1919. NEW ZEALAND.

EDUCATION:

GRADING OF TEACHERS.

READJUSTMENTS FOR YEARS 1917, 1918, AND 1919 (RETURN SHOWING).

Return to an Order of the House of Representatives dated the 26th September, 1919.

Ordered, "That there be laid before this House a return showing separately for the education years [1917, 1918] and 1919—(1) The number of education districts (giving names) in which the Assistant Director of Education returned for readjustment to the Inspectors the completed graded lists of teachers; (2) the particular groups in each district which were degraded as a result of the Assistant Director's action; (3) the number of teachers in each district who appealed against their grading; and (4) the number of instances in which the Appeal Board restored to the affected groups marks lost by the action of the Assistant Director."—(Mr. Young.)

					Retu	RN.						
District.	(1) Adjustments made in Groups indicated.			(3) $oldsymbol{\Lambda}_{ ext{ppeals}}$ lodged.			(4) Restoration of Adjusted Marks by Appeal Board.			(2) And General Notes as given below.		
	1917.	1918.	1919.	1917.	1918.	1919.	1917.	1918.	1919.	1917.	1918.	1919.
Auckland	4 5 6	3 4 5 6	Nil	41	91	51	15	49	•	1(a) 2(a) 4(a)	1(m)	4(a)
Taranaki Wanganui	$egin{array}{c} 3 \ 1 \ 2 \end{array}$	Nil Nil	Nil Nil	$\begin{vmatrix} 8 \\ 10 \end{vmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{c c} 4 \\ 12 \end{array}$	9 3				1(b) 1(c)		• •
Hawke's Bay	$\frac{1}{2}$	Nil	Nil	8	26	10				1(<i>d</i>)	••	
Wellington	3 1 3	Nil	Nil	18	38	20				1(e)	; ; 	
Nelson	$\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$	Nil	Nil	3	10	8				1(f)	••	• •
Canterbury	3 1 3	1 2	Nil	37	23	22	• •			1(g)		• •
Otago	6 2 3	Nil	Nil	13	30	14	• •	• •		1(h)		••
Southland	4 5 1 2 3 4	Nil	Nil	4	7	4	••	• •		1(j)		• •
	9	2	••	142 3(a)	241 3(a)	141 3(a)	15 4(a)	49 4(b)		1(k)	••	•••

NOTES IN CONNECTION WITH RETURN.

1917.

Auckland, -1 (a). During their grading and before their report was completed the Inspectors had graded the whole of group 4, and a few teachers in 5 and 6, lower than in 1916, when the grading was obviously too high.

2 (a). The Department did not degrade these groups, but effected an all-round raising of marks in group 4, since the new lower grading—see 1 (a)—had proved

to be too low—see 1(k). 4 (a). The Appeal Board allowed the appeals of fifteen teachers. The Department. and not the Appeal Board, granted an all-round increase to non-appellants in order to preserve uniformity. This increase subsequently proved to be too great.

Taranaki.—1 (b). As the marking was somewhat below standard, part of group 3 was raised.

Wanganui.—1 (c). Nine teachers in groups 1 and 2 were raised.

Hawke's Bay.—1 (d). Part of groups 1 and 2 were raised.

Wellington.—1 (e). Part of group 3 raised, and a few teachers in groups 1 and 2.

Nelson.—1 (f). Groups 1, 2, and 3 all raised.

Canterbury.—1 (g). Group 1 was raised, and a few teachers in groups 3 and 6.

Otago.—1 (h). Groups 3 and 4 were all raised, and some teachers in groups 2 and 5.

Southland.—1 (j). Groups 1, 2, and 3 raised, and a few in group 4.

General.—1 (k). The raising of various groups in all the other districts was the cause of the raising of Auckland Group 4.

Auckland.—1 (m). This adjustment was made by the Inspectors on the return of their lists and the receipt of information from the Department.

4 (a). The recommendation of the Appeal Board was almost an impossible one to carry out. When this recommendation was forwarded to the Inspectors by the Department they reported as follows: "That the Auckland grading officers feel that they cannot restore the marks of the teachers recommended for restoration unless the marks of those teachers who were also reduced but who did not appeal are also restored; and, further, the Auckland grading officers feel that if all the teachers thus affected are restored then the original disparity between the average level of Auckland and the rest of the Dominion remains.

General.—3 (a). Included in these totals are letters which were subsequently ruled out of order as appeals.

W. J. ANDERSON, Director of Education.

Education Department, Wellington, 13th October, 1919.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given: printing (750 copies), £2 5s.

By Authority: Marcus F. Marks, Government Printer, Wellington.—1919.

Price 3d.]