Needs-based staffing for secondary schools

A paper to the PPTA Annual Conference from the Executive

Recommendations

1. That the report be received.

2. That PPTA insists that new needs-based staffing models are developed and resourced as a prerequisite to the implementation of Schools Plus.

Background

After considering the structural problems with the existing staffing formula, as part of the report on class size, the 2007 Annual Conference recommended:

> *2. THAT Executive presents a paper to the 2008 PPTA Conference identifying and describing models for a needs-based staffing formula in secondary schools.*

The existing staffing formula in New Zealand is fundamentally a rationing mechanism rather than a needs-based mechanism[1]. It is highly formulaic and largely based on four components:

The two main staffing components:

- student numbers at each year level
- base components which all schools receive regardless of size

and two very small staffing components:

- special needs staffing based on the number and severity of special needs students (2.5 teacher hours per week for high needs students, and 5 hours per week for very high needs students, plus a small amount of management staffing)
- to-individual staffing, where a collective agreement entitlement exists, such as beginning teacher time, HoD beginning teacher time, SCT time, etc.

Very little flexibility exists to recognise differences in need between schools of similar size. Before the review of the old staffing formula in 1994, schools could receive discretionary staffing when a local need was identified. While this mechanism was open to some resource capture by principals who could mount 'best case' arguments, it did allow schools with genuine differential needs to receive additional staffing which was not simply a reflection of their roll size.

[1] See appendix 1

The current formula allows the government to make accurate budget projections on teacher costs, but it is not designed to meet students' needs and carries with it several problems:

- Large schools (more than 1500) are significantly disadvantaged in terms of curriculum staffing relative to small schools by the declining impact of the base-staffing components as schools get larger. A high proportion of over-large classes occur in these schools – this systemic problem increases with school size.
- Small schools struggle to offer a broad curriculum. While one solution (pursued in several areas) is a network of schools offering combined curriculum delivery by video-conference, such solutions have problems. For example:

  They are expensive in terms of staffing usage.

  They are costly in terms of operations funds.

  They are more vulnerable to loss of continuity of delivery to students.
- Middle sized schools (around 1000) in urban areas struggle to compete with nearby large schools, by offering a curriculum width that their curriculum staffing allocation does not really support – usually at the cost of large junior core classes.
- The formula was designed to redistribute staffing between and within the whole primary–secondary school sector on a more linear model. It left the secondary sector some 1000 teachers worse off than if the change had not occurred, partly through a direct transfer of staffing from secondary to primary to keep the resourcing change cost neutral.
- The system it was replacing was designed for whole-class teaching pedagogies. The current system does not reflect the staffing needs of an individualised learning paradigm.
- There is no recognition of the differential pastoral and guidance needs of schools with lots of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.
- The existing model under-resources the management and guidance pressures on schools of all sizes and demographics. This often results in local decisions to increase staffing in these areas by transferring hours from the curriculum staffing – which drives up class sizes for curriculum teachers.
- Some resources, such as ITM music time, are so small that they are hard to utilise effectively unless they can be concentrated into clusters. But such clusters are not well supported by the government and are inequitably distributed, as not all regions that need such clusters can have them.
- It was designed in a time of stable secondary rolls and in anticipation of rising rolls.

The problems posed for the secondary education system by falling pupil numbers are considerable. A major concern is whether the curriculum can be maintained as teacher numbers fall and schools decline in size.
Until recently almost all LEAs (Local Education Authorities) determined the number of teachers to be allocated on the basis of a pupil-teacher ratio, which was divided into the

> pupil roll to give the appropriate allocation. . . . this method of allocating staff had advantages for the school at a time of growth. A school might gain 20 pupils and therefore be allocated an extra teacher, but those 20 pupils might be accommodated in existing teacher groups, leaving the extra teacher free for additions to the school's activities.
> In decline virtuous circles become vicious circles. If 20 students are lost a teacher may be taken away, but the same number of teaching groups may be necessary . . . smaller year groups require more teachers to deliver the same curriculum than do larger year groups.[2]

So, we have a staffing model that creates large classes as a by-product and does not recognise different needs in schools, and that is structured to create increasing difficulties for the majority of secondary schools as their rolls fall steadily over the next two decades.

If we had a staffing model that resourced secondary schools according to their need, what might it look like?

Overseas examples

UK

Walsh, Dunne, Stewart and Stotten describe mechanisms applied by some LEAs in the mid-1980s, which include:

- enhanced pupil numbers (EPN), where schools which begin with four or five entry classes are deemed for staffing purposes to have 120 or 150 students per age group, even when numbers fall far below this, to protect the curriculum delivery
- determining how many staff a school needs on the basis of a notional or model curriculum. The school may be free to use the allocated staffing as it wishes, but all are able to cover the notional curriculum if they choose to do so. Notional curriculum is either determined by consensus from a working group of practitioners and sector representatives, or from an average of what is done in schools.

These 'curriculum-based' models include three essential component assumptions:

- the teacher-student contact ratio (the number of periods per week each teacher teaches)
- appropriate group sizes
- appropriate remedial support.

By comparison, the current New Zealand formula assumes that all curriculum teachers teach for 25 hours per week. In fact they teach for 20, and this means official statistics are wildly at variance from the classroom truth. (A pupil:teacher ratio in curriculum staffing of 25:1 means actual class ratios of 31:1.)

[2] K Walsh, R D Dunne, J D Stewart, B Stotten, 'Staffing the Secondary School', *Oxford Review Of Education*, vol 11, no 1, 1985

The Ministry refuses to identify appropriate group sizes, though the property division bases its estimates of room area on a notional class of 25.

There is no measure of the proportion of students who might need additional educational support or of the appropriate pastoral and guidance needs of schools of different types (or of any type). This is a significant flaw in relation to the Labour Party's proposal for Schools Plus.

If appropriate group sizes are agreed, then this generates a figure for the minimum number of option 'strands' at each year level. Conversely, a notional curriculum may pre-include the range of options that should be available at each year level. This itself would identify the number of options lines that should be resourced at each year level.

Germany

The German teachers' union advises us that in Germany the parameters which set the number of teachers each year include class size, curriculum staffing ratios and special education staffing, as well as local (subjective) variations in each state.[3]

Ireland

In Ireland, the Department of Education and Science manages teacher allocations centrally. Allocations are made based on general parameters and are guided in broad terms by student numbers. Within this, special provisions are made for very small schools and very large schools.

The situation is not absolutely clear-cut, because there are a number of different management arrangements in place. For example, some secondary schools are stand-alone. Some are managed by a management board, and report directly to the Department of Education and Science. Other schools (33 in total) are managed by vocational educational committees on a county or city basis. In this instance, although the overall allocation from the department will be based on the common framework, each committee may make local decisions on how to manage and allocate teaching hours and other supports.

Additional teaching posts or teaching hours and additional support and development posts are also made available on an exquota basis, depending on range of factors that must be demonstrated by the school, for example special educational needs, students for whom English is not their first language, socioeconomic disadvantage, etc.

Since 2002, this has been supplemented by a system called 'concessionary posts' whereby a school makes a submission to the department for additional staff to ensure the delivery of a core curricular area for which the school does not have a qualified teacher. This is most common in areas such as the sciences, higher-level mathematics, technology subjects or Irish language. The

[3] From correspondence with German Teachers Union

Irish Teachers Union notes that this supplementary system does deliver in the short term to schools, but causes some problems at system level.

The Irish model reminds us that simple linear formulae will not adequately address the needs of the range of schools and that, in particular, small and large schools are vulnerable to inadequate resourcing under such models.

In 2001, a ministerial 'expert group' reported to the Irish Minister of Education on the allocation of secondary school teachers.[4] The report noted 10 environmental drivers for change to the way staffing is delivered to schools, most of which will have echoes for New Zealand teachers:

- school and societal change
- changed pupil clientele
- inclusion policy
- curriculum reform
- relationships with students
- school leadership and planning
- staff development
- staffing and school amalgamations
- relationships with parents and non-school agencies
- schools and lifelong learning.

There has been no progress on the report.

The report illustrates, that there is some recognition overseas that the needs schools have to meet have changed, and that modern schools are not well served by old staffing systems, based fundamentally on roll size, that would deliver the same staffing to a school in the 1950s as it did in 2008.[5]

USA

At the national level, there is yet to be any solidly agreed-upon American model for allocating teaching staff. National or state-level generate averages using student enrolment to FTE teacher ratios, with the understanding that the staffing still largely depends on school district level hiring.

Ed Hurley, from the NEA Research Division, identified some adequacy study consensus ratios he has been working with, which seem to suggest that education adequacy advocates in America are

[4] *Report on the Allocation of Teachers to Second Level Schools* (the McGuiness report), November 2001
[5] From correspondence with Irish Teachers Unions

working toward such a model. Here are his staffing ratio recommendations, based on eight adequacy studies:

- High school student–Classroom teacher ratio: 20.25 students per core curriculum teacher
- Principal ratio: 1 principal per school
- Assistant principal ratio: 420 students per assistant principal
- Other instructional staff ratio (art, music, phys. ed. teachers, librarians; teacher mentors/ instructional facilitators): 114 students per 'other instructional' staff representative
- Pupil support staff (counsellors, nurses, technology coordinators, psychologists, social workers, speech pathologists, parent outreach coordinators): 200 students per pupil support staff representative
- Teacher aides: 180 students per teacher aide.

The Hurley model, where some small number senior subjects are treated separately from the general student: teacher ratio, ensures that schools can deliver senior subjects in these areas without compromising class sizes in the junior core areas.[6]

CANADA

Canadian provinces establish maximum or average class size targets and resource schools to these levels (see appendix 1 for district breakdowns). In British Columbia, significant movement in resourcing was made when governments began to take notice of parent concerns about the composition effect of classes on their children's learning..

The Canadian model reminds us how important it is to systematically ensure that class sizes are kept down.[7]

NORWAY

Official guidelines specify that an extra teacher is assigned to the grade level within a school when the size of a cohort enrolling in that school exceeds 30 (in lower secondary school), or multiples thereof.

FINLAND

The world leader in education, Finland has better teacher: student ratios than almost every other OECD country, and significantly better ratios than New Zealand.

[6] Correspondence with NEA
[7] Comment from Canadian Teachers Union

Comparisons of staffing resourcing and class size at lower secondary level

OECD countries	2004 average class size, lower secondary[8]	Student: teacher ratio, lower secondary
Korea	35.7	20.4
Japan	33.7	15.3
Mexico	30.1	33.7
New Zealand	**25.2[9]**	**17.3**
Greece	25.2	8.2
United States	24.9	15.2
Germany	24.7	15.6
Poland	24.6	
Australia	24.4	
Austria	24.3	10.4
France	24.0	14.1
Spain	24.0	12.9
OECD average	**23.8**	**13.7**
Portugal	23.3	10.0
Czech Republic	23.2	13.5
Slovak Republic	22.8	13.9
United Kingdom	22.5	17.1
EU19 average	**22.5**	**12.0**
Hungary	21.5	10.2
Italy	20.9	10.3
Belgium (Fr.)	20.8	
Ireland	19.8	
Denmark	19.6	11.3
Luxembourg	19.4	
Switzerland	18.9	11.2
Iceland	18.5	11.4
Belgium		10.6
Finland		**10.0**
Norway		10.5
Sweden		11.9
Partner countries		
Brazil	33.4	18.8
Chile	31.5	44.3
Israel	31.5	14.1
Russia	19.6	

At junior secondary level, New Zealand rates among the highest average class sizes and the poorest student: teacher ratios in the OECD.

[8] *Education At A Glance 2006*, OECD

[9] PPTA, *Class Sizes In New Zealand Secondary Schools In 2004,* (for Year 9 and 10 classes)

Back to New Zealand – moving away from the past

So, what might a needs-based model for New Zealand look like?

It would recognise the demands on modern secondary schools in the 21st century and provide resourcing that:

- is adequate for the provision of a broad curriculum with classes of no more than 20-25 at each year level
- provides for the protection and maintenance of small option subjects
- provides for an extensive network of pastoral and guidance support
- provides for interaction with external agencies (such as CYFS, social workers, police, WINZ, ITOs)
- provides for an extensive network of careers and education pathway guidance
- provides for second-chance literacy and numeracy interventions
- provides for the complexity of managing a personalised learning environment with varied assessment and interaction with a range of external organisations
- provides for interaction with the parent and wider community
- recognises the different demands on large schools
- recognises the special demands on small schools
- protects schools in falling roll situations from the crippling effects of curriculum contraction
- allows much greater flexibility in the structure of timetables
- allows special needs of students and schools with very localised issues to be met
- recognises differences in the student intakes
- recognises the increasing diversity in the composition of secondary school classes
- recognises the health and safety requirements on secondary school laboratories and workshops
- recognises the demands for professional development of teachers.

The most difficult part will be identifying what we really want to achieve and then determining the resourcing required to do it.

The additional staffing to deliver curriculum and support management functions, which is currently paid for by those secondary schools that can afford it, might also offer some guidance in how under-resourced schools are in entitlement staffing.

It is also possible to imagine a scenario where a taskforce is charged with designing new timetable models which achieve agreed option ranges and class size limits, which provide flexibility for courses within and without the traditional format, and which support flexible learning pathways and integrated careers work in schools of different sizes. From this, you could determine the staffing requirements for curriculum and careers delivery. How then to determine the actual pastoral, guidance and administration/management needs of schools (other than applying an overseas model which may not reflect the uniqueness of New Zealand's system)?

Best Practice models in New Zealand

Individual schools make local decisions about how they allocate the lump of staffing they are allocated by the Ministry of Education based upon their roll numbers. Some schools choose to direct some of the staffing into specific types of support (for example, extra guidance counsellors, more administration/management staff, an extensive student support network, a comprehensive careers support network, video-learning networks etc). Each of these innovations comes at a cost elsewhere in the school – either by using staffing that would otherwise have resourced smaller classes or more options, or from guidance or management areas, or the school has to find additional funding to hire extra staffing to make it happen (either directly or indirectly), or it redirects operations funding from curriculum or other areas to resource the initiative.

Few of these 'best practice' initiatives are transferable to other schools, because they require sacrifice of resources from other areas that other schools have not chosen, or cannot choose to make. Unfortunately, the Ministry of Education has few people who seem able to recognise that innovations in schools occur with this internal cost. Rather the assumptions seems to be that if some schools can establish them with no additional external resourcing, then all schools can simply adopt them within existing budgets.

What the best practice models might usefully illustrate is how much additional resourcing might be applied to every school if a modern and effective management, guidance, student support, careers and video-learning network were implemented in each school without having to cannibalise other fundamental components of the school's core operation to do so.

Thus, the piecemeal meeting of needs that is occurring now could be used with a coordinated approach to identify the needs that all schools should be able to meet beyond the curriculum delivery needs – and identify the resourcing required to do this.

Evidence-based practice in teaching and learning

Evidence-based learning points to one-to-one guidance from the teacher to help improve basic literacy and numeracy results. Associated with this is the 'new wave' focus on relationship-based initiatives, such as Te Kotahitanga, which all imply the need for a much lower student: teacher ratio than currently exists in most classrooms and that teachers need more time outside of classrooms to manage evidence-based teaching approaches.

At the same time that education researchers have been catching up with practitioners in their understanding of the importance of forming good working relationships with individual students in achieving the potential for each student, we have seen two phenomena which, in combination, have undermined these personal relationships: growing class sizes and an increased complexity of class composition in most of our schools.

The average classroom is now more likely to contain more special needs students (mainstreaming became the prime ministry dogma to be implemented with Special Education 2000, but without the resourcing to implement it appropriately), more students with English as their second language, and a higher proportion of Maori and Pasifika students. Also, over the last 20 years the leaving age has been increased and a wider range of students are staying on to senior secondary school.

In 1998:

- There were 10,254 suspensions from secondary schools.
- There were 6546 ORRS students, mostly in special units within secondary schools.
- 4800 secondary age students were ESOL students.
- 16.6 per cent of secondary students were Maori, 6.9 per cent were PI, and 7.5 per cent were Asian.[10]

By 2006:

- There were 20,676 suspensions/stand-downs from secondary schools.
- ORRS students had been capped at 1 per cent of the school population, nearly 7000, but many of the special education units in schools had been closed and consequently mainstreaming had become far more widespread.
- 18.1 per cent of students were Maori, 8.5 per cent were Pasifika, and 9.1 per cent were Asian.[11]

There is also an ongoing trend towards mixed-ability grouping, which increases the variation in modern classes compared to those of the last century.

In terms of caseloads, teachers face an increase in the number of individuals with whom they have to establish functional and effective teaching–learning relationships, and an increased complexity in the average case they have to deal with in each class. At the same time, they have less opportunity to work effectively with this more complex caseload, as their class sizes have increased.

[10] From *New Zealand Schools 98*, Ministry of Education
[11] From *Education Statistics of New Zealand for 2006*, Ministry of Education

Back to basics to move ahead

The political reality is that governments like to have certainty about future costs in staffing schools, and formula-based models allow them to predict these costs when they have adequate demographic data.

A new staffing model for secondary education in New Zealand is therefore likely to be formulaic. The critical cause for concern, however is that the current staffing formula is not designed to approximate the actual needs of secondary schools in the 21st century. It is not that the mechanism is not needs-based just because it is a formula. The formula is not based on the needs of schools. For example, schools of similar size receive the same guidance and pastoral staffing component, but any needs-based formula would cater adequately for the number of pupils currently entering schools with serious pastoral and guidance support needs, and through an objective mechanism be able to apply staffing differentially for individual schools because such students are not evenly distributed across schools. In this example, it is likely that a needs-based model would include a new remedial social-factor index as one of its components.

Designing a formula that can allocate resources in a predictable way, and that allows schools to meet the demands placed upon them by the state, the students they are responsible for and the community they serve, requires re-assessing the basic questions.

The government's push for 'Schools Plus' is likely to fail dramatically if it is built on the back of an already failing staffing delivery mechanism. It demands 21st century outcomes from a 20th century framework.

On the following pages are some of the questions we might start to consider in developing a needs-based staffing model for secondary schools that moves us ahead and builds the basis for achieving more than just flights of government/ministry rhetoric.

Thinking about 21st century schools

What do we expect of the student?

They will be engaged through to 18.
They will achieve success (current measure Level 2 NCEA and work or tertiary study and Level 1 literacy and numeracy).
They will undertake an individual programme of learning which will achieve these outcomes.

What do we need to do to support these goals?

There will be personal support and guidance.
There will be learning and career guidance.
There will be educational options available to suit each student that are not mutually exclusive.
There will be the opportunity to learn in a range of ways.
Teachers will be able to engage them in learning.
Teachers will be able to tailor learning to the individual and use feedback to improve individual learning outcomes.

What does this mean about schools?

There will be breadth in learning opportunities.
There will be need to be small classes at all year levels.
There will need to be comprehensive support and guidance structures.
There will need to be the flexibility for greater integration with other institutions and the community.
There will need to be greater flexibility in when and how numeracy and literacy skills are developed.
Schools will have to be more flexible in timetable structure.

What does this mean about teachers?

They will need to engage more in individual student development.
They will need to be more engaged in individual professional development.
They will need to be increasingly flexible in curriculum delivery methods.
They will need to be increasingly flexible in integrating students on different pathways.
They will need smaller caseloads.

What does this mean about the system?

There will have to be a flexible learning and qualifications structure in place.
There will need to be new models of timetabling developed.
There will need to be new roles developed within secondary schools.
How staffing is delivered to schools will have to be reviewed on the basis of new expectations.
The staffing formula will need to address different demands created by school size, intake, location.
Meeting modern needs will be more resource intense – what will this mean about the network of schools?
There may need to be a greater level of agreement about what constitutes appropriate curriculum width.

Considering resourcing in a 21st century way

Resourcing for student goals

Engagement, curriculum width, flexibility	Small classes E-learning
Individualised learning pathways and guidance	Tutor-mentors Guidance and pastoral support
Cross-institution learning	Learning and Careers coordinators
Literacy and numeracy	Literacy and numeracy tutors

Resourcing for teacher capability

Professional learning and data use systemic	PL time and coordination, data sharing time
Professional development systemic	PD time and coordination

Resourcing for administration and management

New schools, new processes, new structures, interagency functions	New management structures Administrative support

IMPLICATION: NEW SECONDARY STAFFING MODEL

OUTCOME: SCHOOLS PLUS

Appendix 1: Summary of current New Zealand staffing formula

Secondary entitlement staffing

1 Curriculum staffing

Roll

Year level	NMI roll	MI roll
	Divide by	Divide by
7 & 8	29	20
9&10	23.5	20
11	23	20
12	18	18
13 to 15	17	17

Base

Schools over 200 Year 9-13 levels * 1.2
Schools under 201 0.4+0.0035*Year 9-13 roll *yr 9-13 yr levels * 1.2

Outside manual Year 7&8 roll/120

Maximum Average Class sizes If the Yr 7&8 roll under 176.

If yr7&8 roll/integer of yr7&8 curriculum staffing >25 then increase to next integer. MACs staffing is the difference between that integer and yr 7&8 staffing

2 Management Staffing Component

Roll

Year level	Multiply by
7 & 8 OM	0.5
7 & 8	3.9
9&10	7
11	9
12	15
13 to 15	16

(Weighted roll X 0.0003) + (0.017 X √ Weighted roll) + (0.05 X Special Education staffing)

Base

Roll	1	29	61	93	124	156	187	219	250+
FTTE	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0

3 Guidance Staffing Component

Base	Schools over 200	Year 9-13 levels * 0.45
	Schools under 201	0.08+0.00185*Year 9-13 roll *yr 9-13 yr levels * 0.45

Additional Staffing

As well as the entitlement staffing there is a range of other *additional* staffing components that add to the total number of staff the school can employ. Most of these extra components do not apply to all schools or are specific to individual teachers. They commonly include (but are not limited to):

- **Special Education staffing**: 0.1 FTTE per High ORS and 0.2 FTTE per Very High ORS
- **Beginning teacher allowances**: an additional 0.2 FTTE per full-time first-year teacher
- **SCT time allowance**: an additional 0.16 FTTE per SCT
- **Instrumental and vocal music tuition allowance**: 1 FTTE per 1000 students
- **Te Atakura Allowance**: 0.5 FTTE per full time Te Atakura

Appendix 2: Canadian province class size limits

Jurisdiction	Class Size Limits
Prince Edward Island One instructional position per stipulated class size targets.	Gr. 7-9: 28 Gr. 10-12: 30
New Brunswick Article 20.01 "Whenever reasonably practicable the normal class size shall be twenty-eight (28) pupils. No class size shall exceed thirty-one (31) pupils". If unforeseen circumstances, Gr. 3 maximum may be 29 pupils and Gr. 4-6 maximum class size may be increased to 31 pupils. In addition, classes exceeding 31 pupils shall be allowed when formed by the grouping of other classes for team teaching or similar purposes.	
Quebec A formula contained in the agreement entitles teachers to additional compensation where maximum class size is exceeded. Lower limits also apply for Special Ed. classes, depending on the disorder.	Avg./Max Gr. 7-11*: 30/32 * For general education courses.
Manitoba: Winnipeg Per School Board 'Rules and Regulations' 1.1 and 1.2 (in CA Appendix). In computing pupil-teacher ratio, all professional employees shall be counted as teachers. Insofar as possible the maximum class size in the secondary schools shall be thirty-five (35).	Junior HS: 30 Senior HS: 25
Newfoundland and Labrador Article 30.01: "In the interest of education, and in order to promote effective teaching and learning conditions, the School Board will endeavour to establish class sizes appropriate to the teaching situation involved within regulatory and legislative restrictions".	
Ontario	
Ottawa-Carleton Per School Board Policy. The average aggregate class size of the Board's secondary classes is 22.	
Toronto For 2006-2007 and 2007-2008: • Class size must comply with the chart. • Up to 10% of the classes in a school may exceed the cap by a 10% flex factor. • The 10% flex factor may not be used after October 31st, or March 2nd in a semestered school. • Maximum pupil-teacher contacts for a full time Teacher shall be 180 students by October 31st in each school year and in a semestered school by February 28th. • Multi level courses capped at the average number. • Multi grade courses capped 10% lower than the target for the level of the class taught. • Programs requiring larger classes (e.g. repertoire music) will be considered for exemption.	(up to) Applied 24 College 26 Essentials 14 Phys. Ed. 34 ESL 20 Workplace 18 Tech. 23 GLE 16 Alternative Ed. 19

York Region

Per Article D.1.0 Staffing; the In-School Staffing Committee (ISSC) shall identify any discrepancies between actual class sizes and the class size maxima. The SAC shall make any necessary adjustments or determine any necessary exceptions. No class shall exceed the maxima above unless agreed to by the SAC.

	Target	Max.
Applied	18	22
Open/College	25	29
Academic	27	32
Learning Strategies	12	16
All Essential	12	16
ESL Core	16	20
Co-op Workplace/ IEP	16	20
All Workplace	16	20
Alternative Ed.	16	20
Tech. (Shop)	18	22
Co-op.-Reg.	22	26
Family Studies	23	28
Visual Arts/ Music/Drama	23	28
BBT Computers/ Word Processing	26	31
Science (labs)	26	31
Phys. Ed.	28	33

Durham Per Article VIII Staffing and Seniority (5) Class Size Guidelines Where the desirable limits above cannot be met, individual class sizes may be exceeded as follows: Advanced Academic / Academic/University: desirable maximum +3 All others: desirable maximum +2.	Gr. 9 and 10 – Non Technical Academic (D): 28 Applied (P): 24 Essential (E) (Locally Developed): 19 Open (O): 28 Technical and Practical Family Studies Open (O): 22 Gr. 11 and 12 – Non Technical University (U): 28 University/College (M): 26 College (C): 26 Workplace: 18 Open (O): 28 Gr. 11 and 12 – Technical and Practical Family Studies University/College (H) 22 College 20 Workplace 18 Gr. 9 to 12 Learning Strategies 13
Saskatchewan: Regina Public Guidelines presently under review. Previous School board policy dictates that it make every reasonable effort to ensure that class sizes not exceed those cited in the guidelines. Various limits apply for Special Ed. classes and limits for Shops/Labs are to be determined in consultation with the teacher, department head, etc. For elementary schools that meet specified criteria, including very small schools and small schools, integration of special needs pupils into regular classrooms and various community school identifiers, the normal class size ceiling is reduced accordingly.	Gr. 4-8: 30 Gr. 9-12: 32 (Avg. not >30)
Alberta The Commission on Learning's 2002 final report contains a number of recommendations including implementing class size averages and class size guidelines (for which the government is presently providing funding). Class composition should be considered by schools in setting class size. Generally, classes with special needs students, students whose first language is not English, and vulnerable and at-risk students should be smaller than the suggested guideline. Classes should also be smaller in cases where there are	Gr. 7-9: 25 Gr. 10-12: 27

safety considerations such as vocational classes.	
Calgary Letter of Intent—expired at the end of the 2006/07 school year.	Gr. 7-9: 25 Gr. 10-12: 27
Edmonton Public Per School Board Policy and Regulation *Learning Group Size*. Limits may be exceeded with prior approval of the superintendent of schools.	No more than 30
British Columbia Grades 8 to 12 may be exceeded at the direction of the superintendent and principal, provided the principal has consulted with the teacher of the class. No more than 3 students with an IEP unless determined by the superintendent and principal, and the teacher has been consulted.	Gr. 4-7: 30 (consent) Gr. 8-12: 30 (consult)
Yukon For trial 2006-2009, maximums may only be exceeded and remedies provided for specific classes per Article 35.05. Thus, for physical education, band, home economics and industrial education classes, the employer is expected to address a class size situation when the respective maximums are exceeded by 3 pupils (by just 1 pupil for multi-grade classrooms or by 2 pupils in a laboratory or shop where safety is not a factor).	Gr. 4-9: 26 Gr. 10-12: 28 Home Ec. & Industrial Ed.: 16
Northwest Territories The *Education Act* guarantees funding will be sufficient for student-teacher ratios of: 16:1.	16.1

Sources: Teacher collective agreements, school legislation, school board policy. Provincial/Territorial Government Education Ministry websites.

2008 Annual Conference Minutes

Minutes of the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association (Inc) held at the Brentwood Hotel, Kilbirnie, Wellington, commencing at 9.45 a.m. on Tuesday 30 September 2008, continuing at 8.45 a.m. on Wednesday 1 October and 9.00 a.m. on Thursday 2 October 2008.

Needs-Based Staffing for Secondary Schools

C08/77/25

1. THAT the report be received; and

2. THAT PPTA insists that new needs-based staffing models are developed and resourced; and

3. THAT any new model of secondary and area school staffing should ensure that the needs of Maori and Pasifika students and communities are identified and met; and

4. THAT any new needs-based staffing model should be aligned with a review of school property.

Carried