

MINUTES OF THE NASDAP EXECUTIVE MEETING

HELD AT WELLINGTON AIRPORT - VISCOUNT ROOM

Friday 17 October 2003 , 9.30am – 3.30pm

PRESENT: Carol Craymer, Roy Fletcher, Stephen Hensman, Leslie Jamieson, Phil Keenan, Sheryll Offner, Lynlee Smith, Annette Taylor, Jenny Thomas, Allan Webb, Joyce Whyman

APOLOGIES: Karen Van Rooyen (CEO, NZQA)

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

Motion: That the minutes of the previous meeting be accepted as a true and accurate record. Moved: Carol Seconded: Lynlee Carried

MATTERS ARISING:

1. Survey

Thank you to Roy for all his hard work on this survey and collation of results. Roy will e-mail the data to committee members in the near future. Roy presented some of the findings from the survey to the last Northland AP/DP meeting. The next step is to look at grants – laptops, cell phones etc. that are part of some AP/DP remuneration packages. Finally to look at what the major tasks of DP/AP are. This will lead to further research into roles and responsibilities.

2. Website

Discussion group section is up and running, so it might be good for committee members to start some discussions on this site as of now.

3. Residential Institutions

Would like to broaden this out to explore what alternatives are available to schools. Stephen presented a paper to the group. Identified goals of the group as far as this investigation is concerned. Stephen will prepare a table for the 4 categories identified – eligibility, process, nature of the education provided, contact details - that NASDAP can produce as a resource for schools. Contact SRI (Suspension Reduction Initiative) Joyce and Stephen to continue to collate. Any information to Stephen or Joyce. Update to go in the newsletter.

4. Newsletter

Date for next newsletter November 10. Allan will contact Kate to get something as follow up from her session. Roy to have an article on further survey findings. Allan has had a response from Woolfe Fisher and will publish that.

A good site to visit. Let members know – www.breakout.org.nz

FADE – to actually hear from someone who's been there. Wonderful power point presentation. Colin

5. NCEA

Covered in conversations with Kate.

6. SPAC

Nothing to report because there has been no meeting. Elections have been taking place over the past few weeks. Anticipate a meeting before the end of the year.

7. Kevin Knight Subsidy

Carol requested a costing outline from Roy for the event held earlier in the year in order to be able to determine what subsidy NASDAP would make. All committee members to be circularized these details to allow a decision to be made. Roy to raise the issue of the role of NASDAP in supporting other areas with these kinds of forums for the next meeting and to have a specific proposal.

8. AGM

Disappointment expressed from the Hamilton group that there were no issues for them to discuss at the AGM in Christchurch. Perhaps that meeting should have more of a focus. Need to take cognisance of the timing of the next AGM. We also feel that the AGM is very important. Letter to Lynette Parish (DP Matamata College) to see that the AGM is better placed for the next biennial conference.

Question raised as to the status of the proposed conference manual? Shona Smith was going to create one. Jenny to e-mail her again. Jenny will also contact Paul McWilliam for some input from the Christchurch organising committee.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Copy attached. 92.3% of Secondary and Area Schools in the country have joined up now. Will roll over the investments. Thank you for Annette's work in this area.

CORRESPONDENCE INWARDS:

- A fax from PNBHS was received about the agreement schools signed with NZQA this year about fees collection and the penalty to be imposed on schools if payment to NZQA is inaccurate. A number of schools have refused to sign this agreement. A question was asked in the House this month of Mr. Mallard..... "Is the NZ qualifications authority threatening to withhold payment of the administration fee...." Mr. Mallard's response: "I am advised that is not the case."
- NZQA embarking on research projects – research for schools. Gathering up best practice models to put out publications for schools.

- Kate Gainsford – concerns about the integrity of the information on the NZQA web site and the hours schools are having to spend trying to unravel the mistakes of another agency. Kate Colbert's response? NASDAP to publish both the question and the reply.
- Kate Ford – Correspondence School. How can they hook into a group? Jenny to follow up.
- Chris France – STA – wrote to say how pleased he was to receive a copy of the newsletter. Would be good to get him to speak to the group
- Academy Diaries – executive diaries. Will deliver them around the country. Would be distributed around the country and we would have to get them out to the DP/APs. Could have 4 pages of NASDAP information in them. We accept the offer. Will sort the contents at the next meeting.
- Mark Haines – On-line learning. Can I do this through the newsletter. \$100 per page is the advertising is related to teacher learning. Moved: Sheryl Seconded: Annette Carried.

CORRESPONDENCE OUTWARDS:

- Letters to all those involved in organising the NASDAP Conference and to their principals

GENERAL BUSINESS:

1. Preparatory Talk about meeting with Karen van Rooyen

Upon arrival in Wellington the group was informed that Karen (CEO of NZQA) had gone home ill and would not be able to attend the meeting. However, Kate Colbert agreed to take her place and to speak with the group. This committee spent the time before Kate arrived discussing particular angles and questions to be raised with her. The following is a summary of the question and answer session with Kate.

2. Kate Colbert Question and Answer Session

The group spent a few minutes outlining the position of NASDAP to Kate to put any ensuing conversation into a context. We also talked briefly about how we see our role on NASDAP in relation to SPAC.

a. Where does NZQA sit within the educational sector? What is their role? What about their core business?

Kate spoke about the role of NZQA to begin with. (See the attached power point presentation).

- A. Setting up a national system of qualifications – access, mobility, international benchmarks
- B. Quality of the education provision. Overarching role in the tertiary sector and with schools. They work in partnership with ERO.

She went on to outline what she considered primary aspects of NZQA's core business.

- Integrated system of qualifications – In other countries it has been much more difficult to bring everyone together.
- Key strategies – enhance the credibility of NZ qualifications
- Working at system level – levelness is equivalent across the world and talk about what the different levels mean. Right through tertiary through to secondary.
- Making sure have a quality of educational provision. Suspect will get fewer PTEs.
- Learning outcomes for Iwi and Maori. Ongoing challenge for NZQA. Very hard to ensure right across all educational providers in the system. Huge challenge to cater for all those needs.
- Growing NZQA's organizational capacity – has been too focused internally in the past. **One team for school communication** – improvement in understanding of what the role of NZQA is. **Second team assessment** – Chris Winstanley. Very focused on the quality of the exams. What is good assessment practice and how can we improve it? Contractual relationship. **Third team operations** – logistical and business process branches. In the process of changing their computer system from a very archaic one to a web based one. In the interim have both systems running. System, quality not there to do it. Mind set change. In the past NZQA has been very directive and there is a tension at the moment as they try to move from that to Not being so prescriptive

She also spent some time speaking about the international nature of NZQA's role

- Outcome – used and valued both internationally and nationally
- Overarching role – Norman Kingsbry – brought tertiary sector together to get them to agree to the register of qualifications and prerequisites. Great for the secondary sector. Easier for credit transfer between learning environments.
- Fee paying students – change in legislation about what is allowed for foreign students. Even for secondary and tertiary providers. Then Minister decided it would be done for short courses even for 3 months. All have to be quality assured.
- Lot more providers are doing things internationally too, not just in NZ. Lot of work happening around these issues. NZQA do quality assurance

not quality control. Our education is here for our kids. To put constraints on it for foreign students is not necessarily a good thing to do.

- Internationally less on checking courses and more on ensuring quality of teaching.
- Moderation could change to assessing teacher capability and therefore enhance the quality of our teachers – NZQA’s role would be looking at a teacher’s ability to assess to national standards.
- Suggestion that we need para-professionals in the profession
- Kiwi Qualifications web site and you can compare what’s available and how they compare with other qualifications around the country. There are mistakes on it still though. Tertiary have put in quite broad qualification descriptors.

b. How are Fees set?

- Board of qualifications authority, the Minister has to consent to them. Seem to be considerable rises, although the Minister didn’t seem to think there were.
- Fare Remission policy supporting 25,000 extra families. Eligible families do seem to have applied.
- This group made the point that schools are doing far more than the \$6 attributed to administration per entrant and this led to some discussion of the position of the six schools that have refused to sign the NZQA agreement. Kate was adamant they will NOT be paid the admin fee. That is NZQA’s audit. There will be no need for a test case. Schools can’t bill NZQA for it, because NZQA are not funded for paying it. It is not NZQA’s job to collect money.
- Letter of agreement – data doesn’t get to NZQA in correct form then why should they get the money? Reality of schools is that we are under resourced. That letter caused huge resentment among staff. Kate’s response was that it is not about screwing schools. NZQA is not funded for any operational activity in schools

c. Deadlines. Can we expect that NZQA deadlines for 2004 will be notified to schools before next year?

- Going out in a circular today to schools.
- We have gone from 50-112 exam sessions this year and with Level 3 also operational next year that will increase again. There is no clear mandate from survey of school opinion to allow exams to start earlier, go longer, to be on Saturdays etc. Same length of time for 2004. Starts on 12th and

finishes on the 2nd. Two sessions per day. Level 1 and Level 3 on at the same time, except for English. Level 2 in the afternoon if Level 1 and 3 are in the morning. Scholarship exam the day after the Level 3. It will be more difficult because there will be more clashes.

d. How are NZQA developments being delivered on to teachers? Does NZQA feel that it needs to have an input to improve standards in secondary schools by way of professional development for staff?

- The problem has been the focus on jumbo days over the last couple of years. How, rather than why. These were vital and have led to stunning consistency of assessment – NQF Assessment in Secondary Schools Moderation in 2002 86% agreement.
- Now we need focussed and targeted PD for staff. Assessment for learning is where we need to go. If assessment does not lead to learning we may as well get rid of it. NZQA is pushing for these things with the Minister, Howard Fancy etc.
- Different schools are at different places. Circular 11 – permission to do things differently. Don't have to have a formal test. Eng, Math, Geo – they were on board with ABA and Unit Standards right at the beginning so they are further along the track than some of the other subjects that have come on board later. Clearly each needs quite different types of PD now.
- NZQA have no role in that, have no PD money at all.
- Colin Brown – would be a good person to speak to this group.

e. How would you (Kate) respond to the assertion that “the assessment tail is wagging the learning dog?”

- It always has and always will.
- Personally would like to see that only assessment, be assessment on line when the kids are ready. Can't make those moves until the sector is ready to move. The tasks should be rich but the skills need to be assessed independently.
- David Philip would be a good person to talk to this group.
- A lot of the assessment issues are because of the way that the curriculum is written. Some of the good practice in assessment goes back to the block in the curriculum. Have to get people on to these groups who are not just subject teachers. Break down the subjects.

f. Why are we only having one standard per subject being moderated?

- Hope that there are more appeals in 2004 as people get more confident in the whole assessment process
- Problem that we are going to have in this country is to ensure the veracity of the results of the internals rather than relying on the externals. It's about the public perception of the reliability of teacher judgement and workplaces having confidence in our reliability

g. Concern about access to, and reliability of the information on, the web?

- Can get any NZQA information in hard copy at any time you want.
- Kate will absolutely take into account the comment made by this group about letting Principals' nominees know of any changes at all.
- Blame the faulty exemplars issue on the Ministry. They have mis-sold exemplars to teachers. More and more teachers are designing their own stuff and it's a whole lot better than the exemplars on the web.
- Making exemplars secure gave them a credence that they didn't deserve. Internal exemplars are giving the wrong messages. Would be delighted if they were all obliterated.
- Schools have taken the position that they should not develop their own, because of workload and it should never have happened. A lot of bad teaching has happened because of it. They were really only a starting point.

h. How does NZQA intend to improve the reliability of Moderation?

- Slightly different focus in each of the agencies therefore slightly different focus in moderation too.
- There is a process of checking the moderators.
- Any time AP/DP see any problems with moderation NZQA needs to see the evidence of those problems.
- Collegial affirmation of a teacher's judgement and that's how we should be seeing it. Need to change a mindset from, you are wrong, to here's some feedback on how to improve. Professional discourse needed. That's also what NZQA want. Needs to be the opportunity for comment. Even an explanation at the front on how this should be read.
- Maybe all Principals nominees need to be trained as moderators. That would start a local conversation.

i. Versions change on the net and we are not alerted to them. Why are we not being alerted to the achievement standards that are being changed? Why not e-mailed out to the Principal's nominee? Why is the Update not used to let us know?

- Mostly because the updates are out of date by the time they actually go out, because it takes so long to get agreement before it goes to print
- Will take back to NZQA this groups suggestion re: e-mailing. Would be pleased to use our e-mail system

j. There needs to be an increase in the operational grant in terms of on-going costs e.g. photocopying etc There are some quite subtle cost increases e.g. Science 1.1 now they have to have those chemicals and do it individually, where they could before do it with 3 or 4 examples or Hospitality, or drama assessments. We administer fees and get a trifling amount back for our administration. We are not being adequately reimbursed. What has NZQA done to impress this on the Ministry and the Minister?

- Let Ministry know areas of tension.
- The Government is trying not to spend anything and this is going to continue until just before the next election. Ministry is aware of the stresses and strains on schools.
- We have an incredibly expensive qualification system, which we run very cheaply. Australia doesn't have nearly as much assessment as we do.

k. When will we receive student results? We are assuming that NZQA will have results out for us in January in a readable format. We want to be able to read the students' results in the same way that they do. And we want the results available in time to be able to advise the kids sensibly of course selection for the year.

- When they're ready. But will do everything they can to get them out as soon as they can.
- Format is being changed. That is the good news. Will be much better.
- Kate believes that we will get the results formatted in the same way as the students do this year and that we will get them when the kids do. However, she advises that we tell the kids that they need to bring their result slips in with them.
- Major problem is the markers of internally assessed standards, it's not the exam markers that have caused the delays we experienced last year.

- 21 November internally assessed results will be up on the web for kids to check their internal results.

l. Why would you send in you non-achieved results?

- Data we have at the moment is flawed, because some schools do send in non-achieved and some don't. NZQA says DON'T send them in.
- This data should not be used to compare schools. Yes its good data for looking at our own kids, but it's no good for comparing schools with. Advice – look at your results, find your good new stories, get to the media before the results come out and tell them those stories.
- Externals will still report non-achievement.

m. What will NCEA be like in the future? What will employers say?

- Do have a vision. A lot of political imperatives.
- The system is changing and it's not easy to change? (See power point presentation)

n. University Entrance. What will that look like? What will the selection criteria be?

- Set standards in consultation with the Vice Chancellors etc. Approved list based on curriculum statements. Because of the universities understanding of subjects there are difficulties. Getting a pamphlet next week to explain exactly where it stands. Set for the next two years.
- Problems come because of the international students failing in the first year.
- Will be harder than the previous 3 Cs, because of the issue of required numeracy and literacy credits.
- Technology has been left off the list, because of the University understanding (or lack of it) of what is now involved in that subject. However, the achievement of any scholarship subject will get students in and therefore they can still get in there. The cohort of kids that have actually traditionally done technology is the problem for universities.
- NZQA need to do a really good PR job on the stats. There's a lot of background to those stats. This needs to go to BoTs. A low level of achievement does not mean bad teacher or unmotivated students. – need to take a look at NZQA web site – NCEA page 2002 commentary of results
- Doesn't matter a bit unless you want to go to Auckland or medical school, because in the end it's just about bums on seats

- Step-Up Scholarships - UE, Level 3 NCEA or not, 80 Level 3 credits, Merit criteria – number of credits at Level 4 and above, number of credits achieved with excellence. Gives some judgement and may give something a bit fairer to judge by. Top students are probably going to leave and do an intermediate year at some other institution.

o. DP/AP have delegated leadership in schools and yet are not consulted by groups like NZQA – What ways can AP/DP be incorporated into that process to get us back into the loop?

- Andrew Kear and Chris Winstanley have the responsibility. Need to get those two and that will be the most fruitful. Set up the same kind of thing that Kate has with principals. NASDAP need to lobby these two.
- Not only do we lead assessment and have the big picture stuff, but we also teach at the chalk face. And yet we do not have the voice. Teachers have a lobby, HoDs have a lobby.
- Kate says that NZQA will make use of NASDAP perspective in the future.

p. Variable level of difficulty between Unit and Achievement Standards?

- There is a team assessing that from an international perspective.
- Many of the achievement standards are at the wrong level. Does not mean that the curriculum is wrong. Learn things together because it makes sense to learn them together. Need to reach some sort of agreement about looking at each standard and see that it is at the right level. Like the idea that there is a debate about the whole issue.
- Quite good opportunity to put pressure on schools to up their standards. We need assurance that if this is Level 2 then this is an international standard.

q. Timetabling? Should we be moving towards six subjects?

- No clear call.
- Schools should be making sure the kids have the access and that they are with the right provider. Multi level study is one way of getting round those issues.
- Need to look at the NCEA as a leaving certificate. Schools tend to over assess.

Kate's final advice - Focus on Learning.

3. Strategic Planning

- NASDAP Plan for 2004. Carol had prepared the draft for a strategic plan. Seven objectives identified and committee members spent some time considering the goals, action and expected outcomes.
- Spent some time talking about the objectives to allow us to focus a little on goals for 2004.
- 4.1 - Unified voice – magazine has been good, but where to? Having straw vote questions in the newsletter and on the web site to hear what the members have to say. Consult people by e-mail. Continue to lobby. Write letters to ask to be represented – e.g. Secondary Futures. Hit list constantly updated. Media statements. Strategy for increasing the membership. Some of the 8% not members are very bitter for some reason. Getting feedback from the Christchurch people from the discussion groups. Up the ante on the newsletter. Use the letterhead in the newsletter. Increase to A-4 size. Extra funding for the newsletter for 2004 – including advertising. These things to be considered at next meeting.
- 4.2 – ensure professional development is available to all regions regardless of where they are. Set up a subsidy system. Congruence throughout the country. Perhaps funding a professional discourse.
- 4.3 – website. E-mails. Picking up AP/DP opinion before the next contract rounds.
- 4.4 – these meetings, e-mail, newsletter, some speaker
- 4.5 – newsletter. A liaison person from this meeting to speak to other regions. Need for this committee to report from our own regions what's happening at each executive meeting
- 4.6 – someone out of this group to have a look at this job. End follow-up from Roy 's survey. Someone with objectivity.

4. Conference 2004

Wairekei July next year. Leslie to get something into the newsletter. AGM next year is also at Taupo. Biennial conference in Rotorua. 2007 Queenstown. We need something concrete for that. Allan to follow up. Annette to talk to AP/DP in Nelson. We need to have a 2007 venue in confirmed.

Meeting closed at 3.30pm

Next Meeting: March 5, 2004 . Date to be confirmed by the end of this term.