



A Hierarchy of Inequality – The Decile Divide

A PAPER FROM THE WAIKATO REGION

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Schools face ever increasing pressures to provide a high quality, public, education.
- 1.2 A 2012 Waikato Region conference paper '*A Level Playing Field?*' highlighted inadequacy in school funding, reliance on fees and other local funding to meet student needs and clear inequality between schools' abilities to access local funding. The paper noted the strong correlation between decile and money raised locally.
- 1.3 In recent years significant social and economic changes have affected New Zealand communities, particularly in large cities. Inequalities between communities have widened¹. Over the last year the media and others have highlighted decile differences between schools and asked if the present system reflects school needs.
- 1.4 There are concerns about use of the decile system for other purposes. Set up as a mechanism to provide targeted funding for students facing significant barriers to learning, the rating has become mixed up with academic performance of schools in league tables and a marketing tool for schools. Parents are often going to considerable lengths to ensure their children access high decile schools, often at considerable sacrifice, in the belief that this is synonymous with 'good' schools.
- 1.5 The Minister herself stated that the decile system is "clumsy". The last review by the Education and Science Parliamentary Committee was carried out in 2003. It seems appropriate to review the current decile system in light of its intended purpose; to allocate additional targeted funding to create an equal playing field for educationally at risk students.
- 1.6 This paper builds on one presented to PPTA's 2013 Issues and Organising Conference².

¹ Rashbrook, M. (Ed). (2013). *Inequality a New Zealand crisis*. Wellington. Bridget William Books.

² NZPPTA. (2013). *New Zealand schools: The decile system*. Wellington: NZPPTA



2 What it was intended for

- 2.1 Deciles were introduced in the 1990s, in response to the polarisation of schooling under Tomorrow's schools, caused by a zoning policy. It was to allocate what was then called 'Equity Funding'.
- 2.2 The intent was to target additional support to schools with high proportions of students from poorer family backgrounds; those with significant barriers to student learning and at risk of not achieving educationally.
- 2.3 Students from these homes can achieve educationally, but they start off from a position of disadvantage, often with significant educational, pastoral and guidance needs. They tend to have parents with limited educational qualifications, low levels of family income, more crowded houses and are more likely to arrive at school with health and learning deficits.
- 2.4 The intent is to 'level the playing field' by providing a higher level of funding for these students to reflect the higher per student costs of addressing the lower levels of social capital and higher levels of social, economic and educational disadvantage.
- 2.5 In 2008 official US national guidelines recommended that additional funding of 40-60% above baseline education cost to bring students from backgrounds of poverty to the same level as their middle class peers. However, US researchers suggest that ratios from 100% to 340% of baseline are necessary to achieve this³.
- 2.6 The extra support which is linked to decile includes:
 - Targeted Funding for Educational Achievement (TFEA)
 - Special Education Grant (SEG)
 - Priority Teacher Supply Allowance (PTSA)
 - Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour (RTLB)
 - Social Workers in schools.

School staffing is not decile linked.

3 How the decile is worked out

- 3.1 The current decile system uses five factors associated with poverty⁴ to identify students from the poorest 20% of families and targets resources to schools where they are concentrated.

³ National Education Access Network May 8, 2008 <http://www.schoolfunding.info/news/policy/5-8-08Weightings.php3>

⁴ Proportions of: households in lowest income band, working parents in lower employment classes, overcrowded households, parents with no/low qualifications and of families reliant on benefits. Originally ethnicity (proportion of



- 3.2 The school decile indicates the concentration of students from the most deprived homes on its roll. It says nothing about the distribution of students from other families. Since the decile is a ranking on the distribution of students from the poorest communities, the decile of any school can change after a 'renorming' even though its intake is essentially unchanged because the proportion of students from the poorest background in other schools can change, causing a relative shift in their ranking.
- 3.3 Decile is recalculated every five years with each new census. The renorming is next year and related changes in funding will be applied in 2015. This will cause considerable change for some schools e.g. those in previously unfashionable suburbs which have had an influx of wealthier residents replacing poorer families. Such schools with currently low/middle decile ratings will see less funding from the government. This will place higher expectations on parents to fundraise.
- 3.4 There is a review process if the Ministry is satisfied there is a significant change in the community.⁵ The grounds are quite strict and it must be a significant change, such as a major employer closing down causing a downturn in employment.
- 3.5 A detailed description of the factors used for decile ratings and how they are assigned can be found on the PPTA website.⁶

4 Some characteristics of high and low decile schools

- 4.1 Tables in Appendix 1 show some characteristics of higher and lower decile schools:
- 4.1.1 Higher decile schools tend to be larger, single sex and long established schools in higher socioeconomic areas, generally in large cities and in specific locations such as Queenstown (reflecting the concentration of affluence). They have enrolment schemes with out-of-zone enrolments determined by ballots or family connections.
- 4.1.2 Lower decile schools predominate in the North, particularly Northland, South Auckland/Manukau and Bay of Plenty. Few of them are single sex schools.
- 4.1.3 Government funding does not meet school needs; operating deficits are the norm; but higher decile schools are able to run

Māori students on the roll) was a factor, but this was dropped when a previous Labour Government came under pressure for its 'Closing the Gaps' policy.

⁵ Over the last 2 years 28 schools applied successfully, 23 unsuccessfully.

⁶ NZPPTA. (2013). *New Zealand schools: The decile system*. Wellington: NZPPTA. Retrieved from: <http://ppta.org.nz/index.php/resources/publication-list/2621-nz-schools-decile-system>



relatively lower deficits using locally raised funds. The clear advantage for high decile schools in raising money from the community is illustrated in the table below⁷.

Donations reported by Boards of Trustees for year ending 31 December 2011 (by decile)

Decile	State			Integrated			Combined		
	No. of schools reporting donations	Total donations \$	Average donation/school \$	No. of schools reporting donations	Total donations \$	Average Donation/school \$	No. of schools reporting donations	Total donations \$	Average Donation/school \$
1	172	3,024,110	17,582	10	251,019	25,102	182	3,275,129	17,995
2	159	4,132,125	25,988	18	351,226	19,513	177	4,483,351	25,330
3	155	3,755,669	24,230	25	608,867	24,355	180	4,364,536	24,247
4	169	5,743,039	33,982	21	472,959	22,522	190	6,215,998	32,716
5	163	5,833,388	35,788	30	854,404	28,480	193	6,687,792	34,652
6	164	6,750,457	41,161	32	1,606,745	50,211	196	8,357,202	42,639
7	136	5,629,728	41,395	37	1,808,469	48,878	173	7,438,197	42,995
8	156	9,109,814	58,396	32	3,632,283	113,509	188	12,742,097	67,777
9	162	11,607,897	71,654	31	8,320,191	268,393	193	19,928,088	103,254
10	180	20,771,627	115,398	27	9,678,042	358,446	207	30,449,669	147,100
		76,357,854			27,584,205			103,942,059	

4.1.4 The fees charged are higher for high decile schools and the collection rate is better than low decile schools. A PPTA survey at the end of 2012 found that it was harder for low decile schools to ask for donations and to pursue them because of the economic pressures in those communities, where set “fees and donations” are lower than those sought by high decile schools.

5 Criticisms of the decile system

5.1 There are three areas for criticism of the current decile system:

- Adequacy for meeting its original purpose;
- The adoption of decile as a proxy for education quality; and
- Decile as a basis for comparison of academic performance.

5.2 Adequacy in meeting its original intention

5.2.1 The measure is meant to target additional support to schools with high proportions of students from poorer family backgrounds to reflect the higher per student costs of addressing the lower levels

⁷ NZCER also found that decile 10 schools still get about \$1100 more per student to spend each year than decile 1 schools (\$8600 v \$7700).



of social capital and higher levels of social, economic and educational disadvantage. But:

- i. It does not equalise income as the funding-raising potential can be quite different between schools. Low decile schools have limited capacity to raise funds locally; higher decile ones will have more success, though even then there may be significant differences, depending on the size of the school and the proportion of families who can contribute significant amounts.⁸

Some low income communities have organised to try to overcome the resourcing gap – e.g. parents and organisations in Tamaki in Auckland worked together to ensure their children have access to as up-to-date technology as local high decile schools. They should have been assured that their children would have been guaranteed access to an equal education experience by the state, and not left to close the resourcing gap themselves.

- ii. There is an increasing trend for high decile schools to grow their roll and get funding for more students, while lower decile schools are under capacity and struggling to maintain rolls.
- iii. Decile does not measure the relative or average community wealth. Two schools in the same decile may have significant differences in the socioeconomic mix of their students.
- iv. A large school in the middle decile may have just as many students requiring special assistance as a small lower decile school.
- v. Recent work by Brian Easton⁹ suggests that the educational disparity between Māori boys and more so for Pasifika students cannot be fully accounted for by socio-economic status. The absence of an ethnicity measure may work against targeting resources to the most at risk students, particularly Pasifika students.
- vi. Concerns about the accuracy of the decile measure for rural schools (discussed later) have not been addressed.

⁸According to Ministry figures, the differences in funding between a typical 1000 pupil decile 1 school and decile 10 school can be as much as \$900,000 per year in favour of the latter.

⁹ Easton, B. (2013) *Ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status and educational achievement: An exploration*. Wellington: NZPPTA



5.2.2 The purpose behind the decile system is worthy and needs to be pursued, but the single figure rating system now is a blunt instrument and does not ensure that every student has equal opportunity to achieve at the highest level in every school.

5.3 The adoption of decile as a proxy for quality of education

5.3.1 The school decile is often misinterpreted as a reflection of the quality or status of a school. Misuse of school decile has created both racial and class stigma for low decile schools.

5.3.2 In fact there are many examples of success in low decile schools which work hard to “add extra value” to raise their students’ educational achievements from a far lower baseline than their higher decile colleagues generally have to deal with.

5.3.3 Our competitive Tomorrow’s schools system puts principals in a dilemma. They are pressured to seek competitive advantage over other schools to improve their own school standings through practices such as cherry picking students with academic, sporting or cultural strengths. At the same time most wish to act ethically and support a system that allows less advantaged schools to continue to operate effectively for the students who attend them.

5.3.4 Some schools deliberately seek to influence their intake so that their decile is raised and the school is seen as more successful.

5.3.5 The decile rating appears on some school websites (mainly the higher decile ones) and is used as an implied measure of the quality of the school. Reflecting the power of the decile as a marketing tool the percentages of Auckland secondary schools reporting their decile on their home page in 2011 was:

Decile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
% reporting decile	7	17	16	19	26	33	43	47	39	44

5.3.6 A Ministry of Education analysis of global education rankings¹⁰ found our schools have less of a mix of students from rich and poor homes than in the past. While based on primary schools, it indicates our schools are becoming more divided, increasing inequalities between them.¹¹

5.3.7 This feeds into destructive competition between schools and the exacerbation of “white flight “. In 2000 around 60,000

¹⁰ Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)

¹¹ New Zealand Herald, ‘Schools divided along wealth line’



Pakeha/European students attended decile 1-3 schools nationally; by 2010 it was only around 30,000^v. The proportion of students in decile 1 schools who were Pakeha/European fell from 11.0% to 5.4%; over the same period total school rolls increased by over 30,300 students.¹²

- 5.3.8 A recent NZCER study¹³ found that 40% of parents sent their children to a secondary school that was not their closest one – usually to a higher decile one. Between 2001 to 2011 deciles 1 to 3 rolls declined by 12%, while deciles 8 to 10 rolls grew by 23%.
- 5.3.9 2011 research on Auckland secondary school zones by Chris Lubienski¹⁴ found boundaries were skewed to allow enrolment of students from wealthier areas, while preventing the enrolment of poorer students. He was suspicious about how the zones are drawn up and the ballot process for out-of-zone enrolments.
- 5.3.10 Lubienski stated that low decile schools are at a real disadvantage when seeking students, even within their home zone. His findings produced a reaction from principals, as the process of zone boundaries is monitored closely, and prompted the Ministry to issue a statement pointing out the transparency of the process.
- 5.3.11 Overseas paying students are a factor in school funding and overseas parents tend to focus on the decile as a measure of quality. As a result, higher decile schools can secure significantly more money from this source.
- 5.3.12 In response to concerns about their use of decile ratings in their reports the Education Review Office has dropped this information. It can still be accessed however. The media publishes achievement results for schools alongside the decile rating. It is the misuse of the rating that is causing concern at present, where the perceptions of parents, based on a school's rating, is influencing decisions about where to enrol their children.
- 5.3.13 Secondary Principals' Association of New Zealand's, Patrick Walsh, supported calls to hide decile ratings:

...parents were using the decile rating as a "blunt instrument" to judge the quality of a school instead of objective information It is not necessary for the Ministry to continue

¹² Ministry of Education

¹³ NZCER 'Vital Connections' Cathy Wylie 2012

¹⁴ Chris Lubienski 'The Decile Delusion', 2011



to publish the decile ranking of schools ... that is an inappropriate way to measure a school's success¹⁵

5.4 Decile as a basis of comparability for school performance

- 5.4.1 The media publishes league tables of pass rates for NCEA Levels 1, 2 and 3, along with schools' decile ratings. Generally high decile schools figure prominently at the top of these tables, suggesting to the public that lower decile schools are providing an inferior education.
- 5.4.2 NCEA results show that all schools, no matter what their decile rating, are improving each year and at each level. But in 2011 the differences between achievement rates in decile 9 and 10 schools and decile 1 and 2 schools were:
- achieved a full Level 1 qualification – 95% compared to 74%.
 - left with a Level 2 qualification – 89% compared to 33%.
 - achieved University Entrance – 2.7 times more likely.
- 5.4.3 In recent papers¹⁶ Martin Thrupp, Professor of Education at Waikato University, criticised the link between NCEA data as a measure of school effectiveness and the school decile rating. School deciles, he wrote, only allow crude comparisons at best and their use for comparing the performance of schools should be discouraged. He noted the variations in pass rates amongst schools in decile 9 schools were:
- Level 1 – 67 to 100 %
Level 2 – 73 to 100 %
Level 3 – 68 to 98 %
- 5.4.4 Within-decile variation is more likely in mid-decile schools. There is more homogeneity in the student intake at each end of the decile continuum.
- 5.4.5 Many elements of the school context create advantaged or disadvantaged conditions for promoting achievement. Thrupp notes that the decile rating does not give an indication of the true mix of students in the school, particularly if there is a significant component outside the immediate catchment area.

¹⁵ Call to hide decile ratings from parents. (2012, June 18). *Close Up TVNZ*. Retrieved from: <http://tvnz.co.nz/national-news/call-hide-decile-ratings-parents-4935676>

¹⁶ Thrupp M 'Continuing Pressures on Secondary Principals Around School Reputation' Paper to Secondary Principals' Conference 2011.
Thrupp M & Alcorn N 'A Little Knowledge Being a Dangerous Thing? Decile based approaches to developing NCEA League Tables.' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 20 : 2010 pp 52–73



- 5.4.6 Using decile as a proxy for education quality is a complete reversal of the actual relationship between 'inputs' and 'outputs'. High decile schools are not better schools than low decile schools. They have a student intake which has less socioeconomic disadvantage and greater levels of social capital to draw on. Their results are enhanced by their ability to attract the most academically able students from the lower decile schools through good marketing, better resourcing and parental misunderstanding of decile.

A past inquiry

- 6.1 The last review into the decile system was in 2003 by the Education and Science Select Committee.¹⁷
- 6.2 In its submission¹⁸ PPTA raised a number of issues, none have yet been resolved.
- i. The decile rating is used by parents to decide where to send children, allowing higher decile schools an advantage, with a consequent widening of the gap between schools.
 - ii. Extra state funding to low decile schools is to overcome the greater educational disadvantage of the students who attend them, but it does not even balance the fundraising capacity of high decile schools with fewest of these most at risk students.
 - iii. All schools should be resourced by the state so that they had no need to raise funds other than for very limited reasons. Given the lack of political will for this, schools have been driven into increasing levels of fundraising, with low decile schools in a weak position to do so.
 - iv. Relative community wealth is not what the decile measures. A mid-decile school may have as many students requiring special assistance as a lower decile school. Two schools in the same decile may have significant differences in the overall socioeconomic mix of their students.
 - v. Low decile schools are stigmatised – low decile implies poor educational standards, difficult students, poorer facilities, fewer opportunities in sporting and cultural activities, etc., while high decile implies the opposite.

¹⁷ New Zealand House of Representatives – Report of the Education and Science Committee '*Inquiry into Decile Funding of State and Integrated Schools*' 2003

¹⁸ NZPPTA '*Decile Based Funding of New Zealand Secondary Schools*'. Submission to Education and Science Parliamentary Committee Inquiry into Targeted Funding for Schools December 2002



- vi. The Ministry could do more to explain the limitations as a source of information to overcome negative impressions of low decile schools.
 - vii. Rural schools argue their deciles are inflated because in their area there will be many farm workers employed on low incomes and some wealthy families, but wealthy rural families are more likely to send their children outside the area for education, not to the local school.
 - viii. The absence of zoning allows more popular schools (higher decile) to select students from outside their geographic area, including promising students from poorer areas.
 - ix. When a school moves up and down the decile scale its funding also changes and sometimes quite significantly, even though the mix of students within the particular school may change very little.
 - x. The submission concluded that the decile rating system targets funding to students from the poorest households, but is misused as a proxy for assessing overall school and community wealth.
- 6.3 The inquiry report focused on the issue of targeted funding and whether the decile system was able to provide a mechanism to do this effectively.
- 6.4 The Inquiry did not accept including ethnicity in the decile measurement, arguing that it was too closely connected to factors such as income. However, Brian Easton's recent work raises doubts about this earlier conclusion.
- 6.5 Nor did the Committee believe that transience of students and their families was a significant factor, but it "acknowledged some schools faced significant change and costs due to transience". It did recommend that a separate funding mechanism be developed to assist schools with high levels of transience.¹⁹
- 6.6 The Report said the Targeted Funding for Education did not operate equitably and "funding should be allocated to the most disadvantaged two or three deciles. Spreading the funding dilutes its effectiveness". This does not address the fact that middle and higher decile schools also have some students from backgrounds that put them at risk of not achieving.²⁰

¹⁹ In 2012 Ministry figures showed that 426 students throughout the country went to more than four schools, 59 to five and 14 to six different schools in that year.

²⁰ Recent furore over funding for private schools to assist students with learning difficulties studying NCEA is part of this. One high decile private school used its resourcing and social capital to secure assistance for a number of students. A neighbouring low decile school received nothing. Stuff '*Private Schools Snare Special Needs Cash*' 23/6/2013



- 6.7 The Committee recognised the misperception of schools based on the decile ranking:

high decile schools are regarded as preferable and low decile schools are to be avoided. It is not a measure of whether the school is providing a high standard of education.

- 6.8 The Committee endorsed the 'significant and specific change' factor in the review process. Rurality and movement of farm labour between the seasons, fluid rolls, incidence of single income families, movement of students (transience), movement to other schools beyond the catchment for an increasing proportion of students with special educational needs (voluntary or as a result of exclusion from another school), did not constitute enough for a review in its opinion.

- 6.9 The debate about what are significant factors affecting learning still continues.

6 A new review

- 7.1 The 2012 Conference determined that "PPTA work with the Ministry of Education and other stakeholders to review the present decile rating classification system so it more accurately reflects the communities schools serve and student intakes".

- 7.2 The Prime Minister in 2012 said a call by school principals to review the decile rating system is fair, but he did not see an easy way around the current mechanism.²¹

- 7.3 A PPTA survey of principals at the end of 2012 indicated overwhelming support for a review of the decile system. The Waikato Principals' Association (primary schools) President reflected the view of principals generally²²

It is due for a shakeup – it would be great if there was a review to see how effective it is because more and more schools are having to dip into their own pockets to provide a quality education

- 7.4 The Minister for Education has stated that decile was "a clumsy method of allocating funds"²³ and has asked the Ministry to report on how schools should be funded across the sector. However, the Minister also says (against a mass of international and New Zealand research) that the

²¹ New Zealand Herald – "PM backs the school decile system" 13/6 2012

²² Waikato Times – "Waikato Principals Welcome Review". 2/7/13

²³ Fea, S (2013, July 1). Minister: I don't like deciles. *Southland Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/southland-times/news/8860387/Minister-I-don-t-like-deciles>



socioeconomic background of students is not significant²⁴. She prefers the (cheaper) ideology that the quality of teaching can overcome all disadvantage that students bring with them to school.

- 7.5 The Ministry says no changes are planned. It argues that at 13% of all operational funding decile funding does not play a big role in determining the overall resources schools receive. However, it makes a big difference in the lower decile schools, while high decile schools raise extra money from other sources.

7 An alternative model

- 8.1 PPTA supports replacing the single decile figure with a socioeconomic profile. Each school would be resourced on the basis of its particular socioeconomic profile. This would lead to a more rational basis for comparisons of schools, more accurately reflect the communities from which the school draws its students and move from a single number which misses the complexities of schools.
- 8.2 Such a profile would identify the proportion of each school's roll drawn from each of the socioeconomic deciles (or from quintile groups). There would not need to be a 'ranking' of schools as the profile would carry all the information necessary for the targeting of resources for need. The socioeconomic makeup of the rolls of schools which are currently undifferentiated within the same decile would be more accurately represented.
- 8.3 The example below shows the profile of two notional decile 5 schools. (All figures are percentage of the total school roll in each socioeconomic band; socio-economic deciles (SED) 1 to 10.)

SED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
School A	16	14	10	18	15	17	6	2	1	1
School B	16	14	10	7	7	8	9	8	12	9

- 8.4 Grouping deciles shows how different schools with a common single decile ranking can be in their student profiles, and by inference in their local fundraising capacity.

SED	1-3	4-7	8-10
School A	40	56	4
School B	40	31	29

- 8.5 Currently equivalency in the proportion of the lowest income families gives the schools the same ranking. Their quite different profiles across all of their intakes would be revealed in a profile measure and resources could be more effectively targeted to meet student needs in each of these schools.

²⁴ Jones, N. (2013, July 9). Schools divided along wealth lines. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from: http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10895565



- 8.6 A socioeconomic profile would reduce the opportunity to judge school quality on the basis of a number intended only for funding purposes. Inter-school comparisons could be addressed with more sophistication.
- 8.7 In the decile profiles above, school B would be expected to produce better student results as measured by gaining qualifications, not because it is a 'better' school but because it has a higher proportion of students from socio-economically advantaged homes, who are most likely to be successful (in whatever school they attend).

8 Conclusion

- 9.1 Decile rating attempts to address the greater cost of overcoming the disadvantage of the students from the poorest homes who are most at risk of failing academically.
- 9.2 The system is under strain because of inadequate overall school funding and the capacity of high decile schools to obtain significantly larger amounts of local funding than low decile schools.
- 9.3 There is a stigma associated with low decile rating because it is used as a proxy for quality to differentiate between schools. There is an urgent need to challenge the negative perceptions of lower decile schools, as well as ensure that the "popular" schools with growing rolls do not cause pressures on staffing and class size.
- 9.4 The belief of parents that high decile means better education exacerbate the divide between the 'haves' and the 'have nots' in our education system. New Zealand's previously largely egalitarian education system is becoming increasingly unequal. In the absence of changes the educational gaps will be extremely difficult to close.
- 9.5 It is time to review the system in the light of considerable social and economic change in the 21st Century and the need to better focus our resources.
- 9.6 A wider application of the socioeconomic data for each student in the school to provide a socioeconomic profile would give a truer picture of the real needs.
- 9.7 The release of new information from the census this year, after a considerable lapse of time since the last one, would be a timely catalyst to act.

9 Recommendations

1. That the report be received.



- ~~2. That the PPTA engage with the Ministry of Education to review the decile rating system to more accurately reflect the student mix in each school.~~
- ~~3. That the PPTA work with the Ministry, Education Review Office and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, to provide more information about the purposes of the decile rating system as a mechanism for the targeted funding of schools, and its inadequacy for other purposes.~~
- ~~4. That this Conference note with concern the increasing inequalities between secondary schools in the public sector and asks Executive to work with appropriate organisations to highlight this as an issue affecting quality public education.~~

Carried Recommendations - Annual Conference Minutes 2013

1. THAT the report be received; and
2. THAT each school be adequately funded by government to reflect the needs of its students so that the provision of education is equitable for all; and
3. THAT the PPTA engage with the Ministry of Education in review the decile rating system to more accurately reflect the student mix in each school; and
4. THAT the PPTA work with the Ministry, Education Review Office and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, to provide more information about the purposes of the decile rating system as a mechanism for the targeted funding of schools, and its inadequacy for other purposes; and
5. THAT this Conference note with concern the increasing inequalities between secondary schools in the public sector and asks Executive to work with appropriate organisations to highlight this as an issue affecting quality public education; and
6. THAT this Conference recommends that Executive initiate a nationwide campaign and work with appropriate organisations to highlight inequity and underfunding as issues affecting quality public education; and
7. THAT there be a report to delegates at the 2014 Annual conference on progress in this work.

Carried



Appendix 1

General decile-related data from 2011

Table 1

Secondary Schools By Decile All Types State And Integrated

Decile	Number	Roll Range	Average Roll	Integrated
1	16	98-1508	666	3
2	28	105-1866	604	6
3	32	88-1221	490	2
4	31	205-2418	676	3
5	36	27-2246	823	5
6	40	135-1810	825	8
7	31	216-2697	838	7
8	34	216-2166	1141	13
9	32	264-2297	1115	6
10	22	463-3026	1248	12

(Does not include Teen Parenting Units)

Table 2

Location of Secondary Schools By Decile And Area

Decile	NO	NS	AK	SA	WA	BP	TWM	ECHBW	WH	MN	WC	CH	CA	DU	OT	ST
1	3	0	0	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	4	0	0	5	2	0	5	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	3	0	6	3	10	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
4	2	0	7	0	6	1	3	5	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
5	4	0	5	0	1	7	6	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	1
6	1	2	6	0	5	4	3	4	3	3	0	1	6	2	2	1
7	2	0	6	0	3	0	3	0	2	5	0	1	6	1	1	2
8	0	0	12	0	2	1	5	2	2	2	0	1	5	1	1	4
9	0	5	3	0	1	1	3	5	5	0	0	4	5	1	4	0
10	0	6	4	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	1	3	0

KEY TO AREAS

NO = Northland, NS = North Shore, AK = Auckland City, SA = South Auckland/Manukau City, WA = Waikato, BP = Bay of Plenty, TWM = Taranaki/Whanganui/Manawatu, ECHBW = East Coast/Hawkes Bay/ Wairarapa, WH = Wellington/Hutt, MN = Marlborough/Nelson, WC = West Coast, CH = Christchurch, CA = Canterbury, DU = Dunedin, OT = Otago, ST = Southland



Table 3
Secondary School Type By Decile

Decile	Co-Ed	Boys	Girls
1	19	1	0
2	25	4	3
3	21	4	3
4	31	4	3
5	25	7	4
6	29	6	7
7	20	6	6
8	20	9	7
9	18	4	6
10	10	10	11

Table 4
Secondary Schools Location By Settlement Type
And Decile

Decile	Urban Metropolitan	City	Town/Rural
1	10	3	8
2	10	6	16
3	13	5	11
4	9	10	15
5	14	10	13
6	13	13	20
7	12	8	10
8	12	12	12
9	9	4	5
10	23	4	4

Table 5
Secondary Schools Operating Deficits By Decile

Decile	Total	Number in deficit	% in deficit	Range of Deficit (\$000)	Average Deficit (\$000)
1	17	11	64.7	21-143	46.5
2	30	15	50	14-161	94
3	29	19	65.5	9-294	109
4	31	19	61.2	6-466	141
5	36	19	52.7	4-370	98.5
6	40	20	50	12-458	90
7	32	13	40.6	15-459	110.5
8	32	8	25.0	4-468	129
9	29	15	51.9	1-548	162
10	21	7	33.3	12-611	178



Table 6

Secondary School Revenue By Decile, Roll Size & Sources

Decile	Number of Schools	Roll Range	Average Roll	Range of Total Revenue (\$000)	Range of Local Revenue (\$000)	Income represented by average local funds raised (%)	Locally raised funds per student (\$)
1	16	98-1508	666	2111-13156	170-2051	6.63	736
2	28	105-1866	604	2079-15766	105-1836	6.39	651
3	32	88-1221	490	1675-14852	5-1275	7.04	786
4	31	205-2418	676	2139-23226	103-2009	9.90	1103
5	36	27-2246	823	2713-18795	165-2573	12.06	1049
6	40	135-1810	825	2588-13568	307-2144	11.82	1142
7	31	216-2697	838	2911-2907	244-3287	13.10	1319
8	34	216-2166	1141	2997-17179	82-2997	11.80	949
9	32	264-2297	1115	3964-20781	364-3871	14.20	1231
10	22	463-3026	1248	812-26666	297-5364	12.16	1589

Table 7

Secondary School Local Revenue Raised By School Decile (\$000)

Decile	Total Raised (\$000)	Average Per School (\$000)
1	7853	490
2	11006	393
3	12311	385
4	23151	746
5	31075	863
6	37712	942
7	34341	1107
8	37466	1102
9	43907	1372
10	43678	1985

Table 8

Donations/Activity Fees Set By Sample Secondary Schools (2012)

Decile	Number of Schools	Roll Size	Range (\$)	Average (\$)
1	5	715	30-100	53
2	9	711	50-120	92
3	12	749	45-220	101
4	15	1111	50-180	104
5	13	1092	90-220	112
6	14	1034	90-240	121
7	10	969	110-400	197
8	10	1289	120-600	233
9	8	1273	125-740	379
10	9	1838	250-900	423