Stakeholder, corporate, and policy perspect ves

") h

ueVe -eaadc e

This art cle takes all of its examples and case studies from New Zealand. The main just f cat on for this approach is that New Zealand has been described as the world's laboratory for progressive digital legislat on; "if a policy maker, public servant or polit cian comes to me and asks me who to talk to around digital policy, I increasingly f nd myself looking at New Zealand as the place that is the most compelling"².

ueVe -eaadec cad ca

New Zealand's economy has some unique characterist cs but shares others with many developed nat ons. It has been transformed from an agrarian to a more industrialized, free market economy, but in the process has deepened socio-economic divisions, suf ered from mediocre economic performance and is heavily indebted internat onally. Although its current populat on is predominantly of European origin, New Zealand is a bicultural society with a signif cant indigenous populat on of M ori, numbering approximately indigenous and immigrant cultures, where various

specifically researchers and software developers, working in conjunct on with the M ori community.



Te P manawa

Kura

Hika Explorer

Photo credits: Te P manawa (image courtesy Maori Mult media Ltd), Kura (image courtesy Te Kura M ori), Hika Explorer (image courtesy Hika Group)

An indigenous language is not just a language but also an important part of an overall culture. As

The second case study (Box 8.2) looks at Orewa College, a school in a relat vely af uent socio economic area that was a pioneer of the Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) approach to mobile learning. This example helps to illuminate the nature of policy that is developed in a bot om up manner from school leadership teams.

The third case study (Box 8.3) looks at the Manaiakalani Trust, a community based init at ve

that has at racted high prof le philanthropic support.

Ś

B Uaaaaa H F Heae u c a

The Manaiakalani Trust serves a cluster of twelve schools in East Auckland, most of which are classif ed as decile 1A, the lowest socio-economic decile. The ethnicity Ps e e Theseaiv naiakahani z Z

One of the policy problems faced by the trust is that its intent on to pioneer a community based approach that could be copied and implemented elsewhere has been a vict m of its own success. Its high media prof le and success in improving outcomes for disadvantaged students has at racted philanthropic support that could not be replicated across other similar init at ves. It also faces issues in that some of its projects are funded as short-term ventures that may be

designed for the creat on of sof ware artefacts, those that are increasingly used in schools tend towards the drag and drop approach that of en 04458445-8564C410666132000304142406000455e5 of sof ware development. An example from the mobile learning space is the use of Hopscotch for developing mobile sof ware on iPads. School students can learn to develop mobile sof ware using a mobile plat orm, but it is unclear to what extent such skills are transferable to other types of IT knowledge. This is part cularly important in a context where the rout ne tasks of sof ware development are of en outsourced, and higherlevel design, architecture and strategy skills are required by employers. Another issue that arises is whether the sof ware tools that students experience in their formal educat on prepare them adequately for the sof ware tools used by industry, part cularly an issue if students only use mobile devices.

In any innovat ve approach to digital teaching and learning there is a potent al tension between moving ahead with pioneering projects and the maintenance or enhancement of equity. How is it possible to ensure that 'all boats rise on the same t de' while not being held back by the valid needs or at tudes of minorites. There seem to be two aspects to this issue. First, before a new innovat on is launched there needs to be extensive disseminat on and discussion of informat on in order to ensure the maximum possible buyin, while implementat on strategies must also ensure that mechanisms are in place to bring all stakeholders along with the main t de. As some of the examples highlighted in this art cle indicate, this includes support ng minority indigenous cultures as well as providing disadvantaged social groups with the ability to engage in informal learning by building community infrastructure that can support mobile learning.

A quest on that should be asked when looking to the future is whether concepts such as ICT, mobile devices or 21st century skills are st II relevant to debates about future educat on policy. Our thinking about the future of educat on is based around some concepts that have common currency, having been well established over the last 20 years or so. The debate about whether the concept of the digital nat ve is real or imaginary has already led to some crit cal commentary on how today's young people learn. However, there are other commonly used terms that have so far endured less scrut ny, but may be equally unhelpful. Def ning a 21st century skill is largely meaningless, in the same way that def ning a ☑ poverty and minority/indigenous culture all have to be accounted for.

 Policy must balance both short-term and longterm goals.

The main message of this art cle is that mobile learning policy is dependent on a complex interact on of stakeholders in its formulat on and implementat on. It requires a major commitment on the part of nat onal government to provide infrastructure and services, but the process cannot only be one of top-down policy. Bot om-up policy is equally important as it allows communities, cultures and regions to adapt to their specific needs. These may be driven by local industry, socio-economic profile, indigenous language, demographics, or a range of other factors.

The case studies in this art cle may be drawn from one nat onal context but their lessons can be translated to other countries and regions. They demonstrate the importance of diversity of approach and commitment to develop mobile learning at all levels of society, from nat onal government, to local community, to individual school and individual person, whether millionaire philanthropist, teacher, student or parent.

- ¹ UNESCO. (2013). *h* . Available at: ht p://unesdoc.unesco.org/Images/0021/002196/ 219641e.pdf Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.
- ² Eaves, D. (2013). New Zealand The World's Laboratory for Progressive Digital Legislat on. *u h* [online] 18 September Available at: ht p://techpresident.com/news/wegov/24353/new-zealand-worlds-laboratory-progressivedigital-legislat on Accessed 23 Nov. 2016.
- ³ Bauer, J., Kim, J. and Wildman, S. (2005). An integrated framework for assessing broadband policy opt ons. *U* o O k , 21.