

The Neoliberal Policy Environment and School Counselling in New Zealand 1988-1999

2.1 The neoliberal policy environment: managerialism, accountability and New Public Management.

This chapter outlines two very different phases of counselling in New Zealand schools that have occurred during the neoliberal political environment. The first described here as *Phase 4: A centralised approach*, is arguably a hang-over from a more centralised set of notions about guidance provision that characterised the welfare state, although it occurred after the neoliberal reforms had been applied to educational administration. Only a few years later, with a change to a National government the neoliberal reforms intensified and were applied to education as a whole, largely in the name of accountability, performance, and value for the taxpayer, thus impacting on school counselling. The second phase identified in this chapter as *Phase 5: Changes with neoliberalism*, describes the changes and examines the post-1996 impact on school counsellors of the Ministerial Reference Group (MRG) staffing formula. Two of the principle changes involved key neoliberal notions of deregulation and devolution, which had the effect of threatening the continued existence of counsellors in schools. Another set of neoliberal impacts has been competition from some allied professions such as: social workers in schools, RTLBs (Resource Teachers: Learning and Behaviour) and competition from other professionals from both inside and outside the school. At first, with the focus on reforming the administration of schools in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the impact on school counselling was positive as exemplified by the 1988 *Education Gazette* notice on staffing. But the neoliberal agenda gained momentum in the 1990s, and by 1995 school counselling came under subtle attack in the staffing formula. The attack was not about counselling practices, but about the place and status of counsellors in schools in the neoliberal policy environment. The following section outlines key elements of this environment.

In the 20th century there was an economic paradigm shift from Keynesian economic management and welfare-oriented interventionism in response to the 1930s Depression, to neoliberal monetarism in the latter part of the 20th century. This shift resulted in profound changes in political and social institutions identifiable as an anti-state and anti-bureaucracy attack on government. Hence a comprehensive social democracy became a neoliberal state in what Jane Kelsey termed "The New Zealand Experiment" after David Lange's Labour government came to power in 1984 (Boston and Dalziel, 1992; Kelsey, 1993, 1995). The neoliberal agenda continued unabated under successive Labour and National governments and began to change only slightly following the election in 1999 of Helen Clarke's Labour-led coalition.

The form of neoliberalism that developed during the 1980s, in Britain, USA and New Zealand has been largely shaped by the theories of Friedrich von Hayek that were developed during the first decade of the twentieth century. Known as the "Austrian School" it included: Frederick von Hayek, Carl Menger, Eugene Boehm-Bawerk and Ludwig von Mises (Peters, 2001). Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* (1944) focussed on the problems of the planned socialist economy where the absence of a pricing system prevented producers from knowing the true production costs and other possibilities. Hayek warned about the political dangers of socialism and totalitarianism which he maintained came directly from the planned nature of institutions. After World-War II, Hayek thought governments were too welfare-oriented and constraining of the free market, consuming wealth and infringing individual rights. For Hayek, the market did not result from human design, but was the result of human actions over many years. Hayek emphasised methodological individualism, the doctrine of spontaneous order and the notion of *homo economicus* (economic man) that is based on three key assumptions: individuality, rationality and self-interest. In 1947, Hayek set up the highly influential Mont Pelerin Society which aimed at restoring classical liberalism, the "free" society and its main institution, the free market. The Society included some prominent economists (Milton Friedman, George Stigler) from the second and third "Chicago School" and with it, the main strands of American neoliberalism – public choice theory (Gordon Tullock, James Buchanan) and human capital theory (Gary Becker) (see <<http://cepa.newschool.edu/het/index.htm>>; also Peters, 2001).

The various "Chicago Schools", emphasising free market libertarianism for over a hundred years, have been highly influential in promoting neoliberalism. In the 1960s and 1970s "neoclassical economics was deemed to provide a unified approach to the study of human behaviour and had been extended into areas that are traditionally the preserve and prerogative of political science, sociology, and other social science disciplines" (Peters, 2001: 15). Neoliberalism claims that efficiency of the free market provides a superior allocative mechanism for the distribution of scarce public resources and is a morally superior form of political economy. Yet, although neoliberal policies are identified with a fiscal austerity programme designed to shrink the public sector (of which state schools form a sub-sector), the negative effect in New Zealand has been one of increasing gaps between rich and poor and the growth of poverty – hardly what could be argued as morally superior results (Boston and Dalziel, 1992). The competitive, possessive form of individualism that is often construed as "consumer sovereignty" – emphasising freedom over equality and individual freedoms over community freedoms – implies first a "freedom from" (especially state interference) rather than "freedom to", and second an acceptance of inequalities that are generated by the market (Peters and Marshall, 1996). Clearly, such notions have important implications not only for education, but also for school counselling as a profession and for the world that the counsellor's clients have to negotiate.

In the 1980s, to legitimate the attack on the bureaucratic welfare state, many Western governments adopted neoliberal ideas, based largely on Hayek's political and economic philosophy. This involved an economic rationalisation or liberalisation aimed at abolishing subsidies and tariffs, floating the exchange rate, freeing up foreign investment controls and restructuring the public sector through corporatisation and privatisation. It often led to downsizing, contracting out and a concerted attack on unions, replacing wage bargaining with individual and collective employment contracts, site contracts, performance targets. Perhaps, most importantly for education, neoliberalism involved dismantling the welfare state through commercialisation, contracting out services, targeted services, and the promotion of notions of self responsibility. Under neoliberalism there is nothing distinctive or special about education or health; they are services, products, commodities to be treated like any other, to be traded in the marketplace (Peters, 1999).

Debate about accountability in New Zealand schools emerged during the 1980s amid concerns about standards of achievement, curriculum development and content, levels of public and parental participation, and managerial responsibility. At this point, accountability became almost a mantra that saw problems in the quality of education being solved through the increased accountability of schools and teachers. In parallel, Neave (1987) argued that the notion of accountability in Britain during the 1980s disguised underlying conflicts between conservative and radical groups. The conservative approach was to challenge progressive education with a move back to the basics of tried and accepted practices. The radical approach challenged institutional inertia and teacher resistance in dealing with issues such as equity and affirmative action. Yet prior to the 1980s reforms, New Zealand schools had always had systems of accountability. For example, schools were accountable to parents and the State through mechanisms that included Department of Education inspectors, external examinations of students (School Certificate, University Entrance, Bursary), and reports to parents. However the issue of accountability was not as explicit as it became after the reforms of the public sector. Successive neoliberal governments in the late 1980s and the 1990s addressed this debate by using a managerialist approach that emphasised the four "D's": decentralisation, devolution, deregulation, and delegation (Bushnell & Scott 1988; Boston *et al.*, 1996; Pollit, 1990). Such an approach is partly exemplified by Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman's *In Search of Excellence* (1982), a title rather significantly adapted for the secondary school reforms, *Administering For Excellence: Effective Administration in Education*, (Ministry of Education 1988a, [Picot Report]) and *Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Educational Administration in New Zealand* (Ministry of Education, 1988b).

Public sector reforms in New Zealand were similar to those introduced in the UK, USA and Australia during the 1980s and 1990s, and have used similar policy mechanisms of "commercialisation, corporatisation, and privatisation; the devolution of management responsibilities; a shift from input controls to output and outcome measures; tighter performance specification; and more extensive contracting out" (Boston *et al.*, 1996: 2). These reforms were "part of a carefully crafted, integrated, and mutually reinforcing reform agenda" (Boston *et al.*, 1996: 3) aimed at improving not just the economy, but also social and political structures. The revamp of the public sector in what

became known as the New Public Management (NPM) was based on particular notions of managerialism and accountability that provided the overall context for the introduction of performance management systems in schools, and in turn their application for school counselling. As part of the NPM, "accountability has been defined in terms of external monitoring, measurement and control, and this particular view of accountability has been enshrined in policy" (Codd, 1989: 3). Codd asserted that in the 1988 *Picot Report* (Ministry of Education, 1988a) accountability became central to the setting up of a Review and Audit Agency which was renamed the Education Review Office (ERO) whose purpose "is to ensure that institutions are accountable for the government funds they spend and for meeting the objectives set out in their charter" (Ministry of Education, 1988b: 20). Jonathon Boston *et al.* (1996) explained that although public sector organisations are constrained by political and parliamentary control of resources, the NPM aimed for optimal use of taxpayer funds, while at the same time reducing public expenditure by improving effectiveness and efficiency through becoming more responsive to its clients and becoming managerially more accountable. "An organisation's effectiveness is measured by the extent to which it accomplishes its objectives, while its efficiency is measured by the relationship between inputs and outputs" (Boston *et al.*, 1996: 13). Therefore the notion of performance became a central concern requiring evidence from schools that they were effective in demonstrating that the state's (and the taxpayer's) investment was paying off. The 1980s administrative reforms required schools to write a charter (set of goals), statements that translate these goals to measurable objectives, to control assets and adopt a variety of reporting mechanisms. The means of achieving accountability were: clear objectives, appropriate management systems, adequate information, incentives and sanctions, and effective assessment.

Boston distinguished the objectives, principles and policies of the NPM model. A Treasury document (1987), *Government Management* indicated the main principles of NPM reforms to the incoming Labour government as being: goal clarity, transparency, contestability, avoidance of capture, congruent incentive structures, enhancement of accountability and cost-effective use of information (New Zealand Treasury, 1987). These NPM principles replaced those of the old-style Public Service, which emphasised anonymity, secrecy, conformity, regulation, bureaucratic structures, incremental budgets, stable career paths, vague performance standards and political neutrality. The NPM as synthesised by Treasury was derived from a range of theoretical models including public choice theory, organisational economics, principal-agency theory and transaction-cost economics (Boston *et al.*, 1996). These theories describe in various ways how accountability can be achieved if it is assumed that people act out of self-interest as rational utility maximisers. This model argues that members of an organisation, like a school, are bound together by self-interest, similar to the ways parties to a contract are bound together. One or both parties are likely to behave opportunistically, trying to disadvantage the other party through self-serving actions at the expense of those they are supposed to serve. When rationality is bounded, opportunism flourishes since both parties are not privy to the same amounts of information. It may result in "provider capture", whereby staff-interests rather than client or "stakeholder" interests dominate a sector. One of the ways Treasury saw of combating what it perceived as "provider capture", and a characteristic feature of managerialism, has been the development of the professional or generic manager with "general" skills and expertise in management as a profession, but no actual experience in the field to which they are appointed (New Zealand Treasury, 1987, 1996). For example: Keith Bollard, originally from the Department of Forestry, was appointed the initial Secretary for the Ministry of Education and subsequently, Howard Fancy from the Treasury and the Prime Minister's Department was appointed as the Secretary for the Ministry of Education. Not only would this prevent provider capture, but also, it would enable a more hard-nosed approach than there might be if managers already had relationships within the sector. Managerialism is only one of the components of NPM, but has become an international ideology upon which the economic, social and political order in advanced industrial societies is currently based (Ball, 1992; Drucker, 1993; Enteman, 1993; Pollit, 1990). Managerialism is an ideology created by managers, a technology of power, whereby managers lay claim to professional expertise in areas of leadership and decision-making and where the objects of the system are incarcerated in the system whether they like it or not (Ball, 1992).

This trend has not yet occurred in secondary schools, where Principals are still generally appointed from the school sector. Treasury saw teachers and PPTA as having "captured" schools, so PPTA came under steady criticism for not being as concerned about the education of students as about the teachers' conditions of work (NZ Treasury, 1987,

1996). PPTA resisted individual contracts, bulk funding of schools and performance related pay. They accepted the implementation of performance management systems in 1997, and finally accepted an element of performance related pay in the form of professional standards as a part of performance management of teachers in 1999. Performance-related pay creates the danger of staff acting out of self-interest whereby they select largely positive feedback, minimising any negatives in evaluations and appraisals provided to managers. Schools and teachers were not so much concerned about *being* accountable, rather, they were concerned about who it was they were accountable to, for what, how this assessment and evaluation were to be achieved and under what circumstances.

Construing the counselling relationship as a contract between two parties that act out of self-interest and behaves opportunistically to maximise their own utility is totally at odds with the notion and culture of counselling. It would seem that *prima facie*, if anything, the counselling relationship is based on the concepts of love, *aroha*, respect, responsibility and altruism rather than self-interest. Indeed, the marketisation of the counselling relationship raises important ethical issues and conflicts of interest. While the move to self-managing schools might require improved reporting, monitoring and accountability mechanisms, the role and place of school counselling in this new accountability model requires careful examination.

A number of the NPM key policies relate strongly to performance management. First there is an emphasis on the use of incentives to enhance performance. Such incentives may include short-term employment contracts, performance-based remuneration systems and promotion systems. Second, the contract is central. The contract specifies both the nature of the performance required and the respective obligations of the parties. Third, performance management systems are linked to strategic planning. In the public sector this may mean that ministers specify strategic result areas and key result areas, and include these in a Chief Executive's performance agreement. Fourth, the clarification of accountability involved the removal, wherever possible, of dual or multiple accountabilities and the avoidance of joint central and local democratic control of public services. But if a management ethos perceives accountability in terms of technocratic control, with an emphasis on external monitoring and measurement of performance, democratic values of collegiality, participation, responsiveness and partnership, deemed to be important for a school's ethos and morale, are likely to disappear.

Many of the features of the reforms in education carried out since the late 1980s can be seen clearly in the NPM (see Boston *et al.*, 1996: 26, for a summary). These reforms include: the belief that private and public organisations (like education) are not significantly different so they should be managed similarly; devolution or self-management; an emphasis on outputs or results rather than accountability of processes; favouring generic management skills rather than policy; contestable funding and the contracting out of services (e.g., Specialist Education Service); introducing private sector management practices, including charters, mission statements, strategic plans etc; introducing bulk-funding and performance-linked remuneration and the use of monetary incentives; and stressing efficiency and cost-cutting.

The NPM model has been applied to the education sector through forms of governance and surveillance. The power relationship between schools and the state are monitored through various techniques set down by the Ministry of Education, the Education Review Office and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). The Ministry of Education developed such mechanisms in a series of policy statements in the mid-1990s, for example: *Education for the 21st Century*, (1994); *Draft National Guidelines For Performance Management In Schools* (1995b); the *PMS* series (1997b); *Professional Standards: Criteria for Quality Teaching - Secondary School Teachers and Unit Holders* (1999a); and *Teacher Performance Management: A resource for boards of trustees, principals and teachers* (1999c). ERO and NZQA undertake external monitoring of accountability within the education sector. ERO conducts effectiveness and quality assurance audits, whilst NZQA accredits schools that have submitted extensive documentation, indicating not so much the quality of their teaching and courses, but that the quality assurance criteria have been fulfilled through schools having policies detailing their management systems and quality control procedures. Middleton (1998: 10) suggests that the monitoring of schools conducted by ERO is "a clear example of Foucault's concept of the 'power of the examination'". Some of the functions of NZQA include: overseeing the setting of standards for secondary and tertiary education; ensuring that assessment mechanisms guarantee standards along

with common entrance standards for university entrance; advising the Minister of Education on standards; establishing policies and criteria for approving courses and for the accreditation of institutions; and achieving international recognition for New Zealand qualifications and vice versa (see Education Amendment Act, 1990). Only when a school was accredited was it then permitted to grant credits for particular courses or determine eligibility for students to enter national qualifications, a task that schools had been doing since they were set up, long before NZQA was formed.

Following Foucault (1977), a form of panoptic and normalising gaze becomes apparent in the neoliberal environment in the form of surveillance techniques that are involved in school performance management systems. Arguably, parents, the media and ERO provide forms of external surveillance and evaluation of the school and its management. If staff appraisal and evaluation involve reports that are provided to the appraiser, but not to the person being appraised, the staff member is likely to feel under constant scrutiny. Furthermore, when salary is tied to the norms of performance, staff are likely to considerably modify or police their own actions and gestures, becoming involved in a form of self-subjugation and forging themselves as "docile bodies". As White and Epston (1990: 71) argued, "this modern system of power is one that not only renders persons and their bodies as projects, but also recruits persons into an active role in their own subjugation, into actively participating in operations that shape their lives according to the norms or specifications of the organization". The form of power that is involved is self-constituting, in that it constitutes or shapes an individual's professional life. For school counsellors, the system of power forms part of their professional identity and their ethical self-constitution.

2.2 Phase 4: A centralised approach: guidance counsellors in all schools, 1989–1995.

The numbers of guidance counsellors in secondary schools increased gradually but not consistently through the 1970s and 1980s. Some schools, deemed to be pilot schools, had several counsellors and guidance teachers, but not all secondary schools had a counsellor, despite having quite large rolls. Auckland Boys Grammar, for instance, had a sports director instead of a guidance counsellor. To remedy this inequitable situation, in 1988 *The New Zealand Education Gazette* issued a statement requiring all integrated and state secondary schools with a roll of over 400 to use their guidance time allowance to appoint a full-time, PR2, Guidance Counsellor from the start of 1989 (Department of Education, 1988). Schools with fewer than 200 students were allocated a half day of guidance network time. This gazetted notice also increased the time allocation for Te Atakura (Maori) teachers in their guidance time and in their time for liaison between the school and the Maori community from one day to two and a half days a week.

Guidance staffing provisions, with brief job outlines of personnel considered to be part of a guidance time allowance were clearly spelt out in the Ministry of Education's RS40 annual roll return as summarised below. The personnel included in the guidance time allowance comprised:

- Guidance network – selected staff e.g. deans, form teachers for pastoral care and personal guidance of students;
 - Guidance counsellor – full-time permanent teacher trained to perform guidance counsellor duties, including careers advice;
 - Guidance teacher – part-time teaching, part-time careers and general guidance of students;
 - Careers adviser – providing educational and vocational guidance to students and parents in schools with fewer than 2 guidance counsellors.
- (Ministry of Education, RS40 annual roll return, 1992).

Guidance counsellor positions were pro-rated at different levels of responsibility depending on the school roll as follows:

- under 200: no provision
- over 200: one 0.6 part-time position
- over 400: one full-time guidance counsellor
- over 900: one full-time counsellor and 1 half-time guidance teacher
- over 1200: two full-time counsellors

- over 1400: two full-time counsellors and 1 half-time guidance teacher
 - over 1800: three full-time counsellors
- (Ministry of Education, RS40 annual roll return, 1992).

This period from 1989 to 1995, following the 1988 *Education Gazette* statement, was a high point in terms of the number, place and status of counselling positions in all state and integrated secondary schools, a time when almost every secondary school had a school counsellor. Such halcyon days were not to last.

Once counselling was set up in almost all secondary schools, during the decades of the 1970s and 1980s it slipped from being a regular and continued focus of government policy, to being virtually ignored by the Department of Education and then the Ministry of Education. It became an invisible player. Even the *Johnson Report* (Department of Education, 1979) downplayed "counselling", despite its emphasis on "guidance". In the 1980s, at a time of increased youth unemployment, schooling was becoming constructed in terms of preparing or fitting the young for the workforce. Both the academic curriculum and youth themselves were blamed for not providing or for not having the 'right' skills. This represented a re-emergence of the deficit model. Young people were encouraged to remain or even return to school to gain skills and qualifications to fit workforce requirements, which in turn lowered the unemployment figures (Webb, 1990). Parallel to guidance counselling, special funding emerged for transition teachers and transition education in a move formalised in *Skills for Young People* (1985), a discussion paper by the Ministers of Education, Employment and Maori Affairs (Marshall, 1987). While "transition policy statements, like funding, have abounded" (Webb, 1990: 42) guidance funding did not, and there was little guidance policy made until the staffing statement in the late 1980s. Then there was nothing more until the mid 1990s when neoliberalism, accountability, and management issues came to the fore (Besley, 2000; Webb, 1990). Counselling seems to have become part of the status quo in schools, with its role and place largely unquestioned. Yet there seems to be an ongoing tension over vocationally oriented guidance structures and guidance counselling that emerges from time to time, depending largely on how the purpose of education is constructed. The *Lynch Report* (Ministry of Education, 1995a), described in the next section, highlights this tension.

2.3 Phase 5: Changes with neoliberalism: deregulation, devolution and decentralisation, 1996–1999.

In a deregulatory move characteristic of neoliberalism, the 1995 Ministerial Reference Group's (MRG) staffing changes that had been implemented in 1996, removed the previous staffing formula (as described in Phase 4). These staffing changes were of crucial importance to school counsellors yet there had been no critique or consultation of guidance counselling by the Ministry. Instead, there was a report commissioned by the Ministry of Education about career guidance, the *Report of the Career Information and Guidance Review Panel [the Lynch Report]*, named after the Chairperson, Brother Pat Lynch, Executive Director, NZ Catholic Education Office and Association of Proprietors of Integrated Schools who publicly supported neoliberal policies] (Ministry of Education, 1995a). In the increasingly right-wing, neoliberal political climate the *Lynch Report* supported the MRG and either deliberately or accidentally ignored all previous government policy and statements on guidance and counselling in the existing staffing formula and endorsed uncritically the MRG recommendations (Ministry of Education, 1995a):

...all school staffing resources, including the basic staffing entitlement, and the Transition Allowance, will be incorporated into a Core Resource Entitlement from 1996. Schools will receive this resource in the form of a global entitlement rather than a specific staffing entitlement (Ministry of Education, 1995a: 16).

The result was that guidance networks and guidance counsellors no longer held prescribed positions, but were simply part of the core or global staffing entitlement. After the MRG deregulation:

- a) schools no longer have a *formal* requirement to have a school counsellor on their staff
- b) the counsellor's status was no longer *specified* at PR2 (or 2MU) in most secondary schools of over 400 students
- c) the counsellor no longer had to be a trained teacher
- d) compulsory training for counsellors was no longer required as it had been (and was fully funded) by the Department of Education.

A *global* staffing entitlement has serious implications because in emphasising 'core' activities it then becomes a relatively easy (and seemingly reasonable) step to cease to fund 'non-core' activities, consequently disestablishing them. Such moves have been rife in the business world where non-core activities may at best be sold off, or at worst, closed down. In the public sector they might be privatised or disestablished. A *global* staffing entitlement implies that counselling is no longer important, possibly no longer needed within secondary schools. It threatens the very place and existence of the specialist role of a school counsellor and the professional training that is required to become such a 'specialist teacher' who often heads a guidance network.

The composition of the panel of five (Pat Lynch; Catherine Gibson, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Youth Affairs; Roger Lampen, Chief Executive, Lampen group; Paul Morgan, Deputy chairman, Federation of Maori Authorities; Jan Osborn, HoD, Foundation Sciences, Central Institute of Technology) on the *Lynch Report* was notable for the lack of representation from the Ministry of Education itself, from state schools or from anyone in careers or guidance counselling positions within schools. However, the appendix listing of those who provided briefings or submissions includes many schools, but not NZAC, although an Auckland Careers Counselling Interest group was noted. The Foreword provides the rationale for this report in terms of "a strong commitment to life long learning" as "one of the passports for being a successful citizen in the new millennium", noting how difficult it was for many people "to navigate their way through an increasingly complex society" (Ministry of Education, 1995a: 1). It asserted that the construction of a "strongly integrated career services network will help empower our country to become an international leader, demonstrating qualities of social cohesion, respect for individuals and robust economic development" (Ministry of Education, 1995a: 1). How such a network and an information system would achieve such social and economic goals is never discussed in the Report.

The following statement about government resourcing for guidance time is alarming for its failure to indicate that the guidance time allocation is used for anything other than "career information and guidance in secondary schools":

26. In addition to the services provided by The Careers Service, the Government also resources career information and guidance in secondary schools. Currently, secondary schools receive resources in the form of a roll-generated guidance time allowance which is included in their overall staffing entitlement. Guidelines require schools with rolls of over 400 students to use the guidance time to appoint, in the first instance, a full-time Position of Responsibility (PR2) guidance counsellor. The remainder of the guidance time is available for career advice. A school's management decides whether to use this component of the guidance time allowance for career advice or to meet other priorities. Likewise school management can utilise staffing allocations, for example general teacher release time, to increase the provision of career services if this is seen as a priority (Ministry of Education, 1995a: 15-16).

This statement implied that 'guidance time' was primarily used for career guidance, and offered no explanation of what was meant by 'guidance', nor made any reference to the personal counselling, the social education or preventative programmes that school counsellors actually provide. In fact, except in small schools, the guidance counsellor does not now undertake career guidance. This is usually provided by another person, not necessarily with any counselling training whatsoever. The selective nature of this report interpreted and emphasised that guidance was narrowly focussed on career guidance. On the contrary, guidance has a broad focus whereby career guidance is by no means the major component of a guidance counsellor's job, nor therefore the main focus of counsellor accountability.

The threat to the counsellor's place within secondary schools was considerably increased through the neoliberal agenda, which promoted devolution of power to schools and Boards of Trustees via the notion of self-management and direct resourcing of teachers' salaries. This was part of a larger strategy that attacked traditional welfare policies and reliance on the state, by promoting self-reliance instead. This strategy has had a large role to play in redefining school structures, the social environment and the ideology within which counsellors must now practice. Within self-managing schools, the Board of Trustees and the principal, not the Ministry of Education, have the power to decide how to staff their schools and allocate management units. Direct resourcing was removed in 2000, but while and where it existed, it provided extra money and flexibility. It could fund any combination of teaching or non-

teaching staff (including more counselling staff) or provide new equipment. It could pay staff more by allocating management units. Despite the MRG deregulation and the lack of a formal place in schools, counsellors were not made redundant, but if they left there was no requirement for a school to replace them with a counsellor or some other equivalent (e.g., a social worker, youth worker, or psychologist) or to contract counselling services to an outside provider.

By late 1999, two positions had been dis-established in Southland: Gore High School's counsellor was removed due to a falling roll; at Mt. Anglam none was appointed despite there having been, prior to amalgamation, a counsellor at each of its schools, Kingswell and Cargill. Some counsellors in other schools had lost status through a reduction in the allocation of management units (e.g., Waitakere College and James Cook High School). Senior College of New Zealand (SCONZ), a private Auckland school, contracts out its counselling provision. Hopefully the current position whereby most secondary schools have continued to have a permanent 2MU position for school counsellors, using trained teachers, does not simply indicate inertia. Instead, it may suggest an awareness of the importance of retaining counsellors within the school structure to deal with students' problems, rather than contracting them from outside (Besley, 2000; Webb, 1996). For a long time now, it has been considered important that those appointed to counselling positions must be experienced teachers. PPTA supported this policy right from the start. It was seen as a necessity so that school counsellors could readily gain the trust and support of students, teachers and Principal. Even in the de-regulated 1990s, most schools appear to lend support for this concept, because teachers have a clear understanding of the structural components of the job as well as experience and expertise in dealing with young people. It seems that the perceived need for counselling in schools has been complicated by the efforts of the New Right to gain control over schooling and education in the reform of education (Ball, 1992).

Guidance counsellors and guidance networks became an integral part of New Zealand secondary schools after the 1971 *Working Party Report*. In fact, as NZAC (1997) argued, they were a core function alongside curriculum and administration. Guidance was clearly endorsed by the 1979 *Johnson Report*. Yet in terms of educational policy and practice, the focus and official discourse about guidance and guidance counselling as a core function almost disappeared from view in the 1980s and early 1990s. Counselling was left to the vagaries of restructuring under neoliberal policies. The sort of invisibility that had developed was exemplified by NZAC's concerns about the way the documentation was constructed for the 1997 Review Panel of ERO. NZAC pointed out that it was difficult to construct specific responses for their submission since their concerns were largely about omissions (NZAC Newsletter, 1997, 18 (2)). NZAC pointed out:

The guidance function is still present, but now subsumed within the descriptions of the two other functions, as exemplified in the National Education Goals and the National Administration Guidelines. ERO teams seem to identify guidance primarily in relation to barriers to learning and concerns about health and safety. Guidance functioning is however pivotal to all aspects of the NEG and NAGs (NZAC Newsletter, 1997, 18 (2): 25).

The implied and imprecise part that school counsellors play in achieving the National Education Goals (NEGs) and National Administration Guidelines (NAGs) was developed after wide consultation by NZAC (Ministry of Education, 1993). NZAC have detailed how counsellors contribute to *all* of the NEGs and NAGs in a four-page appendix to their 1998 policy, *School Counselling*, on the Role of a Guidance Counsellor. NZAC has not made this an official publication, but sent the documentation as correspondence to its members, schools, PPTA and the Ministry of Education. Despite describing how counsellors contribute to all of the NEGs and NAGs, counsellors contribute more directly to some of these than to others. Furthermore, individual job descriptions will alter those NEGs and NAGs which are particularly relevant for counsellors in different schools (for NEGs and NAGs, see Ministry of Education, 1993).

The NEGs involve aspects of the traditional role of school counsellors in terms of personal development, socialisation, adjustment, and Treaty of Waitangi goals as follows: enable students to realise their full potential by working holistically to address their intellectual, emotional, social, physical, and spiritual needs; advance policy develop-

ment especially in student welfare; encourage involvement in guidance related curriculum areas: Health Education, lifeskills and vocational programmes; identify and remove barriers to learning as a core activity for counsellors; provide vocational and educational guidance to help students develop the knowledge, understanding and skills for the modern ever-changing world; offer support, advice and at times counselling for parents in raising their children; monitor the school climate to promote fairness, equity and positive relationships; identify and support special needs students where possible; increase participation by Maori through the advancement of Maori Education initiatives consistent with Te Tiritiri O Waitangi; respecting the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of New Zealand (see Ministry of Education, 1993).

Whilst the curriculum aspects of the National Administration Guidelines do not generally apply as much to them as they do to other teachers, counsellors do provide schools with a major component of NAG 5: "i. provide a safe physical and emotional environment for students; ii. comply in full with any legislation currently in force or that may be developed to ensure the safety of students and employees" (Ministry of Education, 1993). The work that school counsellors undertake in the welfare of students is aimed particularly at this guideline through dealing with issues such as sexual harassment, sexual abuse, bullying, violence, physical abuse, and suicidality. This provision is achieved by counsellors promoting safe and healthy behaviour through individual, group and sometimes family counselling; by organising itinerant services in-house, such as running health clinics; by co-ordinating programmes such as "Peer Support", "Cool Schools" (peer mediation), "Safe Schools", "Eliminating Violence". Such functions are far more extensive than the narrow interpretation of "guidance" suggested by the *Lynch Report* (Ministry of Education, 1995a). Moreover, they do not point to any reason why the MRG should have removed specified staffing for school counselling – quite the contrary.

Certainly, on the basis of enabling schools to fulfil the requirements of both the National Education Goals and the National Administration Guidelines, school counselling can demonstrate clearly that it has an important part to play in meeting the emotional and social needs of adolescents, a part that requires specialist training, skills, understanding and expertise. This major role enables schools to be accountable to the state in fulfilment of important national requirements set by the Ministry of Education and as part of the present performance management systems in schools (Ministry of Education, 1997a, 1999b). In noting the increased stress on adolescents and the limited amount of community assistance available in the 1990s, "adequately trained school counsellors remain the cornerstone of provisions for adolescent mental health and development in secondary schools" (Webb, 1996: 21).

In the late 1990s, it seems that school staffing ratios, including guidance counselling, were defined more by the annual government Budget statements, than by the Ministry of Education policy. Staffing is left more to the discretion of the Board of Trustees and the principal as part of the concept of the self-managing school especially when staff salaries are bulk-funded. In light of this and in lieu of any clear statement assigning counsellors to schools, school counsellors have become particularly vulnerable to the whims, prejudices and support of the principal and Board and are more than ever likely to need to use accountability evaluation data to support and explain their role and to justify their continued existence in secondary schools.

2.4 Policy, protocols and procedures for school counsellors to manage child abuse (1995) and suicide (1998).

Two policies in the mid-1990s set out ways of dealing with particularly serious and challenging issues that counsellors face: child abuse and youth suicide. The first set of policies was a 1995 publication from the Children and Young Person's Service (CYPS), *Breaking the Cycle: an Interagency Guide to Child Abuse*, and the National Inter-agency Protocols that followed. The second set of documentation was the report, *The Prevention, Recognition and Management of Young People at Risk of Suicide: Development of Guidelines for Schools* (Beautrais et al., 1997), that was followed by *Young People at Risk of Suicide: a Guide for Schools* (Beautrais et al., 1998). This subsection deals in turn with each set of documentation.

Breaking the Cycle, 1995

The publication of *Breaking the Cycle: an Interagency Guide to Child Abuse* (1995) followed the 1995 passing of a set of forty amendments to the *Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act* (1989) that included the "paramountcy" principle, as set out in s6 of the CYP&F Act, 1989, regarding the care and protection of children and young people. The "paramountcy" principle meant that the welfare and interests of children and young people are deemed to come first. *Breaking the Cycle* dealt with how child abuse was to be reported and also with the new child protection duties that were placed on the Department of Social Welfare. Mandatory reporting of child abuse had prompted considerable public debate and, after consultation, the Government opted to emphasise education and voluntary reporting instead of mandatory reporting. *Breaking the Cycle* was published in the aftermath of this, and followed extensive consultation with many groups and organisations, including the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Police and Doctors for Sexual Abuse Care. The *Breaking the Cycle* booklet was followed in 1996 by a set of National Interagency Protocols, signed by the relevant chief executive or equivalent from several agencies. The education sector protocol formed Section 5 and comprised ten pages. This was an agreement between the Ministry of Education, the NZ School Trustees Association and NZCYPS, noted as having been "developed with the help of a working party and wide consultation in the education sector" (CYPS, 1996: 2). NZAC was one of thirteen organisations that either formed, or was consulted by the working party. It submitted a policy statement to CYPS that was published with the 1996 protocols. The submission referred to principles of autonomy, beneficence, not doing harm, confidentiality and informed consent in the NZAC Code of Ethics (see *NZAC Newsletter*, 1995, 16 (3): 23-24). This was a significant acknowledgement of the status of the organisation and of the place of school counsellors in dealing with the issues of abuse and neglect.

Breaking the Cycle (CYPS, 1995) is a 63-page booklet with seven chapters. The first briefly described the services of CYPS; the second, provided definitions and signs of abuse or neglect; the third, a new set of procedures for reporting child abuse and neglect; the fourth, a list of personnel and groups involved in child protection; the fifth, interagency case management and safe practice; the sixth, who's who in CYPS and, finally, a directory of CYPS sites. Guidance counsellors were specifically mentioned in Chapter Four, as one of a list of groups that "have a central role in child abuse prevention work and in the area of family violence" and are "based at most high schools and colleges and are often the first to be approached by students" (CYPS, 1995: 48).

The education sector protocol (CYPS, 1996) included two recommended policies, but as was characteristic of much policy making in the neoliberal climate of the times, did not actually prescribe a policy that schools had to follow to the letter. One recommended policy was for reporting child abuse and neglect in schools, the other was for dealing with child abuse allegations against employees in schools. The policies included a set of procedures and a flowchart to clarify the actions to be taken. It was from this template, a policy that was to act as a guide, that Boards of Trustees were expected subsequently to develop their own policies; and it was presumed that ERO would check the policy in their audits of schools. Whilst guidance counsellors were mentioned briefly in relation to the first policy, they were not referred to at all in the second that dealt with allegations against school employees.

The protocol's policy guidelines placed the responsibility for dealing with child abuse/neglect on all staff: "It is expected that boards will need to facilitate training for all staff to help them to identify suspected abuse and/or neglect and to be able to respond appropriately" (CYPS, 1996: 6). It went on to suggest that "to assist with the implementation of a training policy, individual boards and/or principals should liaise with NZCYPS and New Zealand Police" (CYPS, 1996: 6). It then listed guidance counsellors first (along with visiting teachers, SES educational psychologists and "personnel who can provide further assistance to students") as providing "further support", presumably for training staff. Despite stating: "A useful way of managing suspected cases of child abuse and/or neglect is for a staff member to be nominated as a safety advocate for the child or young person" (CYPS, 1996: 6) and the flow chart recommending that the child safety advocate "should be trained in child abuse management" (8), the policy did not go as far as spelling out any clear, distinctive role for guidance counsellors. It did not seem to show any understanding of, nor be prepared to endorse their training, skills or place in secondary schools. Yet in the procedures and flow chart, a staff member who suspects that a child is being abused or neglected is advised to "inform the principal" and to "hold immediate discussion with guidance counsellor or child safety

advocate" (7-8). This strategy may have been advocated because the protocol was for *all* schools and not just for secondary schools, which usually have counsellors as part of their normal staffing complement, or maybe it reflected a low level of confidence in the school guidance counsellors. Maybe if the protocol had gone further, it would have implied that all schools would have had to employ counsellors and the National government of the day was probably not prepared to bear that expense.

Young People at Risk of Suicide: a Guide for Schools, 1998

In a similar manner to the production of *Breaking the Cycle* (CYPS, 1995), the 1998 *Young People at Risk of Suicide: a Guide for Schools* (subsequently called the *Guide*) was produced after considerable consultation to drafts and a Report both of which were written in 1997 (see Appendix to the *Guide* for consultation details). The *Guide* differed from *Breaking the Cycle* by presenting far greater procedural detail. As part of a national strategy in response to serious concerns about New Zealand's "high and increasing rate of youth suicide"¹ (Beautrais *et al.*, 1997: 1), four youth suicide experts (Annette Beautrais, Carolyn Coggan, David Fergusson, and Lewis Rivers) were commissioned by the Ministry of Education and the National Advisory Committee on Health and Disability (National Health Committee) to report on:

- the spectrum of suicidal behaviour in young people and the causes
- the development of school based policies and strategies to manage and prevent suicidal behaviour in the school context
- recommendations for responses to suicidal behaviour in school students
- advice and recommendation to manage the aftermath of suicide, suicide attempts and suicidal behaviour in school students (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 33).

The 1998 *Guide* had an accompanying report, *The Prevention, Recognition and Management of Young People at Risk of Suicide: Development of Guidelines for Schools*, written in 1997 by the same authors.

Guidance counsellors and NZAC had quite a considerable input into the early drafts (see Appendix I in Beautrais *et al.*, 1997) and the final *Guide*. The Appendix to the *Guide* noted that the four authors agreed to a number of alterations to the text after the consultation process and an analysis of the 276 written submissions. Guidance counsellors, along with BoT members and principals took part in a series of 26 consultation meetings held throughout the country. The input of counsellors and NZAC modified the type of medical mental health model that the draft initially presented, and clearly stated and staked guidance counsellors' claims of having a vital part to play in dealing with the suicidality of students (see *NZAC Newsletter*, 1997, 18 (3): 22-28).

The *Guide* (1998) established clearly the responsibility of principals and the BoT in relation to sections 75 and 77 of the Education Act, 1989, and the Ministry of Education's 1993 NEGs and NAGs (see *Guide*, 1998: 7-8; and Eppel, 1998). It was recommended that the Board develop a multi-pronged approach of prevention, recognition, intervention, management and review process, accompanied by relevant school policies:

Prevention - implement health education programmes which promote a safe and healthy environment including teaching the current health and physical education curriculum. Develop policies and procedures for the management of any traumatic event such as the death of a student or a member of staff, so that distress to others is minimised.

Recognition - acknowledge in written policy that, as far as they are trained and able, it is the responsibility of all staff to endeavour to identify young people experiencing mental health and personal adjustment problems and especially those who may be at risk of seriously contemplating, planning or attempting suicide.

Intervention - ensure that any student who is identified as being at risk is referred to the designated staff member (i.e. counsellor) is assessed, assistance and support are provided or a referral made to an appropriate service.

Management - develop a management plan for young people at risk of suicide which details the

immediate actions necessary to promote their safety, including consultation with other professionals and family members, monitoring and/or referral to appropriate services and follow up.

Review - the ongoing review of the policies, procedures and competence of staff to identify and appropriately refer students who are at risk of attempting suicide. (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 8).

The *Guide* and the set of consultation meetings prior to its publication reinforced the mandate of school counsellors, advising: "that all schools should have access to qualified, competent and externally supervised counsellors who assume the responsibility for the assessment and management of all at risk young people in the school" (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 12). Although it does not actually spell out that they need to be on site, it is implied thus: "Schools should develop clear procedures (based on this guide) and a climate which encourages young people to discuss their personal concerns with teachers and feel comfortable about talking to the counsellor" (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 12). Furthermore, "counsellors or designated staff, will then have the primary responsibility to arrange appropriate assistance for the young person while he or she is within the care of the school" (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 12). That there should be some one other than a counsellor included would be a point of concern, if they were not suitably trained and competent as indicated above. It is indicative of the situation in the de-regulated 1990s when schools had freedom to employ who they wished and may have employed a psychologist or social worker as well or instead of a guidance counsellor. The issue of confidentiality was highlighted with the wording in Table 2 of the *Guide* differing from that in the 1997 report by the insertion of "may" with regard to informing the principal and the family/caregiver and by a section discussing confidentiality (see Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 19). Furthermore, since "it is strongly recommended that referrals are made only to professionals who are members of a recognised professional organisation which has documented ethical guidelines, professional conduct procedures and requirements for supervision", it endorsed the work of those school counsellors who belong to NZAC and supported the requirement for them to have supervision, something some principals challenged and were reluctant to fund (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 21-22). The overall effect of this detailed policy was not just to spell out what school counsellors should do in the instance of suicidality, but to endorse the increased professionalism and ethical performance of school counsellors, of their place, responsibility and accountability in dealing with the well-being of students.

2.5 Performance management systems and professional standards introduced into schools, 1995-1999.

This last section examines the state's recent formulation of performance management systems, the professional standards that these entail and NZAC's engagement with these professional standards. Professional standards form part of the neoliberal agenda that have been introduced "as part of the Government's strategy for developing and maintaining high quality teaching and leadership in schools and improving learning outcomes for students" (Ministry of Education, 1999a: 5). The Ministry of Education and schools, as the relevant bureaucracies with which guidance counsellors have to deal, may well have divergent views about what they expect of school counsellors. But, at this point in time, the Ministry requirements seem to converge with those of NZAC, as evidenced by the Performance Management System *PMS 5* document (Ministry of Education, 1997) and its very general statement on professional standards. This would appear to be a strong endorsement for the professionalism and professionalisation procedures that NZAC has in place. It also reflects lobbying by the Association to be heard and acknowledged, so that school counsellors are not left invisible, but are located as "specialist teachers" as they are described in the *PMS 5* document.

It has been NZAC, largely in response to third-party funder requirements of the majority of its members who are in private practice, that has taken the lead in setting the qualifications required for counselling as a profession, not the Government, nor the Ministry of Education, nor NZQA. NZAC has set its own professional standards for counsellors by introducing measures that promote increased professionalisation and accountability, which have enabled it to claim a strong professional profile and status for its members (see Chapter Four). School counsellors have certainly benefited from this because they can justify their position as being not only professionally qualified and registered teachers, but also as being professional counsellors. This section examines how the government formulated its own set of professional standards for school counsellors.

In non-profit organisations such as schools, performance management is "hard to quantify or measure in a manner that would enable performance to be assessed and governments and their agents to be held accountable" (Boston *et al.*, 1996: 13). Nevertheless, in 1995, the Ministry of Education published *Draft Guidelines For Performance Management in Schools* (1995b) that were trialled in 1996 and received extensive consultation with more than 2000 school trustees and principals and over 100 submissions from educational groups, agencies, schools and teachers (Fancy, 1997). With some modifications, and with the publication of more details in further leaflets (*PMS* nos. 1-5, etc) (Ministry of Education, 1997b), the 1995 *Draft* formed the basis for what all New Zealand schools were required to implement from 1997 onwards (Ministry of Education, 1997a).

In the 1995 *Draft*, the Ministry of Education *PMS* guidelines did not support a centralised, "best practice" approach to accountability and stated quite clearly that schools needed to fit in with the guidelines, but were free to develop their own systems to achieve this: "defining the actual scope of each key performance area is the prerogative of each school" (Ministry of Education, 1995: 23). It was the responsibility of individual schools to ascertain what monitoring or reporting mechanisms were most appropriate and applicable for their teachers and for their school counsellors. The advantages in a generic, best practice model are those of centralisation in ensuring uniformity and comparability; of uniform/consistent standards; and of minimising regional differences. The problems in establishing a model of best practice is that it does not acknowledge difference and disempowers a school to some extent. The advantages of decentralisation are enhancement of regional and local autonomy and avoidance of undue concentration of power in a central authority.

The 1995 *Draft* had outlined key performance areas that differed for teaching staff, for those with management responsibilities and for principals, but these were eventually changed somewhat in subsequent documentation, such as *PMS 5* (Ministry of Education, 1997b), which was aimed at specialist teachers, including guidance counsellors. In the two sets of documentation produced by the Ministry in 1999, *Professional Standards for Quality Teaching* (Ministry of Education, 1999a) and *Teacher Performance Management* (Ministry of Education, 1999c), guidance counsellors were grouped with RTLBs. It was clear that both were seen as specialists and their inclusion spells out a place for them in schools. Guidance counsellors were no longer invisible and so were not able to be marginalised as readily as before. *Professional Standards for Quality Teaching* specified three levels of accomplishment, identifying and addressing "areas that need development in a positive and supportive environment as part of the professional development cycle in schools" (Ministry of Education, 1999a: 3). In building on the earlier documentation of performance management systems, professional standards now include the following components and can be incorporated into a job description:

- a) *professional standards* – key knowledge, skills and attitudes that all teachers are expected to demonstrate in carrying out their role(s).
 - b) *performance objectives/expectations* – outcomes or results the teacher is expected to achieve.
 - c) *development objectives* – planned improvements in performance, including professional development activities the teacher will undertake to achieve these.
- (Ministry of Education, 1999a: 4).

Professional standards for guidance counsellors receive a special, albeit brief mention, and are grouped with RTLBs as "unit holders", stating: "the appropriate standards are applied in the context of their student casework; the Secretary of Education's *PMS 5* notice (November 1997) will apply for reference" (Ministry of Education, 1999a: 10).

School counsellors can expect to be appraised, evaluated and held accountable in all facets of their job description, teaching, management and counselling, depending on what they negotiate with their appraiser at the start of the annual performance management cycle. Where counsellors have teaching responsibilities, they are expected to achieve agreed performance standards for teachers, and where they have management responsibilities, they are expected to achieve the prescribed standards for these. Over and above these two sets of performance standards, school counsellors are expected to reach counselling standards. School counsellors had been invisible in the *Draft's* key performance areas in 1995, but *PMS 5* referred to guidance counsellors as specialist teachers and suggested that ways of appraising could be to use NZAC professional standards and supervision reports (see *PMS 5*, Ministry of

Education, 1997b) and might mean seeking evaluations from clients. NZAC had been able to promote the guidance counsellor's cause and special role in schools, defining in turn, by 1999, what were considered to be the counsellor's key performance areas. Whether or not the professional conduct of school counsellors should be monitored by the school and/or by a professional organisation (such as NZAC) would seem to lie in the question "to whom is the school counsellor accountable?" Since they work within an institution, school counsellors are responsible and accountable to that institution. It could be argued that a professional body such as NZAC could monitor counselling professional standards. Despite discussions about instituting counsellor registration and annual practicing certificates, to date NZAC shows little inclination nor has the facilities to perform such a task.

The later document, *Teacher Performance Management* (Ministry of Education, 1999c), built on all previous ones and included much of the information that they contained. The document became in effect not only the latest, but the definitive policy on performance management that had been mandatory since 1997. It explained that professional standards:

- describe the important knowledge, skills and attitudes that all teachers and unit holders are expected to demonstrate in carrying out their role(s);
- replace Appendix G and Appendix 5 criteria of the previous STCEC and ASTCEC [sections of the collective employment contracts];
- expand the existing three key performance areas – teaching, school-wide management responsibilities, already specified in the 1997 PMS requirements;
- formalise the Government's expectations of professional performance of teachers and school managers.

(Ministry of Education, 1999c: 9).

Where it differed markedly from earlier documents was the inclusion of detail on teachers' pay progression whereby, for the first time, performance-based pay has been formally introduced to teaching. Professional standards now form part of the Secondary Teachers Collective Employment Contract (STCEC) to which progressive salary payments on and beyond the basic scale were linked from 2000 onwards (Ministry of Education, 1999c). The employer (principal) is required to attest that there has been an annual assessment of each teacher's performance, measured against all the professional standards relevant for their level (beginning, classroom and experienced classroom teachers and unit holders). This had all been done in consultation with "PPTA, Teacher Registration Board, NZ School Trustees Association, Te Puni Kokiri, ERO, Secondary Principal's Association, NZ Area Schools' Association, Te Akatea, Te Runanga Nui o Nga Kura Kaupapa, Association of Proprietors of Integrated Schools, NZ Intermediate and Middle Schools Association, and the State Services Commission" (Ministry of Education, 1999c: 3).

In the final documentation (Ministry of Education, 1999c), two diagrams showed how professional standards needed to be integrated into the performance management system (PMS) in schools that includes the following components:

Performance Expectations – professional standards, performance indicators, development objectives, other standards and objectives, and job description (optional); *Performance Appraisal* – observation, self appraisal and interview; *Reward* – recognition, registration, career advancement, pay progression; *Professional Development* – formal study, seminar/conference, teaching time with peer, in service training, guidance and support; *Disciplinary/Competency Procedures* (Ministry of Education, 1999c: 6).

The cycle was expected to include professional development to improve staff competence and expertise alongside the set of goals they were expected to achieve. Whilst there was an element of maintenance in this, the emphasis on development was geared towards incremental improvements in a school where both personal and professional goals were expected to fit within the overall scope of a school's strategic plan. These notions were consistent with the NZAC requirements for ongoing professional development. The Ministry of Education documentation emphasised a largely consultative model of accountability for schools that tended to respect the professional status of staff. It emphasised appraisal being a positive experience for staff, with the potential for improving collegiality.

Nevertheless, since appraisal is usually conducted by someone in a position of higher authority than the staff member being appraised, fears, tensions and power issues are almost invariably involved. Review processes exist partly to emphasise the professional development to help staff to improve, but also in order that they have some degree of power to challenge the result of the appraisal.

Chapters One and Two have outlined the main government (and also PPTA) policies that have shaped the place of school counselling in New Zealand secondary schools. Both political and educational agendas have continued to play a part. Early policies defined what guidance counselling should concern itself with and, to a certain extent, what it was about. The neoliberal reforms that introduced New Public Management introduced new mechanisms of managerialism and accountability in education that have strongly impacted upon the professionalism of New Zealand school counselling. Whilst the nature of the student needs and problems may have changed with changing social, economic and educational contexts, barriers to student learning remain. Therefore the need for schools to have counsellors has not disappeared; quite the contrary if the current suspension and youth suicide statistics are considered as an indicator of need. To assert their continued place in schools, counsellors need to publicise what they do and how effective they are in dealing with students. School counselling's identity has changed over time, partly due to the academic education that counsellors now have. The next chapter outlines the changing pattern of education of guidance counsellors.

¹ New Zealand has the highest rate of reported youth suicide among industrialised (OECD) countries. While completed suicide rates are higher in the 20-24 age group than among 15-19 year olds, the rate of attempted suicide is higher for those in the adolescent age range of 13-19 years (Beautrais *et al.*, 1998: 5).