

President's Report – May 2004

Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa

I hope that term two has been kind to you all and that any winter ailments have passed you by. If you have succumbed to illness, I hope that you had a speedy recovery. As busy professionals we often neglect self-care as we may be of the opinion that we are indispensable at school. Please take the time to look after yourselves and your families. Emotional and physical health are very important

The Executive met early this term and we were to have two guest speakers; Phil Smith and Trevor Bleakley from PPTA and Karen Sewell, Chief Executive Officer of the Education Review Office. Due to a communication breakdown at PPTA's end, Phil and Trevor did not meet with us. We spent their allocated time posing questions about the proposed salary claim in relation to Assistant and Deputy Principals. [A copy of the letter that I have sent to Phil Smith on behalf of the Executive and his reply are included in this newsletter.]

Karen Sewell spoke to the Executive in the afternoon and she began her presentation talking about the *"Whakatoke of ERO – The Child is at the Heart of the Matter."* This whakatoke underpins all of the policies and practises of ERO.

Karen gave us a historical tour through ERO's conception, implementation and on-going development. She talked at length about evaluation and that it is concerned with *"providing information that is measurable."* However, she went on to say, *"That there is often a tension between what is measured and what matters."* Educators have to be careful about what they measure. And of course, we all know that "certain measurement" can often lead to the publication of the dreaded "league tables."

When schools receive the eagerly awaited letter that ERO is coming, there is often an on-set of evaluation anxiety. Karen was very keen to point out that this anxiety *"depends upon your attitude and approach."* She is very aware that this anxiety can stem from people; i.e. negative past experiences, excessive ego involvement with the programme model and evaluator's failure to highlight accomplishments when presenting challenges. Karen was very keen to point out that *"Whatever the results of an ERO visit, you [the school] should tell your community immediately, rather than wait for the official report to be placed onto the website."*

All schools in New Zealand are part of the ERO review cycle and most of us will have experienced the new investigative model. Her advice, *"Enjoy the review process. Showcase your achievements!"*

Some of us will enjoy each other's company at the up-coming Central North Island Association's Taupo Conference. The theme is "Liquorice Allsorts" and the keynote speakers and workshops look exciting. To those not able to go, I am sure that you will hear of the conference's success. NASDAP's 2004 annual general meeting will take place at the conclusion of the conference.

Enjoy the remainder of Term II and the upcoming vacation. If you travel, travel safely.

Arohanui

Annette M Taylor

MINUTES OF THE NASDAP EXECUTIVE MEETING
HELD AT WELLINGTON AIRPORT - VISCOUNT ROOM

Friday 14 May 2004 , 9.15am – 2.45pm

PRESENT: Phil Keenan, Lesley Jamieson , Sheryl Offner, Julia Scott, Lynlee Smith, Annette Taylor , Jenny Thomas , Allan Webb , Joyce Whyman

APOLOGIES: Roy Fletcher , Stephen Hensman

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

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

Julia Scott welcomed back to the group. She has been elected as second member for the Auckland region.

MATTERS ARISING:

- Newsletter: Deadline for next newsletter is Wednesday 26 May. Members to flick an e-mail to other reps to get regional news into the newsletter. Sheryl to contact Mary Chamberlain to get something about the curriculum update. Joyce STAR regulation. Julia – NCEA Ministry contract analysis of data. Jenny and Allan - School Strategy discussion document. May 31 deadline for the material. Under a heading of Are You Aware of these Things? Roy – analysis of data from his AP/DP survey. PPTA comparison of AP/DP salaries and disparities. Jenny – Secondary Futures Conference. (Nicola Meek)
- Update on the On-Line AP/DP Support through Leadspace

Some members are experiencing difficulties actually receiving their codes from Rosalie. Lynlee to get back to Rosalie and let her know that there is this difficulty. Also members would like access the on-line curriculum discussions.

- Free Diaries for APs/DPs – Allan Webb

Allan distributed copies to members and has them all ready to go with the next newsletter, as decided at the last meeting. Two to three diaries to go out to each school, dependent on how many DP/APs there are in each school

- NASDAP Scholarship Fund – from 2005 onwards would like NASDAP scholarship included in the prestigious awards list as advertised in the Gazette. Need to do it right. Want to investigate setting up a scholarship fund sufficiently so that the NASDAP scholarship is ready to run next year, not this year. Annette produced details of the KA North Scholarship (Massey and Teacher Awards) as a sample of what might be possible. Sheryl to pick it up as a project to bring back to the next meeting. Details of Sheryl's finding to be e-mailed to all committee members before the next meeting.

TREASURER'S REPORT

91% subscription return for 2003-2004 financial year. Annette reports to date no obvious dissatisfaction with increased fees. 161 memberships paid as at 13 May 2004 for 2004 -2005 financial year. (approx 50% of present members) Un-audited annual accounts presented to the meeting. Books are presently with the accountant being audited so that they can be presented at the Central North Island meeting in June. Copy of report attached.

Motion: That the treasurer's report be accepted

Moved: Annette Seconded: Phil Carried

CORRESPONDENCE INWARDS:

- Teachers Council – thanking for their copy of the newsletter and advising that it had been appropriately distributed.

CORRESPONDENCE OUTWARDS:

- Kate Colbert – Media comments re: NASDAP minutes (as outlined in last minutes)
- The Listener (as outlined in last minutes)
- Carol Craymer – Thank you for work on NASDAP
- Copies of all correspondence outwards can be viewed on the NASDAP web site

GENERAL BUSINESS:

- 1) Meeting with Phil Smith [President PPTA] and Trevor Bleakley

Phil and Trevor did not make it to the meeting in spite of the fact that meeting times and dates had been confirmed with them in writing. The committee, therefore, spent time drafting questions to be sent to Phil with a letter outlining our disappointment at their non-attendance. This letter to be written by Annette.

- What steps are PPTA taking to measure and compare the relativity of salaries between DP/APs and Principals over the last 10 years? And the relativity between AP/DPs and Middle Management? Our membership strongly objects to the apparent devaluation of the skills we are called to utilise in our positions.
- There is concern (and Phil Smith has expressed this opinion on more than one occasion) that one way of implementing the five non-contacts will be by Senior Management teaching more. How is PPTA going to safeguard AP/DPs from this possibility?
- Does the management unit scale apply to Fixed Term units as well as to permanent units?
- If so there is the real anomaly of fixed term units not counting towards superannuation. What will PPTA do about this?
- There is an obvious inequity in the management unit scale being proposed for the current contract round. e.g. staff member A on 2 management units is given additional responsibility and a unit to go with it and is paid \$5000 for that Staff Member B on MU3 is offered the same additional responsibility but receives only \$3500. A similar scenario would result where a staff member is relieving for someone else.
- What steps are PPTA taking to ensure that the ministry is allocating adequate staffing to schools to meet the guaranteed non-contact time requirements for 2005?
- The issue of Acting Principal has been discussed with PPTA on numerous occasions with no action to date. How can PPTA make sure that it is part of this salary round? We contend that there should be no qualifying time required. If an AP/DP takes the role of Principal s/he should be paid accordingly for the full duration of his/her service as Principal.
- The survey that PPTA has just sent out to schools is too simplistic. It doesn't allow for multi-level classes, overseas student money being used to subsidise additional staffing. It doesn't give an indication of what classes have been dropped, the additional workload being placed on AP/DPs, reduced contact time for each class, more split classes at Years 9 and 10. What is PPTA's response to these criticisms?
- Please clarify what contact time really means – does it include form-time, duty time, assembly attendance?
- Would PPTA consider setting a percentage of management units in each school which should be allocated to senior management responsibilities and getting this embedded in the contract?
- What support is PPTA prepared to give senior management?

- What flexibility will PPTA show as far as its expectation that schools satisfy contract requirements mid way through a year? (e.g. .9 allocation – second year teacher, which has only recently been clarified by PPTA and the Ministry, and which schools are being directed to comply with as of now.) What constitutes time for .2 allowance for 1st years?
 - What strategies are PPTA presenting to address the responsibilities of supervising teachers for the significantly increased number of Year 1/2 teachers and overseas teachers now in schools?
- 2) Meeting with Karen Sewell [Chief Executive of ERO] Points made by Karen included:
- Karen joined the meeting at 1.00pm and spoke about the role of ERO in NZ Secondary Schooling.
 - She has been with ERO for just over 7 years. She joined ERO to try to make a difference at the national level in the areas that were an issue for her. Over the last 3 years ERO have worked really hard to make the relationship between schools and themselves a more constructive one.
 - The child, the heart of the matter. This is the whakatoke of ERO.
 - Current work – education reviews and national reports (considers this ERO's most important work and where they can really influence government in its decision making)
 - Evaluation is the product of the process of determining the merit, worth and significance of things used to make judgments, facilitate improvement and generate knowledge.
 - ERO 15 years old and has their reports for the last 14 years. The data is so rich and is being made available to the people through their updated web page.
 - Getting information from a little over 900 schools a year so there is enough information coming now to be statistically valid. Can use the data even though it was collected using different methodologies.
 - All evaluation is concerned with providing the information – what is measured and what matters most? There is often a tension between the two. Have to be quite careful about what you measure,
 - Key questions- what do you want to achieve, how will you determine that and how is it doing?
 - Internal versus external evaluation – official information act makes ERO transparent. No-one will ever entirely trust just what you say about yourself. It's the dialogue with external agencies that adds the validity to what we say about ourselves.

- Use report for the purpose for which it is intended. Ministerial review 2000 – directed to come up with a methodology that would be more useful. Look at the recommendations from last time.
- Three year review cycle. Doing about 16.5% supplementary reviews and about 15% go back onto the ordinary cycle.
- Think that there is a better relationship now so that schools can focus more on what is found than on what ERO do. There are far closer links with the Ministry than there ever were before. Much more constructive and effective than it ever was. In reviewing schools ERO is reviewing the effectiveness of school's implementation of government policy.
- Scope of reviews – school specific priorities, areas of government interest, compliance issues. An opportunity to do things better. Would be good to do the BoT assurance statement every year.
- Lovely caring face of ERO – nicely humorous approach to her presentation and what she had to say.
- Evaluation indicators book. Really useful – but remember they are a tool for review officers, now available to schools to use, but they are not a check list. Indicators focussed on student achievement. Written using clear and useful principles, observable and valid. Can be used for own reflection.
- Challenge to be more user-friendly and for us to come prepared to participate ourselves.
- If a school has an issue with the team that is coming to review it, raise this with the area manager. Hopefully ERO is not so bloody minded that they can't change the team if there are good reasons for doing so.
- Believes she is more accountable as an ERO reviewer than she ever was as a Principal.

Karen also spent some time talking about Evaluation Anxiety:

- Depends on the situation, our attitude/approach, your attitude/approach. Have to be quite careful about how relationships are developed and managed. If ERO get up AP/DP's noses now, then likely to be more difficult next time they come into our school.
- Karen believes that it is good to have her there, because she has an education background. Bit of a punt for Ministry to appoint her CEO, when other CEO appointments have been from an accounting background.
- People sources – lack of experience, negative past experience, excessive ego involvement with the programme model, excessive fear of negative consequences.

- Whatever the results, you should tell your community, rather than wait for it to be on the web.
- People sources – evaluator’s failure to highlight programme accomplishments when presenting challenges, evaluatees emphasise negative findings, role ambiguity.
- In a secondary school we will not see all teachers, its senior management’s role to do that. Now looking at fewer things in depth, you are now a grown up system with responsibilities that you will fulfil.
- The consequence of a negative ERO visit is that ERO don’t get as good information and schools are less likely to take notice of what ERO have found.

She also responded to a number of questions from the floor:

- If I wanted to go and work for ERO, I would have to take a massive pay drop. Why has ERO not done something about this to attract people from Senior Management? What about secondment?

Turnover of staff on ERO is about 12%. There is no area in the country where there hasn’t been turnover of staff, even though it may not seem like it. ERO appoint from the sector. Some things that educators have that other don’t have – better informed about Maori etc. About 14% have been principals. Significant number come from senior managers, also from middle management, about 18-20% is early childhood. Range currently \$75,000 for review officer – significantly more for senior review officer. Many see it as a career step. Many are seeing it as a step to Principalship. Responsible in terms of judgement, but don’t have the same level of responsibility of DP/APs. Have an agreement with PSA that won’t ever have more than about 10% on secondment from the sector.

- Are all vacancies advertised widely?

Gazette, website as with all educational vacancies. Hardest area to maintain is Maori fluent speakers. 18% of staff fluent speakers. Very sought after group

- How often do you check and review home schoolers?

There are about 5,500 students on home schooling. ERO are doing about 640 home schooler reviews a year. It would take about 9 years to see them all. Some will never be reviewed. However, schools can raise issues, if they have them, and ERO will take these seriously and undertake a review as a result of a school’s concerns.

- Some scepticism was voiced about the ERO’s recent NCEA Report. A Feeling was expressed that the report did not fit well with the way that many DP/APs in the region were talking.

Absolutely everything that was said in the report could be backed up with evidence. The principals of the schools were the ones that responded. Some schools sent in more than one reply. Every school that was being reviewed was also monitored and questioned at that time. What ERO got back from the questionnaires was validated in other ways too. Ideally would have waited until the end of Levels 1, 2 and 3. But there was so much going on by the middle of last year that the decision was made to do a survey then and another will be done in two to three years. Often the talk is about two to three years behind the reality. Can only report on the evidence they received.

- What is the availability (hard copies) of ERO's publications?

Don't print many of publications as hard copy any more. Last year only two. Will always send a hard copy if requested to do so, but not a published copy. As a matter of courtesy do send hard copies of any that are printed in hardcopy to all schools. The beginning teachers report has to go to the minister by 30 June. Web copy will be available shortly after that. ERO are also considering producing two reports per year for parents. First about reading – what it all means. What the kids are experiencing so that parents can support them. The second - how parents can help and assist schools. Would be quite hard to do but ERO are thinking about that. These will be hard copies. Not all people have access to computer technology/ electronic data.

If you would like to contact Karen her E-mail is: Karen-sewell@ero.govt.nz

- 3) Elections for NASDAP Executive 2005 – 2006 – **will take place at the end of the year.**
- 4) Wairakei Conference – Lesley Jamieson (Hamilton) has copies of forms for registration if any one is interested.
- 5) PPTA Conference

Those who had attended reported really good feedback about the usefulness of the conference. A pity more PPTA members did not attend. Was that something to do with the timing of the event?

- 6) GST – Query from Hamilton region about the feasibility of registering for GST for conference organisers. Auckland did not do so.
- 7) Difficulties that schools are facing to get Relievers

All schools indicating that finding relief teachers is getting more and more difficult.

NEXT MEETING: Suggestions for speakers – Nicola Meek, Peter Biggs, (see PPTA News Charting the Future) Mary Chamberlain, Don Brash, Bill English - National Party representative of some sort. Someone who could speak to us about negotiating our own contract and how to go about it. How to deal with the media. Annette to action

Meeting closed at 2.45pm

Next Meeting: 13 August, 2004 . Wellington Airport

LETTERS ARISING FROM THE EXECUTIVE MEETING

20 May 2004

Mr Phil Smith
President PPTA
PPTA Head Office
PO Box 2119
WELLINGTON

Dear Phil

It was very disappointing that you and Trevor Bleakley were not able to attend the NASDAP Executive meeting held on Friday 14 May 2004 . I enclose a copy of an email that I received from your personal assistant, that actually confirms that you would be able to attend the meeting at 11.00 am .

Sheryll Ofner [Vice-President] and I were both contacted by Trevor prior to Friday to confirm the meeting and he sought from us both possible discussion topics. Sheryll and I told the Executive members that you both knew that the meeting was taking place.

Thus, the Executive spent “your allocated time” discussing issues arising from the proposed salary claim pertaining to Assistant and Deputy Principals. The Executive requested that I write to you, listing the questions and seek appropriate responses from PPTA.

These questions are:

What steps is PPTA taking to measure and compare the relativity of salaries between DP/APs and Principals over the last 10 years? And the relativity between AP/DPs and Middle Management? Our membership strongly objects to the apparent devaluation of the skills we are called to utilise in our current positions.

There is concern (and you have expressed this opinion on more than one occasion) that one way of implementing the five non-contacts will be by Senior Management teaching more classes. How is PPTA going to safeguard AP/DPs from this possibility?

Does the increased management unit scale apply to Fixed Term units as well as to Permanent units? If so there is the real anomaly of Fixed Term units not counting towards superannuation. What will PPTA do about this?

There is an obvious inequity in the management unit scale being proposed for the current contract round; e.g. staff member A on 2 management units is given additional responsibility and a unit to go with it and is paid \$5000 for that. Staff Member B on 3

management units is offered the same additional responsibility but receives only \$3,500. A similar scenario would result where a staff member is relieving for someone else. What are PPTA's thoughts on this?

What steps is PPTA taking to ensure that the Ministry of Education is allocating adequate staffing to schools to meet the guaranteed non-contact time requirements for 2005?

The issue of Acting Principal has been discussed with PPTA on numerous occasions with no action to date. How can PPTA make sure that it is part of this salary round? We contend that there should be no qualifying time required. If an AP/DP takes the role of Principal s/he should be paid accordingly for the full duration of his/her service as Acting Principal.

The survey that PPTA has just sent out to schools is too simplistic. It doesn't allow for multi-level classes, international student monies being used to subsidise additional staffing. It doesn't give an indication of what classes have been dropped, the additional workload being placed on AP/DPs, reduced contact time for each class, more split classes at Years 9 and 10. What is PPTA's response to these criticisms?

Please clarify what contact time really means; does it include form-time, duty time, and assembly attendance?

Would PPTA consider setting a percentage of management units in each school, which should be allocated, to senior management responsibilities and getting this embedded into the contract?

What support is PPTA prepared to give senior management?

Will a school be expected to provide at least 0.1 non-contact time for year two teachers (over and above the non-contact provisions for all teachers) even when that teacher begins part-way through the year and replaces a teachers on a "full" timetable?

What strategies are PPTA presenting to address the responsibilities of supervising teachers for the significantly increased number of Year 1 /2 teachers and overseas teachers now in schools?

That concludes the list of questions. There are many and I make no apologies for that. Had you and Trevor been at the meeting, this lengthy diatribe would not have had to be written.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Kind regards

Annette M Taylor [Ms]

President NASDAP

THE REPLY FROM PPTA

26 May 2004

Annette
President
National Association of Secondary Deputy and Assistant Principals
Nelson College for Girls
PO Box 842
Nelson 7015

Dear Annette

I very much regret the circumstances that required you to write your letter of 20 May to me. Because of staff changes in National Office I am without a permanent PA at the moment, and the normally ultra-reliable secretary who is standing in made a serious slip-up, about which she is extremely embarrassed and apologetic. Trevor, who you had earlier contact with, assumed she knew the latest about your meeting and so accepted that it had been changed.

I have asked Rob Willetts to provide some data to answer your queries and I attach this information.

I will be speaking to your Canterbury people on Friday, and will be accompanied by Rob and Trevor, so if you have any further issues to raise I would be happy to deal with them there.

Yours sincerely

PHIL
PRESIDENT

SMITH

DP and AP QUESTIONS - RESPONSES

1 In 1996 the salary translation schedule was as follows:

	School size	TBS + 'X' Units
<p>NB. The number of positions at each level was fixed by the Staffing Orders in Council according to school size.</p>		

Position		
PR1	Any	1
PR2	Any	2
PR3	Any	3
PR4	Any	4
SM Class A	1-200	3
SM Class B	201-500	4
SM Class C	501-850	5
SM Class D	>850	6
DP Class A	1-200	5
DP Class B	201-500	6
DP Class C	501-850	7
DP Class D	>850	8

Position	School size	Translation: TBS + 'X' Units	1996 v tbs	2004 v tbs	1996 v PR 4	2004 v 4 units
Base scale	Any	0	\$41860	\$56393		
PR1	Any	1	106.3%	105.3%		
PR2	Any	2	111.0%	110.6%		
PR3	Any	3	116.0%	116.0%		
PR4	Any	4	121.8%	121.3%	\$50985	\$68393
SM Class A	1-200	3	115.4%	116.0%	94.8%	95.6%
SM Class B	201-500	4	118.9%	121.3%	97.6%	100.0%
SM Class C	501-850	5	122.3%	126.6%	100.4%	104.4%
SM Class D	>850	6	125.7%	131.9%	103.2%	108.8%
DP Class A	1-200	5	118.9%	126.6%	97.6%	104.4%
DP Class B	201-500	6	124.9%	131.9%	102.5%	108.8%
DP Class C	501-850	7	130.8%	137.2%	107.4%	113.2%
DP Class D	>850	8	136.0%	142.6%	111.6%	117.6%
		9	Didn't exist	147.9%	Didn't exist	121.9%
		10	Didn't exist	153.2%	Didn't exist	126.3%
		11	Didn't exist	158.5%	Didn't exist	130.7%

SMs and APS and DPs are proportionately better off in 2004 under the unit system than they were in 1996 when compared to both TBS teachers and those unit holders lower down the unit scale. The level of increased advantage rises with the number of units.

Those who increased the **number** of units they had without moving into higher positions are further advantaged in relation to their relative salary position in 1996.

Since 1996 the only additional units which have gone in have been through staffing growth (1.2 units per FTTE entitlement staffing). How does the number of units the currently hold correspond to the number of units APs and DPs would have started with in 1996? A PPTA survey of principals in December 2002 indicated that 53% of DPs had increased the number of units they had translated over from. For these DPs this is a significant individual pay increase in addition to the general increases won by all teachers.

We are aware of a school of 600 in which the DP receives 9 units. This represents an increase of two units over translation – giving this DP a relative salary of 121.9% instead of 113.2% when measured against a PR 4 (four unit holder).

A class A school DP (translating with 5 units) now holds 9 units - a specific to individual increase of .17.5 percentage points over their relative salary margin against a PR 4. and now holds almost half of all the units available to the school.

When comparing with principals things are messier because of the change to the number of grade bands and the salary boundaries, but here goes

School size	1991	1997
1-200	83%	92%
201-500	79%	86%
501-850	76%	81%
>850	72%	75%
School size	Top of band P salary relative to DP	
	July 2003	
151-300	93%	
301-500	85%	
501-671	85%	
672-1025	82%	
1026-1400	79%	
1401-1600	76%	
>2000	72%	

The decline in the value of principals' salaries relative to their DPs was an argument used to raise the formers' salaries in the last round SPCA negotiations. You will note that at the lower end of the roll size the principals are still significantly behind their DPs in salary improvement over the period.

2 Workload: 1 hour per unit guaranteed non-contact time (in addition to the 5 hours base non-contact time). This is an interim step.

The 2004 survey of non-contact time shows the following distribution of non-contact time amongst unit holders:

Permanent units	Mean hours non-contact per five days
1	5.04
2	5.77
3	6.89
4	8.36
AP	14.67
DP	17.67

- 3 Secondary teacher workload research project is undertaken in term 3 2004. Looking at what the workload is of all teachers, particularly focussing on unit holders to find ways of addressing that workload. Arises from the MTF, which came about from the last settlement. Their responsibility to make sure that the researchers get an accurate indication of their workloads and the ways in which these could be addressed.
- 4 The Association is committed to working to implement the careers pathways recommendations outlined in the MTF report – in ways which both which will redistribute workload and add more resourcing into schools.
- 5 The proposed shift to the differential unit rate is the first step towards re-establishing rate for the job – which will allow higher level salaries to be negotiated separately from all other unit rates. The rate for the job was what the APs/DPs indicated they wanted.
- 6 The Association will be reviewing the operation of the unit system with the MoE as part of the industrial round – also arising from the MTF recommendations.
- 7 Relativities with principals etc are irrelevant while there is a linear salary scale above the TBS based on units – changing one rate will move them all up.
- 8 Fixed term units have never counted for superannuation. They are supposed to be temporary allowances for duties which are not ongoing and are not regarded under the super rules as ‘salary’ – in the same way that other allowances aren’t. If they have ongoing unit then they should seek to make them permanent. .
- 9 The impact of fixed term units in the pay proposal won’t affect APs and DPs. Firstly they generally hold more than 3 permanent units and secondly there isn’t an expectation that they would hold fixed term units. Senior managers are paid a salary for a management/administration role – under what circumstances would APs and DPs commonly be receiving fixed term units? Principals cannot hold units of any description.
- 10 Establishing the differential scale they want will cause inequities – the scale that they had before had inequities –e.g. getting your first PR gave you \$2701 , getting your second gave you nothing extra in the first year then \$1972 more. If you were an SM in a class A school you were paid \$48,361 and were paid \$49,774 if you were in a class B school. No-one ever identified a significant workload or responsibility difference for the few extra kids that made a difference. A PR One relieving for a PR Two got no extra money. The linear scale was supposed to remove the inequities – but they don’t like it now because it’s too rigid.
- 11 Half the staffing from SRG is still left to come to staff the 5th hour. It all has to be in place by 2007 and the Government is endeavouring to put it all

in place by 2006. The fifth hour will be linked to the arrival of the last of the SRG staffing, but since some is arriving in 2005 they are expected to begin the process of moving people on to the fifth hour wherever possible.

- 12 PPTA claims come out of the claims development processes. The qualifying period for payment as acting principal has been around since the Green manuals. There is also a qualifying period for short term relievers to be paid at the top of the scale instead of step 10. There is 6 weeks. This affects more people – removing qualifying periods was not an issue raised by branches in the consultation process – did the APs and DPs take part in this? Did they raise the issue? We may be able to raise it in the talks as a small cost item.
- 13 The PPTA survey was about class size and what teachers thought about the size of those classes. It is not about the resourcing of classes or the workload of administrative staff. We specifically needed a snapshot of how big classes are in 2004. The information is for the curriculum staffing working party we are proposing as part of the claim. If they want a survey for other purposes they can run their own. As we expected, members have had enough intelligence to indicate split classes, combined classes etc.
- 14 Non contact time has already been defined – see *'Its about time'*, sent to branches and principals in September 2002 and currently on the PPTA web site.
- 15 'Senior management' is not defined anywhere. What does it mean? What constitutes 'senior management duties'? How are these allocated to units or vice versa? Do APs and DPs want national job descriptions? Anyone now can be called an AP or a DP and any duty can be associated with someone who is an AP or DP. Do they want to go back to the old provision of having a defined number of senior masters/mistresses and DPs per school according to school size?
- 16 PPTA gives every member support. There were no specific claims items raised through the claim consultation process.
- 17 Schools will receive 0.1 FTTE extra staffing for every year two teacher whenever they arrive in the school and is expected to apply this to free the teacher for professional development or apply the agreed compensatory mechanism to the section 5 non-contacts.
- 18 The guaranteed 5+ hour per unit non-contact time with additional supporting staffing is part of the claim for unit holders. The introduction of the classroom specialist positions in all schools is part of the claim (with additional staffing) and these positions should remove some of the duties related to induction, care and mentoring of new teachers. In addition the workload review should show this up as an area to be addressed. There was no claim for this raised through the claim consultation process.

STAR, GATEWAY and TRANSITIONS SERVICES

Some changes to the STAR programme were notified last year. On Thursday 13 May further new initiatives were announced to provide a wider range of career –focussed choices for students.

STAR

Although the STAR policy remains the same for 2004 there are changes in some aspects of the programme. The information below is from the Ministry presentation “Changes to STAR Funding 2004”.

- Funds will be allocated in four instalments within the school’s operational funding (previously one lump sum).
- The funding formula remains the same, but is now calculated on the **ACTUAL** March 1 or July 1 roll.
- The criteria for STAR courses remain the same, but **schools are now responsible** for ensuring that courses meet criteria.
- Course roll over and approval processes will no longer be used.
- Schools are expected to keep course information for auditing and reporting purposes.

Criteria for STAR courses

Courses should meet one of the following criteria (all or in part):-

- Include work-based learning
- Provide opportunities to gain credits towards NCEA in vocational, education and training courses at level 1 or above.
- Be administered by NZQA as a national qualification but not be registered on the National Qualification Framework at Level 1 or above
- Lead to assessment towards the NZ Certificate of Science or NZ Certificate in Engineering or Technicians Certificate.
- Lead towards a trade certificate or the primary industry cadet scheme issued by NZQA.
- Lead to a credit towards a recognised tertiary qualification offered by a tertiary training institution.

As a general rule courses that are already part of a school’s curriculum may not be resourced from STAR funds.

Monitoring and Reporting

The information required is the:-

- Course name
- Course description

Waikato , King Country, Thames Valley

Leslie Jamieson, Hamilton Girls' High School
lesleyjamieson@hghs.school.nz

Western Bay of Plenty, Bay of Plenty

Allan Webb, Tauhara College , Taupo eduwebb@reap.org.nz

East Coast, Hawkes Bay

Stephen Hensman dprin@stjohns.school.nz

Taranaki, Manawatu and Wanganui

Phil Keenan, Stratford High School
kp@stratfordhigh.school.nz

Wellington , Hutt Valley and Wairarapa

Jenny Thomas, Kapiti College jenny@kapiticollege.school.nz

West Coast, Nelson and Marlborough

Annette Taylor, Nelson College for Girls
annette.taylor@ncg.school.nz

Canterbury and Aoraki

Lynlee Smith, Geraldine High School ap@geraldinehs.school.nz

Otago and Southland

Joyce Whyman, East Otago High School
jae.whyman@xtra.co.nz

Please feel free to contact your executive member on any issue.

REPORTS FROM REGIONAL DP/AP GROUPS

From the Waikato DAPA Group

Our committee have been busy organising the CNI DAPA Conference to be held at Wairakei Resort 16 – 18 June. If you would like to attend this popular event and have missed the registration deadline, contact Heather Gorrie at Kawerau College – she may be able to squeeze you in.

Some of our members are also busy planning for the 2005 National DAPA Conference in Rotorua. If you've listened to a stunning speaker/presenter recently who could be considered for the Conference, contact Lynette Parish at Matamata College .

Our seminar day in November will be held in Rotorua this year. DAPAs will receive information about this day nearer the time.

The Waikato DAPAs generally meet once a term for a social function and dinner. For many years the responsibility for organising these functions has fallen to a few who will no longer be continuing in this role. Neither will they continue to be on the CNI DAPA committee. The social functions provide new DAPAs with the opportunity of meeting with experienced DAPAs and for us all to meet informally. It would be a great pity if we did not continue with this tradition. If you are a Waikato and/or CNI DAPA and you would like to become involved in the work of the committee, please contact me or Lesley Jamieson at Hamilton Girls' High School.

Jenny Ellis

Hamilton Girls High School

FREE DIARIES

All members of NASDAP will receive a free 2005 diary with this Term 2 newsletter. The diary is of an executive type and includes four pages of NASDAP details. The cost of distribution has been paid by NASDAP.

Our thanks to Academy Publishing for making this possible.

Academy Publishing

PO Box 1879
Christchurch
Phone: 03 961 5050
Fax: 0800 555 054



This newsletter was produced, published and distributed by:

Education Webb Limited

* Web Site: www.educationwebb.com *

P O Box 1621 , TAUPO

Phone 07 3782 729 * Fax 07 3782 482 * Email eduwebb@reap.org.nz * Mobile 027 23