



Our Ref: OIA-26-443

23 June 2026

Phillip Fry

fyi-request-34783-4b429f11@requests.fyi.org.nz

Dear Phillip,

Re: Official Information Act request regarding ERO's new school reports

I refer to your email to the Education Review Office dated 25 May 2026 requesting the following information under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA):

- 1. The names of any external contractors, consultants, or companies engaged in relation to the revised reporting framework, including consultation, communications, research, design, facilitation, or stakeholder engagement work.*
- 2. A brief description of the services provided by each external party.*
- 3. Any final reports, summaries, presentations, or deliverables produced by external contractors or consultants relating to this work.*
- 4. Any final risk registers, issue logs, mitigation plans, assurance documents, or governance summaries prepared in relation to the revised reporting framework.*

Please find our full response below. I note that a number of responses under the OIA and advice to the Minister on this topic are now available on our website.

- 1. The names of any external contractors, consultants, or companies engaged in relation to the revised reporting framework, including consultation, communications, research, design, facilitation, or stakeholder engagement work.**
- 2. A brief description of the services provided by each external party.**
- 3. Any final reports, summaries, presentations, or deliverables produced by external contractors or consultants relating to this work.**

Prime Research NZ was used to support this work by organising and facilitating the first round of focus groups with parents. What they [provided to us has been summarised](#) and made available on our website, and is therefore refused under section 18(d) of the OIA.

- 4. Any final risk registers, issue logs, mitigation plans, assurance documents, or governance summaries prepared in relation to the revised reporting framework.**

Two papers were submitted to the Organisational Performance Committee (OPC) as part of this work. The first, in September, provided an initial update on progress and set the context for a subsequent paper in October, which contained the full proposal.

I have decided to withhold the September paper in full under section 9(2)(g)(i) of OIA. I consider that release would be likely to inhibit the free and frank expression of opinions between officials, which is necessary to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs.

The October paper, which contains the substantive proposal, has been released to you in full.

In considering the public interest, I believe it has been met through the proactive release of all advice provided to the Minister on this matter on our website, together with the full release of the October paper.

Please note that it is our policy to proactively release our responses to official information requests where possible. We do not publish requesters' personal information.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at <http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz> or freephone 0800 802 602.

Ngā mihi,



Sharon Kelly
DCE – Review and Improvement Services (acting)

Organisational Performance Committee

Date of meeting: 15 October 2025

Item title: Reporting proposal

Author: Zoe Lindsay RIS

Sponsor: Shelley Booysen

Purpose	This paper is to provide the committee with an update of the proposed school reports and share examples. This paper seeks feedback from the Committee.	
Summary	This paper provides rationale and background for proposed new report format and provides examples and guidance.	
Attachments	Appendix 1: Draft 1-page summary reports examples Appendix 2: Draft full reports examples Appendix 3: Ofsted briefing	
	Note	
	This is a follow up from the paper provided for 18 September 2025.	Noted



Reporting proposal

Background

This proposal outlines the intended purpose and audience for ERO (Education Review Office) reports, emphasising their role as accessible and transparent communication tools. It includes the proposed changes and enhancements to reporting for all state and state integrated schools.

What do we want our report to do?

ERO reports have multiple audiences. ERO reports should clearly show what schools do well and where they need to improve, in a way that is easy for everyone to understand.

ERO reports should also:

- fulfil important regulatory and public accountability functions
- be a key communication tool for a range of stakeholders, including parents school leaders, boards, staff, whānau, and the wider community
- provide a transparent account of how well the school is performing
- offer recommendations and priorities for future improvement, supporting the school's ongoing development
- identify improvement actions and ensure that the school's activities are clearly defined and measurable.

How can we promote consistency and quality in reporting?

- Underpin reporting with ERO frameworks and comprehensive guidance.
- Report on the things that matter and the most important foundations for school quality and outcomes and conditions that support success.
- Align reporting across school types (primary and secondary)
- ensure that evaluation processes and language are consistent and in line across the country.
- Use digital tools including AI.

Reporting achievement and attendance

Reporting on achievement helps parents and whānau by showing how well students are doing and where improvements are happening. It gives up-to-date information so school and ERO can respond quickly and helps link evaluation findings to planning for future improvements. Tracking achievement and attendance over time makes it easier to see progress across all schools.

However, reporting achievement as percentages can be misleading because it shows student learning as a point in time number and does not show important things like growth, effort, or different learning needs. It also makes it hard to see progress or added value and can lead to unfair comparisons between schools. Percentages as a measure do not explain the challenges students face or the context of the community in which the school is based.

How to other jurisdictions report achievement and attendance information?

Achievement and attendance raw data are published separately in both the UK and Australia.

- Ofsted do not report achievement or attendance as percentages, this information is reported separately for primary and secondary schools, rather like the MOE publishes Education Counts data in NZ.
- Western Australia discusses performance and outcomes, no explicit percentages are published
- Ireland's approach is similar to ERO, for example: *Almost all children show sustained progress across the curriculum.*
- The Northern Territory focus is on how the school uses their analysis of student outcomes including academic performance, attendance, behaviour, and wellbeing. Achievement outcomes are not explicitly reported.
- In British Columbia's Ministry of Education updates the StudentSuccess.gov.bc.ca portal annually which features performance metrics like foundation skills and graduation rates, and others for student progress reporting. They have moved away from heavy testing and ranking towards local and continuous school improvement initiatives and are using a new framework for Enhancing Student Learning (like the SIF)

Recommend that ERO continue to include an overall judgement and narratives of progress and improvement and qualitative insights into teaching practices, student engagement, and wellbeing. It would be useful to investigate ways to include better growth data (e.g., value-added measures).

Futureproofing

To make school quality reporting future-proofed and long-lasting it's important to consider a design that can be flexible and adapted when things change, is grounded in equity and context and focused on meaningful learning outcomes. This report proposal recommends that ERO:

- Report on student outcomes, progress and achievement
 - Learner/Student Achievement and progress
 - (Foundational) Literacy / Reading and writing
 - (Foundational) Numeracy/Mathematics
 - Attendance & Retention (retention secondary only)
 - Inclusion & Wellbeing
 - Equity
- Include more focus on progress and improvement in narrative findings rather than any further shift towards static achievement or attendance raw data or percentages or graphical depictions of raw trend data.
- Report on the most important foundations for school quality and effectiveness identified in the School Improvement Framework. These overarching areas provide flexibility for narrative comments to focus on progress and improvement overtime. A summary table would provide a high-level judgement of the quality of education provision at the time of the review.
 - Leadership
 - Teaching & Learning
 - Curriculum
 - Assessment
 - Support for learners with additional needs

- School Improvement
- Governance
- Health and Safety
- Māori Medium Educations (rumaki & reo rua)
 - Learner Success
 - Conditions for success

The areas above align with the current government priorities as well as reflecting long standing priority areas for ERO and the education sector. A narrative findings section of the report will provide context and explanation and can be flexible to changing priorities.

Include more contextual information in the About The School section to explain challenges and strengths. This includes EQI and an explanation.

Retain and embed sequenced key steps for improvement to align with school improvement planning.

New reporting proposal

Recommend that ERO consider publishing 3 reports with links embedded in the Summary Report:

1. New 1 page summary report (come up with our own name)

This report would be a one-page summary report. It would include information about the school, ERO judgements and findings against the outcomes and conditions in a simple a table format. Reported judgments would be based on ERO's final judgement against the School Improvement Framework (SIF). The table would include the single word judgment and a short statement. Draft statements have been written based on the SIF and current reports.

This report would include links to the fuller report and eventually to the School Data Summary.

2. New full school report with key next steps for improvement

This report would include 4 sections as well as Regulatory and Legislative Requirements section.

1. About the school
2. Outcomes and conditions summary (as above)
3. Outcomes and conditions findings (the narrative story to unpack the summary)
4. Key next steps
5. Summary statement about ERO's confidence – with recommendations

3. Publish **School Data Summary** (website only initially - with link embedded in the summary report overtime).

This would allow time to develop the portal and allow better reporting of data e.g. a banner/school page for each school with key information for parents similar to the MOE Dashboard.



This is in line with other jurisdictions where school attendance and achievement data are published separately to school review reports.

About the school section

Reports across Australia, New Zealand, the UK, and Ireland all include a section on the school demographics, school context and community. An *About the School* section typically provides a comprehensive overview of the school's context, beginning with its location and catchment area—whether urban, rural, or coastal—and considers relevant socio-economic indicators. It includes details on enrolment numbers and the type of school, offering insight into both size and character.

Student diversity is highlighted, often noting the proportion of students from Indigenous backgrounds, minority ethnic groups, those with special educational needs or disabilities, and students for whom English is an additional language. Including the EQI number help to contextualise the school's particular challenges and strengths. Most reports also provide a statement on staff and leadership, mentioning any recent changes in leadership, staffing numbers, and the presence of specialist staff.

The curriculum and qualification provided by the school are described in terms of alignment with national or state curriculum frameworks, as well as any special programmes offered, such as the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme, enrichment opportunities, or vocational pathways.

Physical and learning environments included in overseas reports with reference to modern infrastructure, specialist facilities, integration of technology and digital safety initiatives, and the use of local environments and community resources. Finally, reports often describe how the school's vision and values guide its context, shaping both the culture and strategic direction of the school.

Propose that new reports include an extended the *About the school* section would include a table of school information and written statement about the school context, vision etc in line with other jurisdictions and feedback from schools and parents.

Learner success & wellbeing, progress & achievement

This section would be included in the 1-page summary report and would be the 1st section of the full combined report.

Judgments will continue to be made by evaluators against the School Improvement Framework. Evaluators would choose from drop down statement that align to each judgement. Judgement would be best fit from across all elements of the SIF domain. Evaluators are already doing this during reviews and writing a narrative statement. This shift is to publish the key word judgment in reports. (Needs improvement, Taking Steps to improve, Embedded, Excelling).

Equity

The proposed reports include a judgment and statement on equity. This is based on how well the needs of disadvantaged and historically underserved students are met. This would clearly report on the quality of support and outcomes for Māori and Pacific learners, learners with additional needs, disadvantaged or at-



risk students. The narrative statement in the full report would include a comment on internal disparity and how groups experience success within the same school conditions.

The equity statement should refer to how well all learners achieve comparable levels of success. It goes beyond simply providing equal access or opportunities and should focus on the impact of the provision of education in each school on student outcomes with the aim to reduce disparities in achievement. Within-school equity focuses on how different groups of learners who experience the same school conditions such as teaching and learning achieve at similar levels and identify achievement gaps.

School conditions for success

Judgments are made by the evaluators against the School Improvement Framework. Evaluators would choose from drop down statement that align to each judgement. Judgement would be across all elements of the SIF domain.

Narrative summary for the full school report will be underpinned by the synthesis and evidential file. AI will be used to write the findings and guidance given to writers for prompts that focus on improvement and the current state of the school. The focus will be on highlighting strengths and actions the school is taking for improvement, offering a more nuanced and contextual view of performance.

Key next steps

How do other jurisdictions report next steps for improvement?

Ofsted reports include clear improvement actions for any area rated below “Expected Standard” which includes specific, actionable recommendations. Areas for improvement are identified through the review process and evidence provided by the school under each evaluative area. Areas identified for improvement are shared with the school on day two of the review and they are told about what the school needs to improve, *giving sufficient detail so that those attending understand their part in improving it.*

In Queensland, the review process centres on appreciative inquiry, highlighting effective practices and exploring ways to further improve them. By focusing on what is working well, schools work with reviewers to identify context-specific factors that contribute to their success. Review reports present key findings along with tailored improvement strategies that reflect each school’s unique circumstances, challenges, and strengths. These strategies are aligned to the School Improvement Tool domains and the School Improvement Hierarchy which ensures that recommendations are both relevant and actionable within the school’s particular context.

There are similarities with ERO and the use of a framework to identify areas for improvement. Evaluators currently use areas identified throughout the review underpinned by the key SIF domains that research shows bring about the most improvements. Next steps for adults are therefore predominantly in areas of Leadership, Teaching and Curriculum, or framed through these lenses – and this aligns to our theory of change. Next steps are tied closely to a school’s strategic improvement cycle and measured through goals set for Student Outcomes.

Summary Statement

Every school report would include a summary statement. This serves to provide the school community with additional context about the purpose and rationale for any recommended interventions. This section is designed to accommodate potential future changes in the TAH approach, particularly in relation to high-performing schools, and offers flexibility for adjustments in both resourcing and scheduling as circumstances evolve. The judgement statements included here are informed by an assessment of the school's capability and capacity to drive improvement.

The selection of summary statements by evaluators and managers will be guided by the categorisation work and use the criteria consistent with the ERO work focused on school improvement, ensuring that recommendations are both relevant and aligned with identified priorities.

Report writing process

We propose writing the reports in two ways. The summary tables and overall judgments will be completed by the evaluator. The intention is that these will be drop down options for consistency and clarity. A guidance/parent's explainer document will unpack the options and meanings and a link included in each report for the reader.

Evaluators will write the About the school statement. Guidance about the purpose and content of the section will be provided. Evaluators will complete the school information table for this section. Next steps for development include considering ways that this could be automated and/or prepopulated.

The narrative findings for the full school reports will initially be written by AI from evidential file and eventually a strongly guided and templated synthesis document. The examples included in this proposal have been written in this way. As part of the writing and QA process the reports will be checked by the evaluation team and a manager for accuracy, clarity and alignment.

The key next steps, summary and recommendation will be identified by evaluators and managers.

MPP has been commissioned to develop a tool and guidance for EPs that enables sharper and better sequenced recommendations and actions for improvement in ERO school reports. This will support EPs to ensure improvement actions are purposeful, action orientated, and improvement focused, Next steps will be sufficiently stepped out to support schools to know what to do and why relative to school capacity and capability sufficiently paced - balancing school context and urgency

Once approved this will be integrated into new report design.

QA process

1. Evaluation team completes onsite review and activities and completes and updates the file with evidence, SEST and synthesis.
2. At QA1Peer/MRIS work through the file and evidential base including the SEST and SIF synthesis.
3. The QA team complete the first draft of the report from the file using AI to write the statement for each section based on the school file with set prompts.
4. Writer reviews the whole report and sends to EP/MRIS for alignment checking.
5. Final check is with the QA team
6. This process will be built into current Asana processes and tasks.

Pilot and trial process

Reports will be trialled in Term 4. The trial will include all schools scheduled for review over a two-week period. The report examples in this proposal have had a review in 2025 and have a report in QA or published.

Managers will have opportunity to review and provide feedback at the managers hui in early November. (decision pending).

Feedback from evaluators. Evaluators will have opportunity to feedback on the report's proposal and new report format. This will be smaller group of evaluators from different offices. They will be asked to provide written comment, and a meeting will be held with them for follow up discussion

TBC Feedback from the sector and parents. Schools who have report trialled in Term 4 alongside the current report will be invited to discuss both reports and provide feedback. RIS will work with parents and whānau to trial and seek feedback.

Risks

Previously identified risks and mitigation please refer to OPC paper 15 September 2025.

Identified risk: The use of AI to write schools reports. Using AI to write school review reports can offer efficiency and consistency, but it also comes with several risks that we will carefully manage.

- The QA process will ensure that evaluators validate, edit and confirm school reports. Co-pilot will be used to write the initial draft of the school report.
- Only internal AI systems will be used to draft the initial version of the school report. Co-pilot will only be able to generate content from the school file which is school-specific and contextual.
- We will trial the use of co-pilot and collect feedback from evaluators and schools. The provides an opportunity to refine the process before scaling up.
- Evaluators could be resistant as they feel it is a loss of professional judgment and control over their work. We will manage this through professional development and clear communication about each step of the process.