



SUBMISSION

NZTC Review Proposals

11 July 2013

For more information please contact Judie Alison, jalison@ppta.org.nz (04) 913 4248

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association, representing some 18,000 teachers employed in state and integrated secondary, area and intermediate schools, welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on this discussion paper on the NZ Teachers Council.
- 1.2 PPTA has had a longstanding commitment to the establishment and retention of a Teachers Council in New Zealand. During the period in the 1990's when compulsory registration of teachers was abolished by Parliament, PPTA led the work to establish a voluntary registration body for teachers, the Teaching Council of Aotearoa, because we believed so strongly in the need to retain teacher registration and a professional body to represent the whole teaching profession. We continued to lobby for the return of compulsory teacher registration.
- 1.3 PPTA welcomed the establishment of the New Zealand Teachers Council in the early 2000's, and participated actively in the reference group which assisted the government to refine its structure and governance.
- 1.4 PPTA values the work of the New Zealand Teachers Council, both in terms of its essential regulatory function and its leadership around its core work in the areas of initial teacher education, teacher registration and renewal of practising certificates, and its competence and disciplinary procedures.
- 1.5 Over the years since its establishment, the Council has moved from an organisation which struggled to establish credibility with the profession or the public, to one which now has a respectable track record of achievement.
- 1.6 Highlights include the development of the Registered Teacher Criteria which now have the acceptance of the whole profession, its work on quality induction and mentoring of beginning teachers, its refinement of the registration policy, its education work about competence procedures, and the current professional learning and development project about performance appraisal.

2. The process

- 2.1 We are pleased that both the review report and Cabinet paper were released along with the new consultation document. This helps the sector see this part of the process of decision-making. In developing our submission, however, we have also taken into account the report of the Education Workforce Advisory Committee, the report of the *Ministerial Inquiry into the employment of a Convicted Sex Offender in the Education Sector*, and various other documents which we have obtained under the Official Information Act.
- 2.2 This leads us to an inevitable cynicism about this current process. There is ample evidence, in the government documents that we have obtained via using the Official Information Act, that there has been a clear intention for some time to establish a Teachers Council which, rather than being the voice

of the whole teaching profession and a vehicle for enhanced professionalism, is instead a tool of increased government control and audit of teachers.

- 2.3 Furthermore, we are not impressed by the prioritising by government of speed of decision-making and consequent legislation over engagement with the profession. While the Cabinet paper talks of the importance of the teaching profession having a “sense of ownership” over the professional body, a process has been adopted that will not help to achieve that even if the decisions made were to be relatively positive. The Cabinet paper acknowledges that the Review Committee recommended a transition process of up to three years, but determines to instead proceed with a consultation round of only eight weeks followed by legislative changes before the end of 2013. The teaching profession will feel pressured and excluded by such a timeline.
- 2.4 We are also not happy with the type of questions being asked at this stage in the review process. There were some very specific recommendations in the review committee’s report, on some of which the Cabinet paper signals that the government would like to consult further. However, in the proposals for consultation these have become broad general questions which continue to avoid the specifics. For example, although the matter of how people become members of the new body is referred to in the paper, there is no question on it. This is, to us, a key issue on which teachers will have strong views and to fail to ask a question about it has the appearance of trying to avoid the issue. The nature of the questions is further evidence, to PPTA, that this process is essentially a charade set up to mask the real intention of government.

3. The review report and the cabinet paper

- 3.1 It is not possible to consider the proposals currently up for discussion without reference to the report of the November 2012 review which was released at the same time as the consultation document. Before addressing the proposals being consulted on in 2013, we set out below some comments on the review report and Cabinet decisions in response.
- 3.2 We are pleased the government appears to have rejected the review committee’s recommendation that the current Teachers Council be disestablished and a transition team set up to manage change to a new body. It is PPTA’s view that this would be a “scorched earth approach” that would fail to recognise that there is valuable ongoing work being done by the Teachers Council that should not be disrupted. The Cabinet Paper instead proposes a process whereby the Ministerial Advisory Group will advise on “reforms” to the Teachers Council.
- 3.3 We do note, however, that the current consultation document appears to be somewhat confused about whether the government’s decision has been to abolish the current body and create a new one, or to reform the current body. The language ranges across “the transformed body”, “the new professional

body”, “reform” and “change” through to “a new body” with “a new identity”, and “a body created to ...”.

- 3.4 The consultation document also asks a silly question about what should be the name of the professional body “to reflect its strengthened role”. The name of the body is irrelevant to whether it will have credibility with the profession. What it **does** will be much more important to the profession. And if this process is actually around reforming the current NZ Teachers Council, why would it not retain the existing name for the sake of continuity of the positive identity that the Teachers Council has striven over a decade to establish?
- 3.5 PPTA recommends that a clear statement be made that the process being engaged in this year is working towards **reform** of the Teachers Council and the related regulatory framework, as noted in the Cabinet Paper, and is not about abolishing the current Council.
- 3.6 We now turn to the proposals for discussion in the latest consultation document.

4. The focus and responsibilities of a body created to lead the development of the education profession

- 4.1 The Cabinet paper asserts that the Minister’s vision “is for a strong professional body that provides leadership to, and is owned by, the profession.” These dual concepts of “leadership” and “ownership” are scattered throughout all the documents, but are never defined.
- 4.2 PPTA believes that the current Teachers Council already exercises leadership of the profession, within the bounds of its key responsibilities in the areas of: approving and monitoring initial teacher education; registration and renewal of practising certificates and related areas such as induction and mentoring, appraisal and competence; and discipline.
- 4.3 We contend, however, that leadership is shared across a range of groups within the teaching profession and this is a highly positive feature of the education system. Teacher unions, despite the insulting attempts of these documents to typify us as “industrial advocacy bodies”, have highly significant professional leadership roles. The NCEA, for example, has its roots in work done by PPTA activists during the 1960’s and 1970’s on criterion-referenced assessment, and decades of continued work towards applying that to school qualifications¹. There are many more such examples.
- 4.4 Teacher leadership through the work of their subject associations in developing resources for the curriculum, providing professional learning to their peers and the like has a really key role. Unfortunately, it appears to us that in these documents, “leadership” is equated with “governance”, despite

¹ See, for example, Alison (2007) *Mind the gap! School qualifications reform in New Zealand 1980-2002*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Massey University.

the fact that both terms are used together, e.g. on page 14 of the consultation document.

- 4.5 One of the requirements stated for members of the professional body is that they “have successful governance experience”. We would argue that “successful leadership experience” would be a far more inclusive term, and that this can be found far more widely within the teaching profession. (We expand on this below.)
- 4.6 Teachers will feel that they “own” the Teachers Council when it has the necessary independence to speak on behalf of the profession even if this is in opposition to policies of the government of the day. For this reason, changing the status of the Teachers Council to that of an independent statutory authority, like the various authorities under the Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003, is vitally important.
- 4.7 PPTA recognises that the Crown has a significant interest in the work of the professional body for teachers because of the Crown’s role in funding public education. It is right and proper for the body to be enshrined in statute and for there to be reporting requirements. However, why teachers need to be overseen by a crown entity, when other professionals who work in publicly funded systems such as the health system are overseen by statutory authorities, is far from clear. PPTA would argue that this is a product of the low-trust environment in which teachers have had to work in the last twenty years or so, both in New Zealand and in many other countries. There is nothing in the process by which the government has arrived at this current consultation to convince us that this has changed.
- 4.8 It is PPTA’s view that the focus and responsibilities of the Teachers Council should remain pretty much as they currently are in practice. The Council has chosen to interpret objectives (a), about leadership, and (b) about encouraging best teaching practice, within the context of its key responsibilities as laid out in the Act: approving and monitoring initial teacher education; registration and renewal of practising certificates and related areas such as induction and mentoring, appraisal and competence; and discipline. This makes complete sense to us, and we would like to see the Act amended accordingly, so that the domains within which the Council was expected to exercise leadership were clear.
- 4.9 There are areas of education which the government would no doubt be reluctant to hand over to the Teachers Council, for example curriculum development, assessment policy, system evaluation, and the like. We are interested to note that the Cabinet paper sets aside the Review Committee’s recommendation that the function of allocation of professional learning and development funds be shifted from the Ministry of Education to the Teachers Council. As noted in the paper, PLD is “a crucial policy lever”, particularly in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment, and to hand the funding of that over to the Teachers Council would implicitly expand its role significantly.

5. What needs to be included in the name of the professional body to reflect its strengthened role?

- 5.1 As discussed above, we consider this an absurd question to be asked here. It seems to reflect the confusion within the documents about whether it is being proposed that the Teachers Council be replaced with a new body, or whether this is about reforming the current Teachers Council (see 3.3 and 3.4 above).
- 5.2 PPTA's clear view is that this should be a reform process, and that the current name of the body should remain. The Teachers Council is doing solid work across a wide range of areas, and while there may be support for some reform, we do not believe that the profession wishes to see it abolished and a new body put in its place.
- 5.3 Apart from anything else, the costs involved with rebranding a reformed Council are not justifiable at a time of economic constraints. Teachers, who are the majority funder of the Council, would strongly resent paying increased fees for a rebranding exercise.

6. In what aspects should the body be accountable to the profession and on what issues should it be accountable to the government?

- 6.1 PPTA recognises that the government invests a large amount of taxpayer money every year into the public education system, and it is therefore entirely reasonable for government to demand some assurance about the quality of teachers employed in that system. Some kind of registration body, enshrined in statute, is the minimum that the profession could expect a government to require.
- 6.2 Such a statutory body should be obliged to report to the government on its conduct of its statutory functions. The minimum reporting to government, as set out in the Proposals for Discussion p.15, i.e. an annual report, statistical information on its regulatory functions, and the power of the Minister to commission an independent audit of its regulatory functions, would seem reasonable to us.
- 6.3 We note that the Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003, though, requires that should the government impose on an authority a requirement for statistical information that will be costly to provide, there must also be a grant of government funds to cover that cost. In fact, we consider that the provisions of that Act under Sections 123-125 regarding statistical information and independent audit, and Section 134 regarding annual reporting, would provide a useful model if the Teachers Council is to be given the status of a statutory authority, a change which we strongly support.
- 6.4 On the second aspect, accountability to the profession, PPTA believes that the Council has a responsibility to carry out its functions with efficiency, timeliness,

and to a high standard. Since its establishment, the Teachers Council has made huge strides in both the efficiency of its conduct of its regulatory functions, and the quality of its work.

- 6.5 Teachers who are part of Council research projects, or who participate in its professional development exercises such as the current project on appraisal, speak highly of the quality of that work. While ten years ago there were constant complaints about delays in registration procedures, this is uncommon today. The Council has put a lot of effort into improving its communications, both through its website and through its regular newsletters.
- 6.6 While competence and disciplinary processes can take a considerable time to be completed, in the main any delays are in order to ensure that due process is followed.

7. What skills, knowledge and experience should be required on the board governing a professional body for education?

- 7.1 PPTA is concerned that suddenly the term “board” has appeared in this question. This seems to give away what we suspect to be the intention of this review, to replace the current broadly representative body with a much smaller body made up of people who have run companies and perhaps a few principals and BOT members. This links to our comments in Section 4 above about the confusion between “leadership” and “governance”.
- 7.2 If the Teachers Council is to generate a sense of “ownership” by the teaching profession, then the profession needs to be able to see itself reflected in that Council. This means that the Council needs to include people from the three major sectors (secondary, primary and early childhood), from both English medium and Maori medium education, and from initial teacher education. It also needs to have principals from both the secondary and primary sectors. Currently there is one elected position for a principal and because of a huge imbalance in numbers, this is always held by a primary principal. This is not useful.
- 7.3 In terms of initial teacher education representation, it is PPTA’s view that in the same way that registered teachers nominate a sector for their voting rights, which currently is either early childhood, primary, secondary or principals, those registered teachers employed in initial teacher education should be entitled to nominate that as their sector, and to vote for a representative of initial teacher education.
- 7.4 PPTA wishes to see the Council remain at its current size of 11, or expanded slightly. We believe that a Council of that size is needed if it is to have the range of expertise required.

- 7.5 We support the presence, as currently is the case, of some non-teaching members of the Council. We believe that they can add a useful perspective to the work of the Council, and are necessary to represent the significant public interest in the credibility and performance of the teaching profession. They should never outnumber teachers, however. Currently, they become members of the Council either as a nominee from the School Trustees Association or as one of the Minister's five nominations. This is an acceptable position to us.
- 7.6 The question asks what skills, knowledge and experience are required, and the discussion document then lists two aspects: knowledge about education, and successful governance experience in education or other fields. There is an implication that the current process of arriving at the membership of the Council, i.e. by a mix of elections and appointments, has not resulted in people with the necessary knowledge and experience. There is an implication also that all members of the Council must have both of these qualities, and this is not necessarily so. A well-functioning Council makes use of the range of knowledge and expertise it has among its members, and knows when it needs to seek outside expertise for specific tasks.
- 7.7 PPTA believes that the current mix of elections and appointments should continue. However, we are concerned that all of the documents seem to take it for granted that there will no longer be positions on the Council reserved for nominations from certain groups, i.e. the two teacher unions and NZSTA. In all of the papers leading up to this consultation, there has never been any evidence produced to support the assertion in the Education Workforce Advisory Group report that "Direct representation of teacher unions on NZTC may lead to emphasis on employment conditions and industrial matters rather than professional leadership"². Even in that report, the conditional "may" was used rather than a definitive statement.
- 7.8 Yet ever since then, in successive government documents, both public and private, it has been assumed that this is the case. This slur on the work of successive teacher union nominees on the Teachers Council is reflected in the use of the term "industrial advocacy groups" in the discussion document.
- 7.9 PPTA has always been very careful in its selection of someone to nominate to the Minister, and accepts that the Minister would have a right to question that nomination if the accompanying CV did not indicate clearly someone who had the capability and standing to carry out the role effectively. The presence on the Council of someone nominated by PPTA Executive is a signal to our members that the union values the Council. It makes a significant contribution to achieving teacher "ownership" of the Council, which the documents claim is a goal of government.
- 7.10 PPTA is also unhappy about the constant references in various papers to low turnouts on elections for positions on the Council. In its ten years or so of existence, the Council has worked really hard to increase its credibility with

² Education Workforce Advisory Group Discussion Document, June 2010

teachers, and we believe that this turnout will increase over time. It may also reflect the general busy-ness of teachers.

- 7.11 Any decision to remove the elected positions would provoke a really negative reaction from teachers, and further add to the perception that the ownership of the Council is in the hands of the government rather than the profession.

8. What are your thoughts on membership fees and what might you expect in return?

- 8.1 There is an assumption implied in the phrasing of this question and in the discussion in the paper that the role of the Teachers Council needs to be expanded, and will therefore require further funding by an increase in teacher registration fees and other charges. As discussed above in Section 4, PPTA can see no need for an expansion of the Council's role. We do, however, recognise that the government does currently contribute a very small proportion of the Council's income, and that the greater degree of independence from government that we seek would require the teaching profession to "buy out the government", in a sense, by forgoing that small government contribution. We calculate that this would lead to only a very minor increase in registration fees.
- 8.2 At the same time, it may be that in future the Council would wish to engage in further work related to its current role, for example further professional learning on teacher appraisal, further support for the induction and mentoring of beginning teachers, or similar. If the Council was seen as genuinely "owned by the profession" because it had been set up as a statutory authority and its membership was truly representative of the teaching profession, it may be that teachers would be willing to contribute a little more.
- 8.3 On the other hand, if some of the proposals canvassed by this consultation paper proceed, such as Ministerial appointment of all members of a much smaller Council, it is likely that any proposal to increase fees would result in a very vigorous negative reaction from teachers.

9. What changes should be made to the current registration and practising certificate processes?

- 9.1 PPTA has never had any difficulties with the concept of separating registration from the practising certificate. In fact we were supportive of this when it was canvassed as part of the Council's review of its registration policy framework between 2010 and 2012. The concept of "registration for life" has considerable appeal to those who are no longer in teaching roles but who continue to be involved with education policy and research, because teacher registration is a valued status.
- 9.2 PPTA has also never had any difficulties with the concept of regular renewal of practising certificates, in the same way that other professions do this. The

licence to practice a profession is something that is highly valued, and we can see that pride when beginning teachers make the transition from provisional registration to full registration.

- 9.3 We do not agree, however, that the current arrangements for renewal of practising certificates are deficient. The biggest issue that we have with the current arrangements, and this is certainly a concern to principals and senior leaders in our membership, is the fact that there are two sets of standards that apply to teacher appraisal: the professional standards in the collective agreement, and the Teachers Council's Registered Teacher Criteria. PPTA attempted to rectify this situation in the 2012 collective agreement negotiations, by claiming to have the professional standards replaced with the Registered Teacher Criteria. The Ministry of Education refused to meaningfully engage with this claim, despite the supporting evidence that we provided of this being a strong recommendation from the OECD team that evaluated New Zealand's evaluation and assessment frameworks in 2011³.
- 9.4 The Registered Teacher Criteria were developed through a widely consultative and peer reviewed process, and reflect the best evidence of what constitutes high quality teacher practice across the sectors. They require evidence, not only of competence, but of teachers engaging in professional learning to make continuing improvement in their practice as they move through their careers. The suggestion that there is not enough emphasis on this lacks an evidence-base and simply does not match reality.
- 9.5 The Registered Teacher Criteria were written as a single set of standards in order to enable them to be contextualised to the range of sectors, roles and the different stages in a teacher's career. Teaching is a highly complex activity which can never be satisfactorily pinned down in sets of specified standards. In fact, as Thrupp argues, "Any development of specified standards would not so much empower New Zealand teachers as limit and constraint them. Professional standards will work best when they are generic standards, written and understood to represent broad guidance and direction in relation to teacher practices and aspirations. Anything more detailed would be to underestimate the importance of local context and pedagogical autonomy"⁴.
- 9.6 It is of considerable concern to PPTA that officials within the Ministry of Education, perhaps assisted by Treasury officials, are working on a different set of teaching standards that would replace the Registered Teacher Criteria and the professional standards in the various agreements. The Cabinet paper claims that this is being done by Ministry of Education and Teachers Council officials, but this is not true, at least in relation to the Teachers Council. Our understanding is that the work is being done by the Ministry of Education assisted by Treasury officials. This is outrageous.

³ Nusche, D., Laveault, D., MacBeath, J. and Santiago, P. (2011). OECD Reviews of evaluation and assessment in education: New Zealand 2011. OECD Publishing.

⁴ Thrupp, M. (2006). Professional standards for teachers and teacher education: Avoiding the pitfalls. Wellington: University of Waikato, PPTA and NZEI.

- 9.7 Standards which are imposed on a profession, rather than standards which arise out of work with the profession, will never have a positive impact on teacher practice. The professional standards in the STCA, which were essentially imposed on PPTA during collective agreement negotiations in 1997, have never really become part of secondary teachers' sense of professional identity. The Registered Teacher Criteria, however, are seen in a much more positive light and have been incorporated readily by schools into their thinking about appraisal and professional learning.
- 9.8 The question of whether practising certificates should specify a scope of practice is one which PPTA considers worth discussing at some later stage. There could be some protection for secondary teachers who are sometimes pressured to teach outside of their subject specialisms, but not provided with the necessary support and development. We are aware that the General Teaching Council for Scotland registers teachers within scopes of practice.

10. What changes should be made to the process of assessing a teacher's competence against the Registered Teacher Criteria?

- 10.1 There is an ongoing need for professional learning and development for senior and middle leaders about high quality teacher appraisal and about the induction and mentoring of beginning teachers. The Council has opted for a high trust model but with provision of professional support, and PPTA supports that position.
- 10.2 The Teachers Council has done some very good work in this area in recent years, and what they have offered has proven extremely popular. This needs to be a permanent feature of the Council's service, because there is constant movement in the personnel occupying leadership roles in schools.
- 10.3 It is worth noting here that New Zealand has no comprehensive approach to providing relevant and timely professional learning and development for teachers as they move through career pathways. The approach to this has been ad hoc and inadequate.
- 10.4 However, the idea that professional leaders should have to be trained and accredited to undertake this role is completely unrealistic in a system with as many autonomous schools as New Zealand, where employment decisions are made by thousands of school leaders responsible to independent Boards of Trustees. Instead, the Council is continuing to provide leadership and professional development about this task, and to investigate wherever there is evidence that a recommendation from a school or centre may not be underpinned by appropriate decision-making processes.

11. What are your views on the proposal to introduce an Authority to Educate to allow for more flexibility to employ people with specialist skills alongside registered teachers?

- 11.1 The proposal to introduce an Authority to Educate is a completely unnecessary “solution” to a non-existent problem. The current Limited Authority to Teach (LAT) status serves as an adequate solution where schools are simply unable to fill positions with trained and qualified teachers.
- 11.2 In 2005, when the Teachers Council was first in a position to seriously tackle the issue of LATs, there were 3,500. This number has been more than halved, to 1200 currently. Of these, 70% are Itinerant Teachers of Music working within the secondary system. We are not aware that there is any great call from principals for these people to move to a different status. The LAT requirements allow an ITM to work across a number of schools, but one school, defined as their “designated home setting” (LAT policy clause 14) has to take the primary responsibility for their supervision, and this is entirely appropriate. People working in education roles who do not have a teaching qualification require particularly careful supervision.
- 11.3 It is bizarre to PPTA that a government which is committed to raising the academic level of teaching qualifications to Level 8 on the Qualifications Framework would even consider something like this.
- 11.4 The proposal to introduce an Authority to Educate is completely at odds with the government’s intention to raise the status of the profession in order to encourage the highest achieving graduates into teaching. People in initial teacher education, considering entering teaching or recently graduated will rightly question the wisdom of such a choice and the significant personal investment involved.
- 11.5 In recent weeks, a PPTA staff member has been interviewing principals of lead schools for trades academies, an area in which one might expect there to be some demand for such a status if such a demand existed. Principals have been asked about this quite specifically, and there is no evidence that such principals are calling for this Authority to Educate. Trades academies do sometimes involve staff from tertiary institutions coming to the school to work with students, but this is normally alongside a teacher. If instead they are to be in sole charge of a group of students, then a LAT can be obtained easily, we have been informed. In other cases students go to the tertiary institution for block courses, and in this case a LAT is not needed.
- 11.6 New Zealand students deserve wherever possible to be taught by highly trained and qualified teachers, and not by people who might have some specialist knowledge of an area but not specialist knowledge of the profession of teaching. Greater attention to recruitment of skilled and suitable people into teaching of Technology over previous years would have been a far better course of action.

12. Other observations and recommendations

- 12.1 PPTA is concerned that there is support in principle in the Cabinet Paper for the Review Committee's recommendation on work towards the development of a Code of Conduct for the teaching profession, but no mention of this in the discussion paper. We take this as meaning that the government intends to proceed with this recommendation. PPTA has serious concerns about this proposal, which appears to be going to be progressed without any consultation with the teaching profession. We can see no basis for a Code of Conduct for teachers in addition to the Registered Teacher Criteria and the considerable body of case law that has been built up by the Disciplinary Tribunal and the Complaints Assessment Committees of the Teachers Council. If there is a wish to develop a Code of Conduct for other people who work in schools, that is a separate issue and one on which we would have no view, as we do not represent these people.
- 12.2 The Review Committee recommended that the Education Act should be amended to provide for immediate referral by the Complaints Assessment Committee to the Disciplinary Tribunal "of any breach of conduct that, if prosecuted, would result in imprisonment". There is no discussion of this in the consultation document because the Cabinet Paper signals a decision to proceed with this without consultation. This seems to assume that this will be a simple matter, but it is our view that this is not so.
- 12.3 The Act defines "serious misconduct" as conduct which "(i) adversely affects, or is likely to adversely affect, the well-being or learning of 1 or more students; or (ii) reflects adversely on the teacher's fitness to be a teacher; and (b) is of a character or severity that meets the Teachers Council's criteria for reporting serious misconduct". The Teachers Council's rules on Making Reports and Complaints (2004) provide considerable detail of what constitutes serious misconduct.
- 12.4 There would be natural justice concerns, however, if reports bypassed the Complaints Assessment Committee (CAC) and went straight to the Disciplinary Tribunal, particularly when only the complainant has had an opportunity to have their side of the case heard by the CAC. The CAC needs to hear all sides of the story to determine the facts before they can be absolutely assured that this is a case of serious misconduct.
- 12.5 There might be documentary evidence to support a decision to refer it directly to the Disciplinary Tribunal, such as a judge's sentencing notes, and we would be happy for it to happen in that situation, but to make a blanket ruling that all cases of serious misconduct must be referred directly to the Disciplinary Tribunal would be in breach of natural justice. It also has the potential to tie up the Disciplinary Tribunal inordinately, which could result in major delays in resolving cases, something which itself would lead to injustice.

12.6 A further concern is that if parents knew that the case would go inevitably to the Disciplinary Tribunal, resulting in their having to appear in front of a much more formal judicial body and be cross-examined, instead of the matter being able to be resolved in a less formal process by a CAC, it could result in fewer complaints about teacher misconduct getting to the Teachers Council. This would be an unintended consequence that would be to the detriment of teaching quality.