools as business as usual to rose schools' awareness of SAC." Not sure what the RTLB (rec 3) is saying but "mobilise" is the wrong work to use. Each progress comment needs to be clear. See changed comments

The Minister's Office has checked the previous briefings on this matter and we note that the review of SAC did not result in recommendations being put to the Minister, nather, the Minister was briefed (METIS 830099 of 12 December 2013 refers) on the Ministry's work programme and relative priorities (a noting briefing). In this context appendix 1 in the current Ed Report should be refrained as progress against the Ministry's work programme and not progress against a list of recommendations. Paras 11-13 in the Ed Report also refer and para 13 in particular needs more specificity - on what basis does the Windstry make the assessment that 'these approaches have not translated into sufficient increases of students in lower decile schools receiving SAC'? What would have been sufficient? Perhaps this paragraph could be a more qualified opinion. Have made changes and the recommendation for a new process is now couched in terms of testing the approach in some scholls and RTIR clusters.

NZQA OIA Issue

NZQA advised the Minister's Office that they processed this particular OIA response last year. So the comment at para 29 that it was "recent" may not be accurate it you can get more specifics about this OIA response then please include it. But if it was the response from 2014 then the Minister's Office may have been consulted (not 100% sure) — but on the basis we have doubts I suggest you withdraw the comment at para 29 re the Minister's Office Yes have made change.

Brian Coffey | Group Manager Special Educationr Strategy and Service Improvement | Sector Enablement and Support \$ 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA

From: Parliament - S

Sent: Monday, 23 March 2015 3:20 p.m.

To: Brian Coffey

Subject: RE(SA) En Report: follow-up required please AND heads-up re NZQA briefing on SAC

Hi Brian

How are things looking with the revisions to the Ed Report – will it be ready today or tomorrow? Regards,

From: S | S 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA | Sent: Monday, 23 March 2015 11:29 a.m. | S 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(f)(iii) OIA | S 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(a) an

Cc: Katrina Casey Geoff Short; Mark Williamson; Don Couling