Results of the Survey of Candidates Standing for Election as Parent Representatives for the 2001 Board of Trustees Elections

There were 2617 state and state integrated schools as at March 2001. Of these schools 10 had commissioners appointed in place of a Board of Trustees, 8 were closing or were so new that they still had an establishment board in place and 14 schools were joining in twos and threes to form 6 combined Boards of Trustees. A further 12 schools were health camps and hospital schools with ministerial appointments to their boards. These schools were not included in the survey and neither was the correspondence school because it has a slightly different board composition from other schools.

This report summarises the information received from returning officers after the three yearly elections for parent representatives on school Boards of Trustees held between March and June 2001. The survey form on candidates standing for election as parent representatives appeared as Appendix A in the Returning Officer's Handbook. Appendix A was submitted by 2455 schools from an expected 2578 schools. This is a response rate of just over 95%, which is higher than the response to the survey in 1998 (89%) or 1995 (91%).

Number of Positions Available

The majority of schools (96.5%) responding to the survey had 5 or more positions for elected parent representatives on their board of trustees (Table 1). The usual number of positions for parent representatives on a board of trustees is five but individual boards can vote to change this number to between 3 and 7 parent representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Schools</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Number of Candidates

A total of 16806 people stood as candidates in the 2455 schools included in these results, excluding a small number of people (<10) who refused to give any information for statistical purposes. This was an average of 6.8 candidates per school, compared with 7.0 candidates per school in 1998 and 6.7 in 1995. The highest average number of candidates by school type in 2001 was at secondary schools with 8.4 candidates per school. Schools with a decile rating of 1 had an average of 7.2 candidates per school and schools at decile 10 averaged 7.3 candidates per school. Deciles between 2 and 9 had averages between 6.5 and 6.9. Schools in rural areas had an average of 6.1 candidates per school and in main urban areas the average was higher at 7.3 candidates per school. In the Auckland region the average number of candidates per school was 7.8 which was higher than any other region. Bay of Plenty and Nelson were just below this average at 7.6 candidates per school. The Gisborne region and the Chatham Islands had less than 6 candidates per school on average in for the 2001 election of parent representatives to the board of trustees.

Number of Candidates

Over one quarter of schools had five candidates for the election, while nearly two thirds of schools had 6 or more candidates (Table 2). The highest number of candidates was 26.
Sixty two percent of the 2455 schools responding to the survey had more candidates than positions available and therefore were required to hold an election. If the number of candidates was equal to the number of positions available for parent representatives then a board of trustees could be formed without holding an election. If only 3 or 4 candidates were nominated for a board with 5 positions, then a board could be formed and other members may be elected later in a by-election or may be appointed. All schools included in the survey results in 2001 had enough candidates standing for election as parent representatives to form a board.

For 2406 of the 2455 schools responding to the survey there was data available on the number of candidates who stood for the previous board of trustees election in 1998. Just over one fifth of the 2406 schools (22%) had the same number of candidates as in 1998, 36% of schools had more candidates and 40% had fewer. In 1995 41% of schools had fewer candidates than for the previous election but in 1998 the figure was lower (31%).

The data shows that in 2001 decile 1 and 2 schools were more likely to have a higher number of candidates than they had in 1998 when compared with schools of other decile ratings, while decile 9 schools were more likely than others to have fewer candidates (Table 3). Schools in main urban areas were more likely to have a higher number of candidates in 2001 and schools in minor urban areas were more likely to have fewer candidates than they had in 1998.

### Table 2: The proportion of schools by the number of candidates standing for election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>&gt;1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Schools</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Number and proportion of schools with fewer, the same number or more candidates than 1998 by decile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Schools with fewer candidates than in 1998</th>
<th>Schools with the same number of candidates as 1998</th>
<th>Schools with more candidates than in 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 49 schools were unable to give their total number of candidates from the 1998 election so percentages in Table 3 do not add to 100%.

### Gender of Candidates

The survey shows that 49% of candidates for the 2001 election were female. In the previous two elections in 1995 and 1998 47% of candidates were female. This figure varied across different types of schools (Table 4).
Table 4: Distribution of candidates by gender and school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Intermediate</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of male candidates seemed to increase with the socio-economic decile rating of the school. At decile 9 and 10 schools male candidates made up 58% of those standing, while at decile 1 and 2 schools males comprised 42% of candidates. In rural areas 52% of candidates were female and in main urban areas 48% of candidates were female. In the Northland region 55% of candidates for the board of trustees election were female. Six other local body regions out of 17 also had a higher proportion of female candidates, while for most of the country the proportion of males was higher. Women comprised 63% of Maori candidates and were also well represented amongst Pacific Island groups. The converse was true for Asian ethnic groups.

Ethnic Composition of Candidates

Most candidates (16610 out of the 16806) included in the survey disclosed their ethnicity. The data was summarised here by excluding the not stated category. The percentage of candidates identified as European/Pakeha is slightly lower in 2001 than in the 1998 election (78.6%). This is due to the increased representation of Maori and Samoan candidates (respectively in 1998 15.2% and 1.9%) and those identified as Other which includes candidates from South America and Africa (Table 5).

Table 5: Major ethnic groups of candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European/Pakeha</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Island Maori</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In main urban areas the proportion of candidates in all Pacific Island groups was higher than the national proportions. The proportion of Maori in minor urban areas at 27.3% was higher than the proportion in any other type of area.

In the Gisborne region 50.4% of candidates were Maori. In Otago and Canterbury almost 93% of candidates were identified as European/Pakeha. The highest percentages of Samoan candidates were in Auckland (8.5%) and Wellington (4.9%).
Previous Experience

Just under half (49%) of all candidates standing as parent representatives for the 2001 board of trustees election were recorded as having had no previous experience on a board. A further 33% were current elected parent representatives standing for re-election, 11% were co-opted or appointed members and 7% had been members of a board of trustees at some earlier time. During the 1995 election 53% of candidates had not previously been a member of a board of trustees and in 1998 the figure was 50%. The proportion of women with no previous board experience was slightly higher than that for men in overall and for each decile (Table 6).

Table 6: The proportions of male and female candidates with no previous board experience by decile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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