Board of Trustees – 2005 Mid-Term Election Summary Report

Introduction
This report gives a brief summary of the most recent mid-term elections held on 28 October 2005. 298 schools had opted into the mid-term election cycle of which 105 held voting elections. This compares with 313\(^1\) schools that opted into the 2002 mid-term election cycle of which 131 held voting elections. Returning officers were required to complete Appendix A – Summary of Candidates and Appendix B – Declaration of Results. While each newly elected board representative was required to complete an Appendix F – Change of Board Membership form.

Analysis of community interest in the 2005 mid-term elections
In 2005 there were 105 schools that held voting elections\(^2\) out of a possible 298 schools. Those 105 schools posted out a combined total of 46,607 voting forms\(^3\), an average of 443 forms per school. From those forms posted out 30\% (13,754) were returned. Of the 13,754 votes cast, 3.1\% (422) were invalid. Overall there were 89 Primary schools, four Intermediate schools, seven Secondary schools and five Composite schools that held voting elections. In 2002 analysis of community interest was not collected and therefore cannot be compared to the interest in the 2005 mid-term elections.

In the 2004 triennial board of trustees’ elections, there were 2,550 state and state integrated schools of which 90\% (2,207) of schools responded to the survey on candidates standing for election as parent representatives. A total of 13,879 candidates represented the 2,207 schools that responded, an average of 6.3 candidates per school.

Analysis of candidates offering themselves for 2005 mid-term elections

Positions Available vs. Candidates
In 2005 there were 298 schools that had opted into the mid-term election cycle of which 105 schools held voting elections. Overall there were 674 positions available and 796 candidates. This is an average of 1.2 candidates per position. In 2002 there were 696 positions available and 874 candidates, an average of 1.3 candidates per position.

Secondary schools had the highest ratio of candidates per position at 1.3. Primary schools had 1.2 candidates per position and Intermediate and Composite schools both had 1.1 candidates. There were just two candidates that offered themselves for the three positions available at Special schools. In 2002 Secondary schools also had the highest ratio of candidates per position at 1.5. Composite, Primary, Intermediate and Special schools had 1.3, 1.2, 1.0, and 0.6 candidates per position respectively. Table 1 illustrates the comparison of positions available and number of candidates by school type for the 2002 and 2005 mid-term elections.

\(^1\) At the time on analysis in 2002, two schools were yet to hold mid-term elections and are therefore not referenced in any comparisons made regarding 2002 mid-term elections.
\(^2\) In addition there were five schools that were in the mid-term cycle that had not returned any information and were therefore excluded from this analysis.
\(^3\) For six of the 105 schools holding mid-term elections, it was unknown how many forms were posted out. In addition there was one school that voted but did not state how many forms were returned and one school that had an absurd number of invalid votes that has been excluded in the count of invalid votes.
Table 1 - Number of Positions and Number of Candidates by School Type: 2002 vs. 2005 Mid-term comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
<th>Average Number of Candidates per position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Primary</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Primary</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Composite (Yr 7-10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Composite</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 7-15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 9-15)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2005 Manawatu-Wanganui region had the highest ratio of candidates per position at 1.4 while Tasman region had the lowest at 0.8. In 2002 Nelson had the highest ratio at 1.9 while Bay of Plenty region had the lowest at 0.9. Overall, the average number of candidates per position by region is much lower in 2005 than in 2002 as Table 2 illustrates.

Table 2 - Number of Positions and Number of Candidates by Region: 2002 vs. 2005 Mid-term comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
<th>Average Number of Candidates per position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu-Wanganui</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Previous Experience of Candidates**

In 2005 just under half (48.7%) of the candidates had no previous experience of having been on a Board of Trustees. 32.3% were current parent representatives standing for re-election, 9.3% were current co-opted or appointed members standing for re-election and 8.5% had been a member of a Board of Trustees at some earlier time. Over half of all candidates (53.6 %) were Males; the remaining 46.4 % were Female.

In 2002 the majority of candidates (60.1%) had no previous experience of having been on a Board of Trustees. A total of 31.6% of candidates were either current parent representatives or current co-opted or appointed members standing for re-election. 8.4% had been on a Board of Trustees at some earlier time. In 2002 53.2% of candidates were Male; the remaining 46.8% were Female. Refer Table 3 for comparison between 2002 and 2005 mid-term election candidates by previous experience and school type.

**Ethnicity of Candidates**

In 2005 well over half (69.5%) of all candidates were NZ European/Pakeha. Maori represented 12.2% of all candidates, Other European represented 10.7%, Pacific represented 2.9 %, Other represented 2.5 % and Asian were represented as the lowest proportion of candidates at 1.4%. In 2002 77% of all candidates were NZ European/Pakeha, 12.6% were Maori, 7.3% were Other European, 1.7% were Pacific, 0.8% were Other and 0.7% were Asian.

From 2002 to 2005 NZ European/Pakeha and Maori were the only ethnic groups to see a decline in the proportion of candidates. The number of NZ European/Pakeha candidates has declined by 2.3% while the number of Maori candidates has declined by 1.5%. The number of Pacific candidates has increased by 3.4%, Asian by 4.5%, Other European by 2.4% and Other by 7.0%. Refer Table 4 for a comparison between the ethnic mix of candidates from the 2002 and 2005 mid-term elections.

---

4 Table 3 includes 10 candidates in the Total figures that are not represented as a single column in this table. These 10 candidates did not state their previous background.

5 Table 4 includes 8 candidates in the total figures that are not represented as an individual column in this table. These 8 candidates did not state their ethnicity.
## Table 3 - Previous Candidate Experience by School Type: 2002 vs. 2005 Mid-Term comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Parent Representatives</th>
<th>Co-opted or Appointed Members</th>
<th>Not previous members</th>
<th>Proportion who have never been on a Board of Trustees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Primary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Primary</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Composite (Yr 7-10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Composite</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 7-15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 9-15)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Secondary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 3 cont. - Previous Candidate Experience by School Type: 2002 vs. 2005 Mid-Term comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Previous Members</th>
<th>Proportion who at some earlier time had been on a board</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Primary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Primary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Composite (Yr 7-10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 7-15)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 9-15)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Male
### Table 4 - Ethnic breakdown of Candidates by School Type: 2002 vs. 2005 Mid-term comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Maori 2002</th>
<th>Proportion Maori</th>
<th>Pacific 2002</th>
<th>Proportion Pacific</th>
<th>Asian 2002</th>
<th>Proportion Asian</th>
<th>NZ European / Pakeha 2002</th>
<th>Proportion NZ European / Pakeha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Primary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Composite (Yr 7-10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Composite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 7-15)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 9-15)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 cont. - Ethnic breakdown of Candidates by School Type: 2002 vs. 2005 Mid-term comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Other European 2002</th>
<th>Proportion Other European</th>
<th>Other 2002</th>
<th>Proportion Other</th>
<th>TOTAL 2002</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Primary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Primary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Composite (Yr 7-10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Composite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 7-15)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Yr 9-15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total - Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>