

The Provision of LEOTC to New Zealand Schools:

A policy review paper for the Ministry of Education

Compiled by Michael Deaker, Education Consultant, Dunedin.

Executive Summary

Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom emerged from the 1989 “Tomorrow’s Schools” reforms of education administration. Initially it was a staffing fund for museums, art galleries, zoos and science centres. By 1999 it had become a curriculum-based teaching and learning programme across all essential learning areas involving a wide range of providers.

By 2004, the Ministry of Education’s expectations of LEOTC providers included: hands-on, specific and interactive learning experiences in authentic contexts; enrichment of the curriculum for diverse learners; partnership between providers and schools; contributions to the achievement of Government education goals. By 2006, over 600,000 students were receiving LEOTC at an average subsidy level of \$9.30 per student.

The goals and purposes of LEOTC are related to and supported by all the strategic education documents, including the MOE Statement of Intent, 2006-2011; The Schooling Strategy, 2005-2010; the draft Revised NZ Curriculum Framework. New Zealand and international research into the effectiveness of LEOTC is unanimously positive, and highlights its particular successes in: complementing and enhancing classroom teaching; supporting science and technology education; providing value for money; improved learning and positive student attitudes (especially enjoyment of learning, inspiration, and creativity).

Consultation with user-schools in mid-2006 found satisfaction with the current LEOTC core requirements and a wish for continuation of partnerships with providers and hands-on, authentic learning. Similar consultation with nine LEOTC providers revealed strong support for: the inclusion of teacher professional development into the requirements; longer funding terms for substantial and proven providers. Officials in related agencies also sought longer terms of engagement with major providers, teacher development provision, identification of specific school curriculum needs, some changes to selection processes and joint ventures and partnerships between MOE and other agencies and local authorities.

1. The strategic aims and purposes of LEOTC and how they have evolved since 1992

The LEOTC contestable contract system emerged from the “Tomorrow’s Schools” reforms implemented from October 1989.

When the staffing allocations were being analysed for the introduction of the new resourcing regime, 37.5 fulltime teacher equivalents were identified as being Education Officers working in museums, art galleries and zoos. The employers were either Education Boards or the Department of Education, both of which were disestablished from 1 October 1989.

As all teachers were required to be employed by Boards of Trustees, an interim measure was to “attach” these Education Officers to a nearby school.

During 1992, the “attached” status was reviewed by the Resourcing Division of the Ministry as there were issues emerging such as:

- management difficulties where the Education Officer was employed by a school, but worked under another employer,
- school boards were experiencing issues with performance and accountability,
- there was no way of extending the range and type of services being offered, and
- there was little accountability, including ERO reporting.

The solution introduced by the Minister (Dr the Hon Lockwood Smith) was to disestablish the positions and introduce a contestable contract system for the provision of “Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom”. The total resource for allocation was determined to be \$1.6 million. It could be said then that the first strategic purpose of LEOTC was to solve employment issues created by the “Tomorrow’s Schools” reforms.

After the 1991 Budget there were severe financial constraints on Government expenditure, and new policy appropriations for this initiative were declined. Insufficient resources were available to make the changes required without reduction in the services being provided. The stalemate and status quo continued until about June of 1994.

By chance, Simon Upton, then Minister of Science, discussed a problem he was facing in the Budget allocation for 1994-1995 with Dr Smith. Mr Upton’s Ministry (MORST) had been granted \$1.2 million for science centres/education. He told Dr Smith that there was no infrastructure within MORST to handle this educational resource, and the Education Minister proposed a solution.

As recounted by Andrew Hutson, a senior Education resourcing official of that time, the Minister of Science urged the Ministry of Education to keep the MORST resource for “science education” but otherwise consented to have the \$1.2 million transferred to Vote:Education for use within the proposed LEOTC contestable fund.

This transfer was documented, including a proviso that a MORST official be involved in the selection process for science-related tender rounds. This practice continues into 2006.

(Interestingly, it was this injection of science-specific MORST funding that gave LEOTC an increased curriculum emphasis and accelerated the move of LEOTC away from being just a personnel and resource management solution).

The MORST allocation lifted the pool available to \$2.8 million and allocations began in 1994, for three years, beginning 1995.

The general policy was that the resource allocation should be targeted to regional and metropolitan museums, art galleries, zoos and science centres with a small amount available for other initiatives. Important factors were equity of access (by location) and curriculum coverage across all year groups.

The funds were seen as a contribution to educational services already being provided by the service. In essence they represented a staffing position (full or part-time) and support funding for materials and communications. No capital costs were provided. To lessen the risk to the Minister, the LEOTC allocation was to be part of the contractor's cash flow and not all of it.

Dr Smith was briefed in December 1994 about the first LEOTC allocation round: 30 proposals had been received, decisions made by "an expert panel", and more than 90% of the funds had been made available, through 16 contracts, to science centres.

About the end of 1996 responsibility for LEOTC was transferred to the Curriculum Division of the Ministry of Education. The purpose of LEOTC was redefined as "curriculum support" and additional funds were made available from the existing Curriculum baseline, taking the pool to about \$3.5 million.

The funding was further increased in 1997 to \$5.6 million per annum for the first full year of the contestable model. This represented about \$8 per pupil. In essence this funding, which now included the resources from staffing and the MORST transfer, was to be centrally distributed on a contestable basis.

A significant change was introduced in 1999 when the triennium process was separated into annual focus rounds of:

- Social Sciences
- Sciences including zoos and environmental centres, and
- Arts and cultural.

The change was necessary, according to Andrew Hutson, because it was increasingly difficult to select a balanced range of services to allow for coverage across New Zealand; and to compare claims made in the Arts versus Science versus Museums/History.

Existing services were broadly classified into one of the three groups based on their predominant focus, and contract variations allowed for re-phasing the contract periods to build a three year cycle. At the same time, the contract periods were moved to coincide with the Budget timing of July-June appropriations.

By 1999, there were 60 services being funded.

Clearly, then, during its first five years, LEOTC widened in strategic purpose and took on an especially inclusive and increasing emphasis on the New Zealand Curriculum. Its origin was as a staffing fund for museums, art galleries, zoos and science centres, but LEOTC had evolved by 1999 into a fund to support curriculum-based teaching and learning across all major essential learning areas and from a broadening range of providers.

This is illustrated by the project specifications (request for proposals) of 1998 which focus on these requirements:

- Support for the NZ Curriculum Framework by qualified services;
- The principles of learning and teaching; and
- Appropriateness of facilities, systems, experience and expertise (which could be within museums, zoos, art galleries, science centres and “other similar facilities”).

Notably, the number of proposals attracted by these project specifications totalled 87, almost three times the number of 1994, over half of them from potential new contractors. By July 2000, there were 21 metropolitan providers, eight national and 27 provincial, a total of 56...national coverage of LEOTC had been rapidly enhanced in its first six years.

[The LEOTC appropriation was augmented by the introduction of two special appropriations totalling about \$0.3 million for:

- The GLOBE project which arose from a meeting with the then Minister, Trevor Mallard, and the USA ambassador in 2000; and
- The WATERWAYS project which received additional funding as part of the Environmental resources programme and was included in the Vote:Education appropriation of 2000/01]

The project specifications for 2000 introduced requirements which have become fundamental for LEOTC: “hands-on, interactive” learning experiences which enrich the NZ Curriculum and are “other than those available in the wider school environment”.

2001 brought emphases on coverage and diversity. Priority was to be given to regions where there were no providers, to filling gaps in LEOTC service coverage, and to proposals which showed evidence of consultation with Maori and Pasifika communities.

More specific requirements arrived in 2004, fleshing out the strategic definition of LEOTC to very much what it is today: learning was to be in “authentic contexts” and was to enrich the curriculum for “diverse learners”. LEOTC learning was to be “specific rather than general”, partnerships between providers and schools and teachers was required (including pre- and post visits), and contribution was expected towards the achievement of the Government goals for education.

Teacher professional development was still ruled out and limitations were in place on “outreach” i.e. services taken to schools which could not be “more than a small part of the service”. [This latter constraint, plus the requirements that services provide learning experiences “not otherwise available in the immediate school environment” create opportunities about to be taken up by MORST who will be empowering Crown Research Institutes to take senior secondary science learning experiences into schools.]

Thus, by the end of its second five years, LEOTC was much more specifically defined and the expectations on potential providers were higher and more proscribed. These providers, over 60 by 2004, were:

- curriculum-focussed,
- working closely with teachers,
- providing authentic, hands-on, interactive and specific learning experiences, and
- complementing the learning going on back in schools’ classrooms.

The 2006 project specifications did not introduce additional expectations. The character and purpose of LEOTC seems settled, well understood, thoroughly enmeshed in the current and evolving education policy framework (as illustrated below), delivering learning to over 600,000 students per year at a remarkably low \$9.30 per student (compared with \$8 nine years ago).

2. How LEOTC fits within the 2006 and ongoing policy framework

In significant ways, the evolution of LEOTC as summarized above was an anticipation of the key elements of current education policy. These elements include: teaching made more effective, focal emphasis on curriculum-based learning, encouragement of lifelong learning (once school children have made education visits to their local museum, gallery, zoo or similar they are likely to continue visiting, and with their own children, says the research), involvement of families and communities (parents and whanau members almost always assist and support LEOTC class visits), the development of key competencies by students (LEOTC experiences are purpose built for “managing self”, “relating to others”, “participating and contributing” and “thinking”), and special effort to increase the learning and achievement of Maori and Pasifika students.

The highest level strategic settings, in the Government’s **Vision for the Coming Term, 2005**, give impetus to the provision of high quality LEOTC in their requirement for transformation through: high levels of achievement; engagement of New Zealanders “throughout their lives to maximize their social and economic participation”; and emphasis on families, young and old. The research evidence below indicates that LEOTC can contribute to the achievement of all of those.

Similarly, contributions can clearly be made by the LEOTC programme to the **Education Priorities for New Zealand, May 2003**, enabling “New Zealanders (to) engage in learning throughout their lives”, “building of the professional capability of educators”, “meeting diverse learning needs”, “improving teacher education”, and “developing a collaborative and responsive education network”. These and other priorities will

contribute to the two pivotal goals for education: “an education system that equips New Zealanders with 21st century skills” and the “reduction of systematic underachievement”.

The Ministry of Education’s **Statement of Intent, 2006-2011** adds further to the impetus for quality LEOTC with its three vital outcomes:

- Effective teaching for all students
- Family and community engagement in education, and
- Developing quality providers.

The research literature studied, and the responses received in recent months from LEOTC providers and user schools referred to below, both underline how significantly a modified LEOTC policy could assist the achievement of all three outcomes.

The Schooling Strategy, 2005 – 2010 asks that all New Zealand schools work towards “effective teaching” as one of three major goals for the next five years. The research is clear that LEOTC can be a major contributor to effective teaching.

The consultation document published in July 2006 including a **revised NZ Curriculum Framework** for possible implementation in 2008, underlines the ongoing and increasing significance of LEOTC. As Secretary for Education, Howard Fancy, says in the Foreword: “The revision of the curriculum emphasizes the importance of teaching and learning...It emphasizes the importance of making stronger connections between what goes on in schools and in the wider community”.

The inclusion of draft Key Competencies in the revised curriculum has already been noted by LEOTC providers as a potential strengthening of their role. This is justified when four of the five the competencies proposed (managing self; relating to others; participating and contributing; and thinking) are all revealed by the research to be significant outcomes from LEOTC experiences.

Effective Pedagogy is also defined in the revised draft curriculum, as, interalia, working “in partnership with families and communities”. As has been confirmed in an LEOTC context, the discussion document states: “Current research shows that students learn best when teachers: make connections, provide multiple opportunities to learn, facilitate shared learning, and enhance the relevance of new learning”.

In sum, all these strategic documents underpinning the New Zealand schools system create a “push” towards modifications to the current system which would enable even higher quality LEOTC.

3. The education benefits delivered by LEOTC:

- **for New Zealand students,**
- **for New Zealand teachers, as perceived in the research literature, here and internationally**

Of the many research publications read for this report, the 12 most significant and their key findings, were:

- **Evaluation of Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom (LEOTC) Programme**, NZCER, 1997. (LEOTC programmes play an essential role in complementing the classroom work of teachers).
- **The Effectiveness of the Vote: RS&T contribution to the LEOTC fund of the Ministry of Education in the Promotion of Science and Technology**, Royal Society of NZ, 1998. (LEOTC provides effective support for the promotion of science and technology education; from 1995-97, MORST provided 62% of LEOTC funding and in that period, at least 68% of LEOTC funding went to science and technology learning experiences. Consideration should be given to longer-term contracts [than three years] and to the development of a strategic approach).
- **Comprehensive Evaluation of Learning Experiences the Classroom (LEOTC) Programme**, University of Canterbury, 1998. (94% of user schools, and 70% of non-user schools, said LEOTC was value for money. Distance and cost for low decile schools were only significant barriers to participation. 84% of user schools were very satisfied with the system).
- **Research into Effectiveness of Programmes for Curriculum-based Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom**, University of Waikato, May 2005. (Improved learning resulted from collaboration between teachers, education officers, parents and students. Students developed positive attitudes)
- **Curriculum Integration and Experiences Beyond the Classroom to Enhance Science Learning (Lit Review)**, MOE, December 2005. (Effective science pedagogy involves not only taking into account students' existing ideas and experiences but also providing opportunities for students to have rich foundational experiences outside their classroom lives)
- **An Agenda for Museums in the 21st Century**, Harald Skramstad, USA, 2000. (Rather than building collections and sharing them through "outreach"; museums must create new worlds of "inreach" in which young and old can reach in to museums through experiences which will help give value and meaning to their own lives and stretch and enlarge their perceptions of the world).
- **Beating the Odds – Factors which can Make a Difference for New Zealand Children from Low-income Homes**, Cathy Wylie, NZCER, 2003. (Increasing professional development for teachers at all levels. Educational policy centred on enriching teaching practice and teacher development is likely to make the most difference for 'low' achieving children from low-income homes).
- **Education Outside the Classroom Manifesto**, DFES, UK, 2005. ("We believe every child and young person should experience the world outside the classroom as an integral part of their learning and development, complementing learning in the classroom. High quality education outside the classroom can stimulate and inspire; foster independence; aid personal and social development; and can often motivate reluctant learners. These experiences should be stimulating, safely managed and enjoyable, and contribute to meeting the needs of every child")
- **Education Outside the Classroom: an assessment of activity and practice in schools and local authorities**, NFER (UK), 2005. ("...convinced that outdoor

learning can benefit pupils of all ages and can be successful in a variety of settings. The DfES aims to encourage out of classroom learning to be seen as an integral part of all children's and young people's education")

- **Measuring the Outcomes and Impact of Learning in Museums, Archives and Libraries**, University of Leicester, UK, May 2003. (Promotes a framework of five Generic Learning Outcomes for use by institutions to assess their educational success: Increase in knowledge and understanding; increase in skills; changes in attitudes or values; evidence of enjoyment, inspiration and creativity; and evidence of activity, behaviour, progression).
- **Review of Future-focused Research on Teaching and Learning (Lit Review)**, MOE, 2006. (Two themes emerge from this review of 97 major international projects: the crucial role of teachers; the need to transform traditional conceptions of learning. The review supports development of teaching and learning through participation and collaboration, and community-led initiatives, and a degree of "deschooling" which includes strong emphasis on e-learning and local initiatives involving community partnerships and networks).
- **What Did You Learn at the Museum Today?** Research Centre for Museums and Galleries (UK), 2003. (Evidence from 1000 teachers and 20,000 students indicates: enjoyment, inspiration, creativity were main outcomes. Students were inspired to learn more, broaden their aspirations and feel confident about themselves as learners).

Student learning

Engagement, excitement, ignition of interest, induction into life-long learning, self-management, group learning skills, growth of participation and confidence to contribute: all these attributes are found among LEOTC students according to the research (and according to the providers and teachers surveyed in recent months).

It should be particularly noted that the key competencies of the draft revised curriculum are, according to the research of Boyd, Hopkins and Watson (2006), more likely to be achieved in "authentic learning contexts", a core requirement of LEOTC. Authentic learning is defined as learning which: enables students to take action on real projects; give opportunities for student choice, challenge and risk-taking; and is fun, relevant and engaging.

The unique contribution of LEOTC to student learning was neatly summarized in a Ministry of Education submission to Trevor Mallard, Minister of Education, in August 2004: "The essential value of LEOTC is its capacity to provide authentic contexts which enhance the effectiveness of teaching and learning back in the classroom".

Effective teaching

The research clearly finds, without exception, that learning and teaching is improved through LEOTC activity. So long as it happens within curriculum contexts and partnerships with the outside-the-classroom provider, teaching is made more effective.

The research clearly indicates that teachers' confidence, knowledge, and professional skills are enhanced by taking their students to LEOTC.

Iterative Best Evidence Synthesis Programme (Quality Teaching for Diverse Students, and Families and Communities)

Both of these corner stone Ministry of Education research publications indicate that quality LEOTC will enhance effective teaching and student achievement. The BES programme defines “what works” for diverse students. A teacher who took students to quality LEOTC providers in the community, preferably with good representation of “parent helpers”, and as part of a well sequenced programme of teaching and learning would be likely to be an effective teacher in BES terms.

Summary of Evidence, and Proposed Modifications for: Selection, Contracting, and Monitoring and Assessment of Services.

(a) The Current Strategic Directions – Push Change Factors

Vision for the Coming Term, 2005

Education Priorities for New Zealand, May 2003

The Ministry of Education's **Statement of Intent, 2006-2011**

The Schooling Strategy, 2005 – 2010

The **revised NZ Curriculum Framework, 2006** (including its proposed Key Competencies)

.....all these strategic documents lead the New Zealand schools system forward and create both a “push” and a rationale for a Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom programme which should be more readily available, more comprehensive and of even higher quality.

(b) What the Research Says

Whether it be into **Effective teaching** or **Student learning**, including the Ministry's own **Iterative Best Evidence Synthesis Programme** the published research strongly supports the view that quality learning experiences outside the classroom, integrated with curriculum-based classroom programmes, enhance learning and teaching in schools.

(c) The Views of Schools, Providers and related Ministries – the Pull Factors

From June to August 2006, consultations were held by email and phone, with a range of LEOTC-user schools from Dunedin to Auckland, and with nine LEOTC providers (one national, six metropolitan and two regional). Face-to-face consultations were also conducted with officials of the Ministries of Culture and Heritage, Research, Science and Technology, and Education. The evidence from these interviews is summarized below and clearly, in sum, creates a significant pull towards some improving modifications to the present system of defining core requirements, and of selecting and contracting providers.

First though, the point must be made that LEOTC, while relatively low-profile in status and funding at government level, is highly valued and massively used by the schools sector. Annual attendance is running at over 600,000 students per year (not much short of the total national school enrolment) and this equates to an average subsidy of just \$9.30 per student visit. Clearly any “improvements” need to be carefully considered and decided on only after consultation with schools and providers.

Nevertheless, some compelling reasons for modification to the administration of LEOTC emerge from the research and consultation of the last few months.

User Schools

All were unanimous that the current statement of core requirements needed no change. They wanted the emphases kept on partnerships with providers and hands-on, authentic learning experiences.

When asked about any desirable outcomes for students and teachers that could be added to the list there was similar strong support for the status quo although one school did suggest that providers be required to employ teachers at award rates of pay and conditions, noting that sometimes they were paid \$30,000 less per year and expected to work through holidays.

The surveyed schools were asked whether the current way of selecting providers was best. All said it was, noting that it was demanding, with two schools suggesting that major providers should be enabled to form partnerships with provincial and rural facilities such as museums and galleries so that their rural colleagues could have easier access to expert learning without traveling to the city. One suggested more outdoor education experiences should be contracted and there was significant support for more senior school, NCEA-level offerings. There were also calls from about half the schools for the Ministry to maintain long term contracts with quality, larger scales providers with proven track records.

Providers

Changes sought by providers to the core requirements revolved largely around effective teaching. They especially wanted a role for themselves in teacher professional development, currently negated by the project specifications. “Require teachers to attend pre-orientation visits”; “fund us for one major teacher PD session per term”; “seek ways of giving us a role in pre-service teacher education e.g. as a location for practicum’s”; “require providers to connect their LEOTC offerings to classroom programmes”, said another.

There were calls for better definitions in the core requirements of “21st century skills”, “reduce systematic underachievement”, and “specific rather than general experiences”; and for more emphasis to be put on quality, effective teaching.

But it was in the methods of selection, funding and monitoring that the big modifications were requested. Many said the current proposal/selection system was demanding but fair, although one wanted more transparency in the panel process. That provincial art gallery wanted feedback from the panel to both successful and unsuccessful proposers.

The big call for change was in the funding and contracting procedure and the majority of providers, mainly metropolitan, sought differential arrangements: up to five years for long-term, successful, quality and diverse providers to give them surety of quality teaching, programme and resource development arrangements; plus a second tier of shorter contracts for smaller unproven providers.

Along with this were requests for school year rather than financial year start and finish points; indexing of salary and fuel costs (the national provider); and advisory groups to be independent and with MOE, advisory service or subject teacher association representation, not hand-picked by the providers themselves.

Increased funding was specifically called for to better “embed LEOTC into the education system”. A group of Wellington providers argued that LEOTC is “a necessary part of the unique character of New Zealand education” and that with more funding and more structuring of LEOTC into the curriculum, New Zealand would be a world leader in innovative “reality” education. Joint ventures between Ministry of Education and the Ministries of Culture and Heritage, Environment, Agriculture and Fisheries, Research Science and Technology, and Creative NZ were suggested as means of enlarging the resource and broadening the activity.

But it was the call for a longer term of agreement for major providers with good track records and wide curriculum coverage which stood out in clarity and strength.

The work of the WIN Network team was much appreciated for its professionalism, feedback, advice and contacts. The new template was praised as was the responsiveness of MOE staff where “vast” improvements were noted. However a broader assessment and evaluation was sought by many, especially the larger providers again who believe they should be accountable for evidence-based learning outcomes, not just administrative, statistical and financial reporting. “The quality and effectiveness of our programmes are not assessed” was a typical comment. (This seemed a little at odds with the comment from Andrew Hutson of WIN who observed: “LEOTC providers are generally robust and transparent and well focused on supporting the curriculum”.)

Related Agencies

The comments from officials at MORST, MCH and MOE were remarkably congruent with those of schools and providers, especially in their calls for a teacher development role, greater emphasis in funding allocation towards major, proven and successful providers and longer contract terms for same.

They were also unanimous in seeking closer links between the curriculum and LEOTC services. “MOE should go out and find what schools actually need from LEOTC for each essential learning area and then specify that this is what we are looking for from providers”, one said. Consultation with teacher subject associations, teacher and principal associations, or a Schools Advisory Group was suggested.

It was also suggested that successful and adaptable large providers could receive a five-to-ten yearly grant sufficient to cover standing costs such as teacher salaries and then be enabled to build on this core by successful bids to specific ELA annual rounds (preferably all ELAs each year).

Another suggestion was for MOE to call a conference of current and intending providers, along with some key teachers and advisors, to talk through these new approaches and ways of transitioning into them.

If several of the modifications above were introduced the long history of annual political complaint from unsuccessful proposers which has bedeviled LEOTC (and successive Ministers) could be brought to an end.

Other specific and related suggestions from officials included:

- Re-allocate, in the selection procedures, both the 12% of marks for “suitability of the organization” and the 8% for “quality of the proposal” to quality education service outcomes;
- Explore partnerships with local authorities (the major funders of museums, art galleries, zoos and the like) to provide expanded LEOTC and community education services.

There was no support, from schools, providers or officials for a regional system of funding allocations.

Summary of Modifications Proposed

Reviewing all the research, and “Push” and “Pull” towards system modification summarized above, the key changes recommended for consideration are that:

1. LEOTC, proven to be a sought after, successful and effective programme of modest funding, be enabled to increase its contribution to the government’s goals of effective teaching, quality providers, lifelong learning of 21st century skills and reduced systematic underachievement. More funding to this end should be sought from Vote: Education and through joint ventures with Ministries of Culture and Heritage, Agriculture and Fisheries, Environment, Research Science and Technology, as well as with Creative New Zealand and territorial local authorities.
2. Once the revised New Zealand Curriculum is confirmed in 2008, the LEOTC programme be further strengthened specifically to enable assistance with the achievement of the key competencies through authentic learning contexts.
3. Teacher pre-service and in-service education activities be defined and sought rather than denied in the statement of core requirements of LEOTC in the project specifications. These activities should be expected from major, long-term, providers who can establish partnerships with pre- and in-service teacher education institutions.
4. “Outpost” relationships between metropolitan and rural providers be encouraged.
5. Schools’ specific curriculum-linked teaching and learning needs and wants, in all essential learning areas, be sought, defined and given priority in requests for proposals.

6. Annual selection rounds for particular learning experiences identified from across all ELAs be conducted, after consultation with schools, teachers and advisors to identify the sector's needs.
7. Programmes be regularly evaluated for their successful learning outcomes, as evidenced by providers and schools.
8. Longer terms of contract, perhaps just for base-level funding, be granted for large, diverse and proven providers; along with shorter term contracts for new and less assured providers of desirable curriculum-linked learning.
9. A close working relationship be maintained with MORST as it begins funding Crown Research Institutes for specific science learning experiences in schools, and be explored with territorial local authorities who could jointly fund community and education learning programmes in museums, galleries, zoos, and parks.