

## **MINUTES OF THE NASDAP EXECUTIVE MEETING**

**Term I Meeting – 26 February 2007, 9.00am**

**Wellington Airport Conference Centre**

**PRESENT:** Roy Fletcher Phil Keenan, Geoff O'Halloran, Ali Painter, Lynette Parish Penny Prestidge, Julia Scott, Lynlee Smith, Annette Taylor, Joyce Whyman

**APOLOGIES:** Phil Carmine, Sheryl Ofner

### **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING - MATTERS ARISING:**

- **Election of 2007/2008 Office Holders** - President Annette Taylor. Vice-President Sheryl Ofner, Treasurer Annette Taylor.
- There was an extended discussion on the topic of leadership training possibilities for AP/DP. Annette to contact some of the leadership centres on our behalf.
- Thank you to Sheryl and Lynlee for their work with the Education Gazette on the article promoting the scholarship winners.
- Any information for the web site can just be quickly flicked through to Annette and she will forward it to Hothouse.
- Discussion around the issue of blocking access to the website so that it is only available to financial members. Decision made that to do that could be self defeating, and so decided not to pursue this.

Motion: That the minutes of the previous meeting be accepted as read.

Moved: Annette

Seconded: Ali

Carried

### **TREASURER'S REPORT:**

Annette tabled the Treasurer's Report for Term 1, 2007. Current total funds, as at February 23, \$26,474.53. Predicted total subscriptions for 2007, assuming 2006 members re-subscribe \$50,250.

Motion: That the treasurer's report be accepted.

Moved: Annette

Seconded: Phil

Carried

### **CORRESPONDENCE INWARDS:**

- For Teachers – New Zealand Teachers Council – Spring Issue No 5 (x 2 copies)
- ERO – Going to Secondary School – November 2006 (x 4 copies)
- ERO – Annual Report 30 June 2006
- Hon Bill English – thanking us for having him to speak in October
- Social Solutions – Professional Development Seminar - Invitation to attend a conference next week. Annette reserved one space
- Christopher Faull – email (forwarded to all executive) – Evaluated Bullying Resource
- Graham Flanagan - email (forwarded to all executive) – Tools4Work

### **CORRESPONDENCE OUTWARDS:**

- Frances Salt – CEO of ERO accepting invitation to address executive at February meeting.
- Bali Haque – NZQA Deputy Chief Executive – accepting invitation to speak with us at October 2007 meeting

- Rt Hon Steve Maharey – Minister of Education – declining invitation to speak at May meeting received the day after the meeting (27 February, 2007)

#### **GENERAL BUSINESS:**

- 1. Newsletter** – deadline Tuesday 6 March 2007. Reminder that all articles need to be in rich text format.
- 2. Meetings for 2007**  
Friday 11 May – Wellington Airport  
Tuesday 21 August 2.00pm-5.00pm – Nelson  
Friday 26 October – Wellington Airport
- 3. NASDAP Scholarship 2006 and 2007**  
Vaughan Couillault will be working on his research into the analysis of NCEA results later this year. He has been in contact with both Annette and Lynlee about uplifting his monies for the scholarship. Annette asked that executive members do a push with our regions for applications for the scholarship for 2007-2008. Lynlee to contact Vaughan with further detail re: uplifting scholarship monies.
- 4. 2007 Biennial Conference** – Planning for the conference is well underway. Keynote speakers have all been confirmed. Registration forms should be available within less than two months.
- 5. SPANZ** has not responded to our contact at this stage. Seems to be an indication that they wish to us to remain a separate entity. Decision to let the matter lie at this time.
- 6. Waverly High School**  
There was some discussion of the issues around the current Waverly High School situation and the events surrounding their presently being in the media. Phil Keenan expressed concern for the DP - Louise Hurley. Regardless of the rights or wrongs of the situation the current position is a tragedy for everyone in the community and for all those who have been working in the school.  
  
After some extended discussion about the situation Executive decided that Annette would write a letter of personal support from NASDAP to Louise.
- 7. Contract Negotiations**  
A number of Executive members again expressed that they were very disappointed with the progress that PPTA has made in looking after the interests of AP/DP. There is a SPAC meeting scheduled for Friday March 16. Annette asked that members of Executive also on SPAC ask for feedback on the AP/DP percentage uptake with DAEN in light of the fact that NASDAP provided a database for PPTA to work with.
- 8. Accepting New Students**  
Some concern voiced amongst members of executive that schools are forced to take ‘outsiders’ – (students who are sent to schools from outside your area, who have no idea of the ‘community’ culture) and the impact that this has on the school in terms of discipline and ‘unacceptable behaviours’ that need to be

addressed. There is a concern that there is a lack of documentation and ‘honesty’ about the ‘baggage’ that these students come to an area with. Have a professional responsibility to be honest with our colleagues in other places around the country. There are still insufficient resources to support transient kids. There was some suggestion that the students that we should be giving the greater support to those who come through their whole school education largely in one place, because those are the ones who are ‘au fait’ with the culture of the local community and upon whom we have the greatest impact. Advice from within the committee was to be sure to use Section 71 or Section 27 when dealing with these transient students.

ENROL system is picking kids up very quickly now. In spite of all the politicking, this committee felt that the reality is that there is no real pressure to ensure that kids under 16 are at school. The potential of flagging was discussed however; it was felt that the only person who is seeing the flagging is the database operator/ student officer. Flagging is a really good idea, but there needs to be a way for the Deans to keep a track of their students.

John Hattie’s latest research indicates that the greatest effect on student learning is the ‘removal of disruptive students from the class’, and not effective feedback and feed forward he has originally argued.

Alt Ed – need to find some solutions rather than simply keep talking about all the problems. \$11,000 per student works well in a city area where a number of schools can aggregate the funds. One school in a rural area, where there is only one place – doesn’t even pay a teacher aide for one year, let alone an experienced teacher. Need access to adequate funds and also to have worthwhile courses when the kids are there. \$650 per subject per student on correspondence makes for a very expensive full-time course of study. Subject clash is no longer an acceptable ground for enrolling a student on correspondence. Not allowed to enrol one student in a course now, need to enrol in pairs.

Would be good to have a speaker from Alt Ed to speak to us on how we can access help for some of our disruptive kids.

#### **9. New Resource (TKI/Leadspace)**

Consider the Evidence – Home page. Do not need a password. Evidence based decision making using data

Current research that is worth our looking at: Best Professional Development, The Best on Leadership

#### **10. Labelling Junior Classes**

The issue of how to label banded/streamed junior classes was raised and several alternative labels, and the reasons behind them were discussed:

Accelerate, Diligence, Mixed Ability, Supported Learning

Extension, Mixed Ability, Learning Support

Neighbours – (10-letter word which provides a letter for each of the ten junior classes) only ones who know which class is which are those who do the timetable.

Academic, vocational and work skills

GATE classes – Gifted and Talented. Problem with using numbers to determine class placement is that they give students the impression that classes are ranked.

#### **11. Survey – Roy**

There were a number of issues raised surrounding the survey conducted last year and the spreadsheet results that Roy has forwarded to executive members. Evidence from the survey would seem to suggest that AP/DP are being subsumed – in large schools DP/AP getting \$50,000 less than Principals. Can we copy our school Su reports, remove the school specifics and put the figures in front of SPAC as evidence of the increasing gap between AP/DP and Principal salaries? The suggestion was that under the official information act we are entitled to see this. There was a suggestion from the meeting that AP/DP should have a certain percentage under the Principal and that relativity needs to then be maintained. Roy would like to suggest that we push with PPTA for the pay rate for “second in charge” to become fixed.

By the same token there was also an indication that middle managers wages are creeping up from underneath – others below AP/DP taking on a single other responsibility and getting MUs for fulfilling those responsibilities and that the gap between middle managers and senior managers is also being eroded.

Gut feeling that we need to do surveys as a 1-page exercise from here on in. Keep them simple and quick to fill in. This may help to overcome the problem of getting surveys returned. There were only 145 returns from an 800 membership. Executive were disappointed that there were not more returns. Every two years want to gather further data – fill it in at conference and have a draw for those completed – 400 members in one place, with a prize draw. Annette will take this to the conference organising committee.

For the 150 who filled in the survey we need to get something into the newsletter to give them some feedback. Roy to action this for the Term 1 newsletter.

#### **12. MIDYIS and/or YELLIS**

Questions were raised about how schools who use Midyis and Yellis are using the results that they are getting. This is an area that many schools appear to be struggling with. There is a plethora of data, but schools often do not know how to actually use that to adapt their teaching and learning programmes. Good discussion about managing the data that we already have – evidence based assessment. Know how to collect data, but don't know how to analyse it. Large numbers of teachers who do not understand the issue of assessment and what it is being used for. It requires quite a body of knowledge and a lot of upskilling. Julia will flick some stuff through to members on helping HoDs to analyse their own data. Professional judgement is not a bad tool, but what are the critical questions that need to be asked?

#### **13. Professional Development for Aspiring Principals – and for AP/DP who have chosen not to aspire for Principalship.**

Conferences may not be the best way for long term ability to do the work. Numerous people who want the nuts and bolts things. Unitech courses are available and a number of private firms; for example, Interlead Consultants based in Wellington, run by John McClelland.

It is difficult to ascertain what it is that people actually want and what they actually need.

It is timely to have discussion and debate around 'what is good Professional Development'. Where are our leadership people based and how far are their resources being stretched? Each School Support area is funded to provide leadership training. The new principal has support, but the new AP/DP does not get that, and it is the feeling of this group that they need to.

#### **14. Other Matters Discussed:**

- There are too many peripherals that impact on the core business of secondary teaching. Every year the core business is becoming less and less of the reason that schools are there.
- Looking at the timing of Professional Development for staff. Some of the suggestions that were offered were: 7.30am start one day term, delayed start to the day – students not required to front till one hour after normal start time, school assembly run by the Head Students, Year 13 Dean and AP while the staff is having PD for half an hour in the morning.
- School start dates have been set until 2010. Could be some flexibility on start date over the next few years, to allow a slightly earlier start. This is apparently likely to be gazetted in the near future.
- An extended discussion on the fragmentation of subjects and the fact that students can choose not to do the 'difficult' parts of a subject in order to get higher marks and are therefore ending up with only a limited understanding and basis upon which to build for university courses. Serious concern expressed within this committee at this tendency.

#### **GUEST SPEAKERS - Frances Salt – Acting CEO of ERO and Jenny Clark – National Manager Public Affairs of ERO**

- Paid tribute to the work that AP/DPs do with her whakatoki – “When the work is done well at the back it goes well at the front.” “Na te mahi a muri, Ka ora ai a mua.”
- Purpose of ERO - To provide external evaluation that contributes to high quality education for young New Zealanders. Joined because wanted to be part of forging an education system that is improving.
- ERO is about evaluation. The systematic determination of the quality, merit, value of something. Evaluation leads to a judgement about the merit worth or significance of something.
- Reasons for evaluation – Both formative and summative. Length of training – induction for one month, wouldn't lead a review for at least six months, mentor, senior review officer, have a diary.
- External review – ERO. Internal review – school self review. Looking forward to the time when the external review is no longer necessary. 'Everybody seems to hate external evaluation while nobody trusts internal evaluation' – David Nevo.
- ERO's Education Reviews – participatory, focus on student achievement, have improvement as their purpose, aim to complement each school's own self-

review. Movement along the spectrum from compliance to participatory reviews – in consultation with your school.

- ERO's focus on Improvement – from compliance – have we done it? To improvement – how well have we done it? How much better can we do it?
- Some facts about ERO – 160 review officers, almost all have been teachers, recruit from HoD level and above, trained in evaluation, work from local offices. Although recruit widely, it is teachers that ERO is looking for. About 20% at the moment have been principals. Train the reviewers in evaluation – have a 2-year Post Graduate Diploma in reviewing through Massey University. Ten offices across the country and six areas. Try to cross pollinate, by having reviewers work across areas over time. Review on a three-year cycle, seek evidence for judgments in classrooms, provide an unconfirmed report for comment, all evidence is publicly available, have evidence of their impact. Need to be able to step back from their own experience to enable them to look for evidence. Everything is triangulated (based on observation, reading of documentation and interview) – and all evidence can be found in the Evidential file, which is available for schools to be able to look at.
- Who reviews the reviewer? Parliament's Select Committee, (report published on [beehive@govt.nz](mailto:beehive@govt.nz)) the Minister responsible for ERO, Treasury, the State Services Commission, the Education Sector, the public.
- Analysis of the newspaper clippings around the country – on average about 100 mentions of ERO in newspapers around the country every year. Last year there were 250 positive headlines, 160 negative and over 500 neutral.
- ERO's external evaluation – education reviews, supplementary reviews, special reviews. Special reviews can be taken by ERO where they don't fit under the normal reviews.
- The three strands of ERO Education reviews – school priorities, areas of national interest, compliance issues.
- School Priorities Strand – focused on student achievement, linked to school self-review information, usually different from a previous review, decided by ERO after scoping exercise.
- Areas of National Interest Strand – evaluations undertaken in all applicable schools nationally for a set period of time, ERO decides on topics and duration of evaluation, reported in ERO individual reports, aggregated for ERO national reports
- Areas of National Interest on-going in Secondary schools – Maori Student achievement, Pacific Student Achievement, Hostels, International Students ACE. Have extra money for doing the last three so does not deflect from other areas of review.
- Areas of National Interest Term 1 2007 – student underachievement, engaging with families/whanau/communities. Schools themselves will be asked to define underachievement
- Proposed Areas of National Interest Term 2 2007 – student underachievement, pandemic planning. There are clear steps in the Ministry guidelines and ERO is likely to start asking about those. Might be able to get some good practice that we can then share amongst schools as they try to come to terms with Pandemic planning.

- Proposed Areas of National Interest Term 3 2007 – pandemic planning, provision for Gifted and Talented students, secondary futures.
- Proposed Areas of National Interest Term 4 2007 – secondary futures, provision for Gifted and Talented, learning environments. (physical environments for learning)
- Compliance Issues Strand – Board Assurance Statement (BAS), attestation of compliance by principal and board chairperson, ERO checks BAS as part of scoping, ERO asks about five specific areas to do with student safety – emotional and physical safety, student attendance, stand downs and suspensions, teacher registration.
- Taking the Lead in External Evaluation – know about evaluation, promote the value of external review, know about ERO’s approach, acknowledge evaluation anxiety, contribute your own self-review findings. Evaluation anxiety is real; it is an acknowledged syndrome, so help to prepare your staff for that.
- Know about your school’s review – what are the school’s priority areas for review, what are ERO’s Areas of National Interest for this review? Staff letter (explains that won’t be in everybody’s classrooms), trouble shooting. ERO want the senior staff to lead them in what they are reviewing in individual schools. Talk to the coordinator, the area manager, Frances herself. Can contact Jenny or Frances at the following addresses: [frances.salt@ERO.govt.nz](mailto:frances.salt@ERO.govt.nz) [jenny.clark@ERO.govt.nz](mailto:jenny.clark@ERO.govt.nz) or the web site [www.ERO.govt.nz](http://www.ERO.govt.nz)
- ERO is a named link on the NASDAP website.
- If ERO is returning to a school within 12 months (and this is posted on the ERO website and can be found by searching “returning within 12 months” on ERO website), first indication that there is a school needing support. This is the time that NASDAP could ask of a school up for further review if there is anything that we can do as an organisation to help at this time.

**Meeting closed at 2.45pm.**

**Next Meeting: Friday 11 May 2007 Wellington Airport**