



**The University of Auckland**

**Strategic Review**

**of**

**Early Childhood Education  
Centres, Facilities, Services,  
Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga**

**October 2008**

**Revised 12.01.09**

## Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Kim Hope for her expertise in conducting the Review and bringing the benefits of her professional networks, her extensive experience of the early childhood education sector, her insight and flexibility in responding to the working party and project sponsor's recommendations.

Many people have contributed to this review and we would like to thank the following people in particular:

- All those who made time to participate in the consultation process.
- For their valuable advice and guidance to the design of the benchmarking and strategic review surveys:
  - Linda Mitchell, Lecturer in Early Childhood Education (ECE) at the University of Waikato, formerly researcher at New Zealand Centre for Educational Research (NZCER).
  - Robin Sigley, Academic Convenor, Diploma of Teaching, Centre for Education Studies, Open Polytechnic of New Zealand.
  - Deborah Lee, Practicum Coordinator (ECE) Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland).
- Heather Day, Equity Office at Victoria University of Wellington (Victoria) and Brian Newman, Manager Children's Services at the University of Melbourne, for making available studies of ECE facilities carried out by their universities.
- Stephen Cope, Web Programmer, Department of Statistics, The University of Auckland, for the technical design and administration of the on-line strategic review survey.
- Ilze Ziedins, Senior Lecturer, Department of Statistics, The University of Auckland, for assistance with the analysis of the strategic review survey data.
- Prue Toft, Vicki Watson and Margaret Freeman, The University of Auckland Equal Employment Opportunities Office (EEO Office), for their support and assistance to the strategic review process.
- The Project Sponsors and Working Committee for their overall guidance to the strategic review.

## Executive Summary

- There is increasing recognition by universities that family friendly policies, which include the provision of quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) services, are critical in attracting and retaining students and staff. This is particularly important for universities in groups such as Group of Eight (Go8) and Universitas 21 (U21) who are competing to attract high level staff and post-graduate students many of whom are in the childbearing age group.
- It is clear from the reports of other studies, including The University of Auckland's 2007 *Women Returning to Work* project and The University of Melbourne's 2005 *Child Care Needs Analysis* that the provision of childcare on campus can assist with the recruitment and retention of high quality staff.
- For childcare on campus to be used as a recruitment and retention incentive there must be capacity within the centres to accommodate the demand. Many parents who responded to the survey are currently using other centres because they were not able to get a place at a University centre:
- There were also a large number of responses related to the lack of an ECE facility at Tamaki Campus.
- Recent research with relevance to this review and responses via the consultation and survey stages have shown many parents/caregivers value the opportunity to have their child close to their place of work or study. This is particularly important for very young children, many of whom are being breastfed. The shortage of ECE centres in Auckland area, especially for under 2-year-olds, means there is no guarantee that parents/caregivers can secure places at other centres for their children even if they prefer to have them in a different location.
- Providing Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga was stated by most respondents as being *very important* or *important* to The University of Auckland's attraction as a place to work or study. There was also some support for consideration of providing ECE centres which cater for Pacific languages and cultures.
- In its *Work, Life and Family Policy*, the University stresses it is committed to providing high quality ECE centres on campus, and as an educational institution, the University has a commitment to excellent standards in early childhood education. This is cited as *very important* by 89% and *important* by 8%. However, a large number of respondents expressed concern that current early childhood education at the University does not meet quality standards.
- One of the most significant factors influencing the current standards of early childhood education at the University is physical environment. A number of centres are still located in what were intended to be temporary facilities and only one of the seven is in a purpose-built facility, raising concerns about appropriateness, health and safety. Some parents/caregivers have removed their children from centres, or chosen a non-University centre even though it was not as conveniently located.

- The high turnover of ECE teachers in the centres also concerned many who participated in the consultation process. Staff stability is important for young children who require secure relationships and high staff turnover has been shown to affect quality outcomes for children. Many other universities are experiencing similar problems. There is also a high level of competition for qualified staff in the Auckland area.
- The University of Melbourne found that better pay and conditions led to low staff turnover in their centres. A submission to the review at The University of Auckland pointed out that “quality early childhood centres attract quality early childhood teaching staff”.
- Respondents also identified a number of other factors they believe would enhance the current provision of ECE at the University, including:
  - extending the provision of ECE facilities to every campus;
  - extending opening hours;
  - expanding the current centres to reduce waiting lists;
  - ensuring centres are affordable for staff and students and exploring options for subsidies;
  - exploring ways of ensuring all centres have safe drop-off and pick-up areas and car parking;
  - siting facilities for under-2-year-olds near to those for over-2 for ease of transition and convenience to parents/caregivers with more than one child attending a University centre;
  - reviewing the current management and governance structures for ECE centres to ensure clear accountabilities relevant to users; and
  - enhancing current resources in centres (furniture, equipment, etc).
- A number of universities in the benchmarking stage highlighted their ECE centres as exemplars or centres of excellence. There was strong support in the consultation process for this review for Auckland to strive towards also achieving this objective. Some the respondents suggested linking ECE centres with teacher education and research opportunities.
- Most respondents rated school holiday programmes and after-school programmes as *very important* or *important*, however providing after-school programmes was seen as more problematic. Five of the Australian Go8 and/or U21 universities and five of the New Zealand universities who responded to the benchmarking survey provide after school and/or school holiday care.
- More than 84% of the 289 respondents rated breastfeeding facilities as *very important* or *important*. Through the EEO office, the University has already made considerable improvements in response to recommendations in the *Women Returning to Work* project (2007).

## Recommendations

- 1.0 That the *Work Life and Family Policy* statement that “*the University is committed to providing high quality Early Childhood Education Centres on campus, and as an educational institution, the University has a commitment to excellent standards in early childhood education*”, be retained and implemented.
- 2.0 That the University of Auckland amends the policy to include a commitment to the “*provision of high quality ECE centres utilising research and teaching expertise and opportunities*”.
- 3.0 That the University ensures the governance for ECE centres meets University strategic objectives, staff and student needs and ensures consistent, high quality provision. Consideration to be given to the establishment of a *Quality of Campus Life* accountability to manage this governance responsibility.
- 3.1 Governance and management structures are reviewed to ensure consistent high standards of provision and clear accountabilities which are relevant to the users of the ECE centres and support appropriate engagement with whanau.

### Planning

- 4.0 That the University commits to provision of high quality ECE facilities on each campus for staff and student parents and caregivers in current and future planning.
- 4.1 That there is urgent development of a quality brief, consistent with the review recommendations for the provision of high quality ECE facilities that will be incorporated into the current planning for campus development.
- 4.2 That the University includes in its planning the steps necessary to ensure the physical environment of all centres to meet high quality standards.
- 4.3 The University should aim for waiting lists of no longer than two months in each centre.
- 4.4 That administrative systems in HR and student recruitment (including post-graduate), include processes to ensure the earliest possible signal of demand for ECE places and hence effective waiting list management.

### Quality

- 5.0 That the University ensures it adopts a high quality approach to ECE centres and staffing to ensure services meet the needs of parents and children by:
  - provision of pay parity across the compulsory education sector
  - non-contact time for staff
  - an increased level of professional development
  - monitoring staff turnover to ensure it is lower than the sector norm
  - provision of support for provisionally registered teachers.
  - strategies to proactively recruit staff to University ECE centres
- 5.1 That each ECE centre, Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga aim to be a centre of innovation within 10 years.

- 5.2 That the University aim for high quality staff: child ratios that exceed minimum standards to maximise government funding opportunities and the meeting of compliance requirements of registered staff ahead of the 2012 deadline.

### **Communication**

- 6.0 That up-to-date and comprehensive information about ECE centres, Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga services and facilities is easily accessible through the University website and in printed material.
- 6.1 That the University develop online registration for centre waiting lists and personal follow-up.
- 6.2 That the University provide administrative support for e-newsletters being sent on behalf of the centres to parent users.
- 6.3 That website links are created between ECE and Faculty of Education material.

### **Accessibility**

- 7.0 That opening hours ECE centres reflect the University's standard hours of 8.00am-6.00pm therefore opening from at least 7.30am-6.30pm.
- 7.1 That the University maintain accessibility for part time and full-time staff and student users of Centres.
- 7.2 That access to the centres is available to all staff and students with caring responsibilities for 0-5 yr olds, including grandparents and other caregivers.
- 7.3 That the University maintain affordable and competitive rates for staff and students at all centres.
- 7.4 That the University urgently implement childcare deductions before tax for staff.
- 7.5 That the University evaluate the feasibility of an explicit subsidy to its ECE provision at a similar level to that of other New Zealand universities.

### **Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga**

- 8.0 That the University continue to provide both Kōhanga and Kōhungahunga centres.

### **Pacific**

- 9.0 That the planning brief includes provision for a Pacific Language Nest.

### **Service provision**

- 10.0 That the University increase the promotion of school holiday programmes to staff and students.

- 10.1 That the University investigate the feasibility of campus school holiday programmes including the possibility of utilising the ECE centres.
- 10.2 That the University increase the provision of breast feeding and expressing spaces including in the centres themselves.

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	9
Background to the review	10
Current ECE provision at The University of Auckland	11
<b>Findings</b>	13
1. Staffing	13
1.1 Ratios	13
1.2 Qualifications	14
1.3 Professional Development	16
1.4 Access to non-contact and meeting time	17
1.5 Staff stability	17
2. Parents	18
3. Accessibility	20
3.1 Affordability	20
3.2 Rates	20
3.3 Hours of operation	23
3.4 Waiting lists	25
3.5 Location	27
4. Physical environment	30
5. Ownership, governance and management structures	34
6. Recruitment and retention	36
7. Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga	42
8. Catering for other languages and cultures	43
9. University ECE Centres as exemplars	44
10. Other childcare facilities and services	46
<b>Conclusion</b>	49
<b>References</b>	50
<b>Appendices</b>	51
Appendix 1 - Working Committee	51
Appendix 2 - Research Methodology	52
Appendix 3 – Client letter	57
Appendix 4 - Benchmarking Survey	58
Appendix 5 - Strategic Review survey	62
Appendix 6 - Work, Life and Family Policy	93



## Introduction

The University of Auckland is committed to providing high quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) centres, facilities, services and Kōhanga Reo ((total Māori emersion ECE centres).

There are currently seven ECE centres at the University catering for total of 255 children (77 under 2 years and 178 over 2 years). Of these, one is a Kōhanga Reo and one is a Kōhungahunga (medium Māori ECE centre).

In 2007, the Pro Vice-Chancellor Equal Opportunities (PVC EO) was given responsibility for a Strategic Review of these centres. Project sponsors were identified and a Working Committee (see Appendix 1 for details) established to develop the terms of reference, methodology and timeframes for the review which was initiated in June 2008.

The review stems from the University's *Work, Life and Family Policy* which states "The University is committed to providing high quality Early Childhood Education Centres on campus, and as an educational institution, the University has a commitment to excellent standards in early childhood education".

The review aimed to provide recommendations and a framework for the University to enhance its status as a world-class place to work and study

This review was also aligned with the University's Strategic Plan, in particular to objectives 4, 7, 10 and 13, and to the University's EEO Policy:

*Objective 4: Achieve 800 masters and 500 doctoral completions per annum through the development of an international quality graduate programme.*

*Objective 7: Achieve a high quality student body with an annual growth rate of equivalent full-time students of 1%. This student body to be composed as follows: 78% in undergraduate, 12% in taught post-graduate and 10% in research post-graduate programmes.*

*Objective 10: Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi: Fulfil the responsibilities and obligations of the University under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.*

*Objective 13: Recruit and retain a high-quality staff and student body, striving to create equal opportunities for all those of ability to succeed in a university of high international standing.*

*EEO Policy: ... The University acknowledges an obligation, within available resources to provide facilities and support services such as childcare centres and liaison officers, in order to meet EEO objectives.*

The Review's Terms of Reference are to "provide recommendations and a framework for the University to enhance its status as a world class place to work and study" with specific objectives to:

- Identify the role of ECE centres and Kōhanga Reo for the children of staff and students, parents and caregivers, in relation to the University's strategic direction and objectives.

- Identify the purpose and contribution of ECE centres and Kōhanga Reo to The University of Auckland.
- Benchmark against other institutions in U21 (Universitas 21), Go8 (group of Eight), APRU (Association of Pacific Rim Universities) and New Zealand universities for examples of best practice.
- Assess current and future staff and student needs for the use of ECE centres and Kōhanga Reo.
- Consider the needs for wider childcare services and facilities e.g. school holiday and after-school care programmes and breast feeding facilities.
- Where appropriate make recommendations for improvements to ECE centres, including the special needs of Kōhanga Reo.

The review was implemented in two stages:

1. A literature review to provide specific information on the quality provision of ECE in universities. It also included benchmarking with other key universities. A full report of the findings from this stage was completed in September 2008.
2. An opportunity for staff, students and the wider community of the University to make submissions and/or to respond to an online survey about ECE services and facilities at the University.

This report presents the findings from the second stage and, where possible, links have been made with the findings from the literature review and benchmarking exercise.

Recommendations for improvements in relation to current and future staff and student needs have been made for consideration.

### **Background to the review**

The University has provided early childhood services since 1970 when the first facility (known as Crèche 1) was established in Wynyard Street. A further two crèches were established in modified residential dwellings on Wynyard Street (crèche 2 in 1987 and crèche 3 in 1993). In 1991, the Park Avenue facility was established (also in a modified building), principally to provide early childhood services to staff members.

In 2001/2002, the three crèches located in Wynyard Street were relocated to make way for the Business School:

- Crèche 1 was relocated to a purpose-built facility adjacent to the existing Park Avenue Centre;
- Crèche 2 was relocated to a new temporary building at 26a Symonds Street; and
- Crèche 3 moved to a modified residential building in Alten Road.

Originally, a new purpose-built facility was included in the plans for the new Business School, but this was later changed.

A background paper written for the Strategic Review Working Committee explains that the plans for the review of ECE Centres originally related mainly to the three relocated centres in response to recommendations made in the 2002 Student Life Commission Review which stated:

“Ensure the provision of crèche facilities suffers the minimum disruption during the period in which a new crèche facility is built on the city campus;

Conduct a review of all aspects of the crèches on the campuses (including pricing, staffing needs, the level of cross subsidy by non-crèche users, safety and suitability) with a view to investigating the feasibility of:

- Expanding the capacity and hours of operation of crèche services for student-parents;
- Providing expanded and more flexible facilities for both regular and student-parent use;
- Ensuring the adequacy of pick-up, drop-off and parking spaces that permit easy and convenient access to the facilities for student-parents;
- Developing new protocols for communication (for example, text messaging);
- Considering the creation and promotion of an individualised University baby-sitting service that can be accessed by students on a regular or casual basis;
- Developing childcare facilities on the Tamaki Campus.”

In 2003, the amalgamation of the Auckland College of Education and The University of Auckland added the Epsom Avenue Early Childhood Centre and Te Puna Kōhungahunga to the University facilities.

In 2004, The University of Auckland Council decided the ECE centres would not be relocated in the Business School.

In 2004, a brief review of ECE centres' physical upgrades was carried out by EEO and Student Administration and completed by Property Services (this was in view of concerns that when shifted, the centres were not intended to be in that condition for more than a few years).

In 2006, Student Administration conducted a functional review of ECE.

In 2007, the PVC EO was given responsibility for a strategic review of ECE centres, facilities and services. The PVC Māori indicated it would be appropriate to include Kōhanga Reo in this review.

The background paper also noted that while “the 2002 Student Life Commission refers to *crèches*, the EEO Policy uses the term *childcare centres*, and Student Administration web calls them *Early Childhood Centres*. *Early Childhood Education Centres* has been used [in the strategic review] in accordance with current educational practice”.

### **Current ECE provision at The University of Auckland**

The seven ECE centres cater for 255 children (77 under 2 years and 178 over 2 years), including one Kōhanga Reo (total Māori immersion ECE centre) and one Kōhungahunga (medium Māori ECE centre). Distribution of places is as follows:

#### **City Campus**

- Alten Road Childcare Centre is licensed for 30 children (24 from 3 months to 2 years and 15 over 2 years). It caters for children of students and staff with students having priority/
- Symonds Street Childcare Centre is licensed for 36 children (all over 2 years). It caters for children of students and staff with students having priority.

- Hineteiwaiwa Te Kōhanga Reo is licensed for 25 tamariki (5 from 6 months to 2 years and 20 over 2 years). It caters for children of students, staff and the wider community.

#### Grafton Campus

- Park Avenue Childcare Centre is licensed for 50 children (all from 2½ to 5 years). It caters for children of students and staff.
- Park Avenue Infant and Toddler Centre, licensed for 35 children (25 from 3 months to 2 years and 10 over 2 years). It caters for children of students and staff.

#### Epsom Campus

- Epsom Avenue Early Childhood Centre is licensed for 25 children (8 from 6 months to 2 years and 17 over 2 years). It caters for children of students, staff and the wider community.
- Te Puna Kōhungahunga, Epsom Campus (Māori medium ECE centre), is licensed for 45 tamariki (15 from 10 months to 2 years and 30 over 2 years). It caters for children of students, staff and the wider community who want Māori medium education for their tamariki.

In June 2008, the distribution of staff and student children attending the centres (with the exception of Hineteiwaiwa Kōhanga for which information was not available) was as follows:

Centre	Student children		Staff children	
	Total	Full time	Total	Full time
Alten Road	32	14	22	4
Symonds Street	23	14	13	8
Park Ave	22	19	31	11
Park Ave Infant & Toddler	12	7	27	
Epsom Ave	18		12	
Te Puna Kōhungahunga	14		33	
	<b>121</b>		<b>138</b>	

## Findings

Much of the recent literature relating to quality early childhood education focuses on how participation in quality ECE enhances positive outcomes for children both at the time and in later years. This research has led to wider acceptance of the importance of quality ECE and increased demand for quality services.

Key findings from the literature review, benchmarking exercise, campus meeting discussions, survey responses and submissions have been grouped under key factors known to have a high correlation with quality ECE provision (see Appendix 2 for methodology).

Responses related to operational issues including curriculum are outside the terms of reference for this review and have not been included.

### Self-selection

An important consideration for the strategic review was to provide an opportunity for all staff, students and the wider community to contribute to the review. Therefore a limitation of the methodology is that respondents are self selected (rather than a random sample). It is therefore likely they will have interest in the provision of ECE and may be more supportive of this than the general University population. It is however important to note that respondents who are not current users of ECE and who don't intend to be so in the future were also broadly very supportive. This indicates support for the provision of ECE within the wider University community.

A further limitation is that predicting future demand for ECE within the context of the review was difficult and while respondents were asked about possible future requirements in relation to ECE the methodology does not allow for accurate predictions.

### Open-ended responses

Of the 292 survey respondents, 207 (71%) took the opportunity to answer at least one of four open-ended questions. Of these:

- 91 were academic staff;
- 67 were general staff;
- 5 were ECE teachers;
- 10 were post-graduate students;
- 15 were undergraduate students; and
- 19 were respondents not currently working at the University.

Many of the responses addressed more than one issue and where appropriate have been separately reported under the relevant section.

### 1. Staffing

Structural features of staffing include qualifications, high staff: child ratios, staffing stability, rates of pay, professional development opportunities and access to non-contact and meeting time. Findings related to each of these areas have been reported separately.

#### 1.1 Ratios

The research by Mitchell, Wylie and Carr (2008) found qualified staff working with children and high adult: child ratios linked to better gains for children.

Factors currently determining regulated age groups and ratios in New Zealand are roll numbers, ages of the children and whether the service is all-day or sessional. Ratios are set at:

- 1:5 for under-2-year-olds;
- 1:6, 2:20, 3:30 etc for over-2-year-olds in all-day centres; and
- 1:8, 2:30, 3:45, 4:50 for over-2-year-olds in sessional centres.

A maximum of 25 children under 2 and 40 over 2 can attend an ECE service at any one time.

All but two respondents rated having a high teacher: child ratio as *very important* or *important* in providing a good ECE service.

The University of Auckland ECE Management 2008 business plan states that:

*“At The University of Auckland early childhood centres we aim to provide a 1: 3 adult child ratio for under 1 year old children, a 1: 4 adult to child [ratio] for 1 to 2 year olds and a 1 adult to 9 children over the age of two. At some times of the day our ratio is much better than this.”*

Information received from the benchmarking survey provides the following information in relation to ratios:

Centre	Staff: Child Ratios	Roll Number
Alten Road	1:3 under-1-year-olds	under 2 yrs 24
	1:4 1-2-year-olds	
	1:8 2-3-year-olds	over 2 years 15
Symonds Street	Between 1: 7 & 1:9 over 2's	over 2 years 36
Park Ave Infant & Toddler	1:3 under-1-year-olds	under 2 yrs 25
	1:4 1-2-year-olds	
	1:8 2-3-year-olds	over 2 years 10
Park Ave Childcare	Between 1:7 & 1:9 over 2's	over 2 years 50
Te Puna Kōhungahunga	3:10 under 2's	under 2 yrs 10
	4:35 over 2's	over 2 years 35
Hineteiwaiwa Kōhanga Reo	Not clear from information received	under 2 yrs 5
		over 2 years 20
Epsom Childcare	Not clear from information received	under 2 yrs 8
		over 2 years 17

## 1.2 Qualifications

Research has shown a clear correlation between levels of teacher education and quality outcomes for children. The New Zealand Government's 10-year strategic plan stipulates that all education and care centres would employ registered teachers for at least 50% of regulated staffing positions by 2007 and by 2012 all regulated staff in teacher-led ECE services will be fully or provisionally registered.

Findings from the responses by New Zealand universities to the benchmarking survey and from a separate benchmarking study of ECE provision in New Zealand universities carried out by Victoria University, indicated that:

- Victoria University is the exemplar with all regulated teachers qualified and registered;
- Others are working towards 100% (e.g. Waikato); and

- The University of Auckland appears to have the lowest proportion of qualified staff although meeting the current regulations of 50%.

The University of Auckland ECE Management Plan 2008 Business Plan notes that:

*“Sourcing trained teachers in Auckland is very hard with at least 150 full time positions available. A consequence of this demand has been the soaring costs of employing trained staff. This looks like remaining a short to medium term problem.”*

Nearly all survey respondents with children currently attending an ECE centre and/or who envisage they may require ECE in the future rate having qualified teachers as *highly important* or *important*. Distribution of respondents is as follows:

<b>Importance of qualified ECE Teachers</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	48	21	2	0
A non-University ECE Centre only	48	10	1	0

<b>Importance of qualified ECE Teachers</b>				
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	22	8	1	1
31 - 40	81	27	3	0
41 -50	28	13	3	0
51 and over	22	2	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>

In addition to being qualified, high importance was placed by survey respondents to teachers being warm and nurturing as shown in the following tables:

<b>Importance of warm and nurturing teachers</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	66	4	0	0
A non-University ECE Centre only	57	2	0	0

<b>Importance of warm and nurturing teachers</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	31	1	-	-
31 - 40	0	105	6	-	-
41 -50	1	39	4	-	-
51 and over	0	25	1	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

### 1.3 Professional Development

Access for all ECE teachers to professional development is an important factor in the provision of quality ECE. All respondents to the benchmarking survey noted there is a commitment to the ongoing professional development of their staff. In addition to opportunities for individual staff development, some universities report having designated days for centre professional development. Others mentioned taking advantage of university academics to assist with professional development and/or taking advantage of opportunities available to university staff where applicable.

Some universities/centres also reported having designated staff development days for centre professional development (e.g. University of Auckland Epsom Avenue Early Childhood Centre, Massey, Victoria, Melbourne and Nottingham):

*“3 staff only days per year plus PD required for all teachers; well supported by each centre. Formal and Informal PD. Staff are registered so PD a essential component.”* (Victoria)

*“Close services for two PD and planning days during non teaching time.”* (Melbourne)

The University of Melbourne also mentioned making use of university ECE academics to assist with professional development. Others mentioned the option for staff to also take advantage of professional development opportunities offered by the university relevant to their own development or to appropriate university initiatives:

*“Waite has a focus on sustainable living so staff are currently receiving additional PD in this area.”* (Adelaide University)

Respondents from Auckland ECE centres to the benchmarking exercise made the following comments in relation to the provision of professional development opportunities:

*“[Opportunities for professional development are] strongly encouraged by ECE management. ECE management are informed and approve payment. For larger conferences and conventions, supervisors forward interested people’s names to ECE management and approval given by Student Admin as courses usually include accommodation and travel.”* (ECE management)

*“Staff can choose courses to line in with goals identified through appraisal. Whole centre professional development [opportunities] and support for further study.”* (Epsom Ave Childcare Centre)

*“All staff set goals in their development review and are encouraged to attend workshops that are considered to be helpful for overall planning for tamariki and staff development.”* (Te Puna Kōhungahunga)



The survey did not ask a specific question relating to opportunities for professional development; however one respondent observed:

*“When I visited in 2004 there seemed to be a lot of very young staff (as opposed to a mix of old and young) and no real emphasis on staff training or retention in order that staff and good staff at that were retained. Nothing I have seen or heard since has convinced me that the things have improved.”* (Parent who took child to an alternative centre but will be soon requiring childcare for next child)

#### 1.4 Access to non-contact and meeting time

The NZCER 2007 survey found access to non-contact time and meeting time were important components of employment conditions. Work most frequently completed in non-contact time includes assessment, planning, evaluation. This was followed by discussing work with other teachers, collecting data and working on documentation, preparing resources and administration.

The University of Waikato appears to be an exemplar in that it has a programme release team. In addition to providing specialised programmes for children, this team enables each centre to hold a weekly meeting during normal working hours.

A specific question on non-contact time was not included in the benchmarking survey, however respondents noted staff meeting time varied from once a month to once a week. These meetings are often out of normal working hours and either paid or with time in lieu.

Respondents from Auckland ECE centres to the benchmarking exercise said about the provision of meeting time:

*“Collective encourages 72 hours paid per year. ECE management encourages fortnightly meetings of up to 2 hours. Staff paid 2 half-days of teacher only time per year.”* (ECE management)

*“Staff meetings are held outside working time and the contract states that all teachers will attend meetings.”* (Epsom Ave Childcare Centre)

*“Weekly hui kaiako Paid for: In-training and untrained teachers with time in lieu. Trained staff have time built into salaries.”* (Te Puna Kōhungahunga)

#### 1.5 Staff stability

Staff stability in ECE centres is important for young children who require secure relationships, as a high staff turnover has been shown to affect quality outcomes for children. It is also expensive in terms of recruitment costs.

The NZCER 2007 survey found staff turnover in New Zealand ECE centres was exceptionally high. A number of respondents to the benchmarking survey also noted the difficulty in finding registered teachers and maintaining staffing levels. However, the University of Melbourne noted that providing better pay and conditions than many in the sector had led to low staff turnover.

While a specific question related to salaries or turnover of ECE staff was not asked in this survey, the general comment section elicited many responses indicating this was of concern:

*“... there seem to be a lot of relieving or temporary staff in this part of the crèche, and I never know from one day to the next who will be attending my child, or whether I will have even seen them before. I don't like this, as it is important for the staff to know my child and for her to feel bonded to them.”*

*“I would have reservations in recommending the centre due to the high staff turnover.”*

Reasons attributed to difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified ECE teachers included the shortage of trained staff in the Auckland area, the poor physical conditions in which to work (other than Kōhanga Reo and Te Kupenga), and the rate of pay:

*“... I am certain that the rates of teacher's pay is well below average by current industry standards and am sure that this is the major factor hindering staff recruitment and retention. I am also concerned by the lack of support teachers receive to help them achieve their training and professional development goals. Children's portfolios are not at all up to date due to constantly changing staff and overuse of relievers who are strangers to the children. Children's sense of emotional wellbeing is negatively affected by this.”*

*“The hospital crèche pays their staff more and they all leave to go there - there is too much competition.”*

*“The University should be able to offer quality and subsidised childcare to staff as part of the benefits package, similar to current practices in Australian Universities. This could help staff retention and make the University a more attractive place to work by making the employment offer more competitive.”*

A submission from three academic staff members specialising in Early Childhood Education in the Faculty of Education makes the point that “quality early childhood centres attract quality early childhood teaching staff, and in turn attract researchers”.

## **2. Parents**

A key initiative of the New Zealand government strategy has been towards greater empowerment of parents and whānau to be involved in their children's early learning. While there were differing interpretations of the benchmark survey asking about provision for parents in University ECE centres, most described welcoming parents into the centre. Some explicitly encouraged the involvement of parents on their website and/or organised special activities for family gatherings. An innovative way of involving parents was described by the University of British Columbia which enabled parents to bridge staff: child ratios at the beginning or end of the day for a small fee reduction.

A number of questions in this survey related to parental involvement. The factor carrying the most importance to respondents was good communication between parents and teachers. All current ECE users rated this to be *very important* (110) or *important* (20) and all but one of those who envisage that they may require ECE in the future said it was *very important* (175) or *important* (37).

Most parents/caregivers either currently using ECE centres and/or who envisage using them in the future rated being involved in the planning of their children's learning to be *very important* or *important*. Distribution of these respondents is shown in the following tables:

<b>Importance of being involved in the planning of your children's learning</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	22	28	19	1
A non-University ECE Centre only	23	20	14	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>

<b>Importance of being involved in the planning of your children's learning</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	15	14	3	0
31 - 40	0	41	47	22	1
41 -50	2	11	16	15	0
51 and over	0	16	7	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1</b>

In relation to wanting to teach their own child and being involved in running the service the responses were more variable as shown in the following tables:

<b>Importance of parents/whanau teaching their own child</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	14	17	20	19
A non-University ECE Centre only	8	11	18	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>

<b>Importance of parents/whanau teaching their own child</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	7	16	5	4
31 - 40	3	14	31	34	29
41 -50	3	4	11	10	16
51 and over	2	7	9	4	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>53</b>

<b>Importance of Parents/whanau involvement in running the service</b> e.g. committees, parent help				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	13	21	28	9
A non-University ECE Centre only	12	18	20	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>Importance of Parents/whanau involvement in running the service</b> e.g. committees, parent help					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	13	9	7	3
31 - 40	1	19	39	46	6
41 -50	1	10	13	13	7
51 and over	1	12	10	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>17</b>

### 3 Accessibility

Issues relating to accessibility include affordability, hours of operation, waiting lists and location.

#### 3.1 Affordability

A number of national surveys in New Zealand have found cost to be the biggest barrier to accessing ECE care and this impacts on participation in work, education and training, particularly for women.

The expense of childcare was also highlighted in the *Women Returning to Work* survey responses with a resulting recommendation that the feasibility of deducting childcare fees from parents' and caregivers' salaries before tax be explored.

A government strategy to address issues related to affordability has been the introduction of 20 hours' free ECE for 3- and 4-year-olds attending teacher-led services. All New Zealand universities have decided to participate in this option, but some commented in the benchmarking survey that while it has been welcomed by parents the funding does not meet the operating costs of the service. This is also noted in The University of Auckland's ECE Management 2008 Business Plan.

#### 3.2 Rates

Information received from six New Zealand universities in the ECE benchmarking survey found average charges (without considering deductions for more than one family member, 20 hours free hours' childcare subsidy for 3- and 4-year-olds and WINZ subsidies which are available to some parents/caregivers) to be as follows:

1. Centres charging a flat rate for staff and students:

Weekly

\$133 - \$250 for under-2-year-olds with the average rate being \$175.61

\$123 - \$235 for over-2-year-olds with the average rate being \$148.01

Daily

\$33 - \$48.50 for under-2-year-olds with the average rate being \$36.83

\$30 - \$45.00 for over-2-year-olds with the average rate being \$33.85

2. Average rates for staff and community in centres with separate charges from students are:

Weekly

\$189.52 for under-2-year-olds

\$174.05 for over-2 year olds

Daily

\$41.78 for under-2-year-olds

\$38.52 for over-2-year-olds

The actual rates charged at Auckland centres are as follows:

Centres	Cater for children of	Weekly Cost		Daily Cost		Sessional Cost	
		under 2	over 2	under 2	over 2	under 2	over 2
Alten Road, Symonds Street, Park Avenue*	Students	\$175	\$165	\$37.50	\$35	\$18.00 (4 hrs)	\$17.50 (4 hrs)
	Staff	\$220	\$203.50	\$46.50	\$42.00	\$28.00 (4 hrs)	\$25.50 (4 hrs)
	Community						
Epsom Early Childhood Centre	Student	\$172.50	\$155.10	\$36.22	\$32.55		
	Staff	\$212.50	\$195.80	\$44.62	\$41.11		
	Community						
Te Puna Kōhungahunga	Student						
	Staff	\$133	\$123				
	Community						
Hineteiwaiwa Te Kōhanga Reo	Student	\$140	\$130				
	Staff	\$150	\$140				
	Community						

\*Park Avenue charges an additional \$2.50 for food per day

In response to the characteristics respondents look for in a good ECE Kōhanga Reo, most current users and/or those who envisage using a centre in the future said affordability was *very important* or *important*. Distribution of these respondents is shown in the following tables:

I can afford the cost of the ECE Centre/Kōhanga				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	35	28	8	0
A non University ECE Centre only	27	24	5	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>

I can afford the cost of the ECE Centre/Kōhanga					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	-	15	14	2	1
31 - 40	-	58	42	9	2
41 -50	-	19	17	7	1
51 and over	-	10	13	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4</b>

The issue of affordability was raised in the submission made by the Pacific Reference Group (PRG):

*“The issue of affordability is critical and will impact highly on Pacific staff members (both general and academic) who are mostly employed at lower salary scales at this University raising the issue of accessibility for all groups.”*

A large number of the open-ended responses referred to issues of affordability:

*“Affordability, comparing with Kindcare, the University day care has much worse facilities and is charging even more than that. Two children here you have 5% discount, Kindcare are doing 10%, they still can make money as a commercial centre.*

*“It would be nice if all centres could have the facility of providing food. This would take a lot of pressure off the parents to pack a lot of lunch boxes, especially for toddlers. There are centres outside the University which provide food and nappies at the same cost that the University takes. This makes the University centre more expensive.”*

### **Subsidies**

The University of Melbourne’s 2005 child care needs analysis report includes an analysis of how other organisations, in particular universities, are dealing with child care issues including subsidies:

*“Worldwide there is an understanding that child care is a critical issue for universities, their staff and their students. The rationale is the same; for universities wanting to attract the best and meet contemporary equal opportunity requirements; child care is seen as fundamental.”*

A few respondents to the benchmarking survey also mentioned their university was providing some level of subsidy to enhance affordability:

*“Financial support is provided, particularly to the student crèches, to keep fees at as manageable level as possible, yet still provide excellent staff: child ratios of qualified teachers.” (Victoria)*

*“The university does have an established practice of providing support for the provision of a university-affiliated community based childcare service (in effect a ‘preferred provider’) to meet the needs of both staff and students. This support includes the provision of rent free buildings for the service and a significant annual grant to assist with the service. Their support equate to over 7.5% of the revenue for the provider.” (Otago)*

*“Here the University provides annual funding to Children’s Services. This covers some of the additional costs of having staff directly employed by the University and covered under the Higher Education Workers award and Enterprise Agreement. Our pay rates are higher than in the community or for-profit early childhood sectors. Funding also enables us to charge lower fees for students, and they can also access a shorter year.” (Melbourne)*

In response to the survey question asking if the University ECE centres should be run on a full cost-recovery basis or subsidised by the University:

- 250 think ECE services should be subsidised by the University;
- 38 think it should be run on full cost recovery; and
- 4 did not respond.

*“... UoA provides other services to make people’s working and studying lives easier (e.g. parking, tea rooms, rec centre, food/coffee, pharmacy, bank, etc.) Childcare is the biggest single expense/source of*

*stress I have encountered in my working life and it is essential that the university continue to provide a high-quality service that is convenient for staff and students. As childcare tends to be the concern of students and younger (therefore less senior) staff it can be hard for these groups to have an adequate voice within the university.”*

*“Get the tax issue sorted out. If Westpac can arrange for salary sacrifice then so can the University which has known this for well over a year. ... As part of the drive to improve the quality of the ECE centres, the ECE centres should not be in effect paying the University ‘rent’ for their premises.”*

The Human Resources submission states that “providing a salary sacrifice scheme would be an additional benefit to staff and this option is currently being explored”.

The Pacific Reference Group submission specifically recommends:

*“That the fees of using childcare centres are reviewed and consideration be given to subsidising the cost of childcare as is currently possible for car parking”.*

### 3.3 Hours of operation

Another issue relating to accessibility involves the number of hours available to parents and whether that amount of time will meet their needs.

A number of New Zealand studies, including The University of Auckland’s *Women Returning to Work* project have found there is often a mismatch between the hours the ECE centre is offering and the hours required by the parents.

Responses to the benchmarking survey show the earliest opening time for a university ECE centre to be 7.30am with others not opening until 8am or even 8.30am. Within New Zealand, the majority of centres close at 5.15pm or 5.30pm, with the exception of the Canterbury College of Education centre (Te Ao Tamariki) which closes at 5.45pm. Two centres reported that they provide extended hours for students if required.

The majority of ECE centres in the benchmarked Australian universities close at 6pm. The centre providing the longest hours will be one currently under construction at Monash University. This centre will be open from 6.30am until 6.30pm.

University of Auckland current operating hours as provided by the respondents to the benchmarking survey are as follows:

Alten Road	7.45am – 5.15pm
Symonds Street	7.45am – 5.15pm
Hineteiwaiwa Kōhanga Reo	8.30am – 5.00pm
Park Ave infant & toddler	7.30am – 5.15pm
Park Ave Childcare	7.30am – 5.15pm
Epsom Ave Early Childhood Centre	7.45am – 5.30pm
Te Puna Kōhungahunga	8.00am – 5.00pm

The importance of hours available being an important characteristic in a good ECE service was asked in the survey. Distribution of these respondents is as follows:

Importance of hours available				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	48	20	3	0
A non-University ECE Centre only	41	14	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

Importance of hours available					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	1	19	9	3	-
31 - 40	0	76	32	3	-
41 -50	0	27	15	2	-
51 and over	0	17	9	0	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>-</b>

A large number of the open-ended responses referred to hours as an issue and all but one expressed a desire or need for longer opening hours.

*“The opening hours do not reflect lecture times, slightly earlier and later opening times would be desirable especially for staff who cannot turn up to 8am lectures late.”* (Academic staff member with a child currently at University centre)

*“My main concern is that the centre is only open until 5pm, yet the University increasingly expects that teaching will continue until 6pm. This creates great inconvenience.”* (Academic staff member with a child currently at University centre)

*“The hours of opening are far too short for academic staff and give you no flexibility. I miss early morning and late afternoon meetings. I cannot attend all of senate because the crèche shuts at 5.15.”* (Academic staff member with a child currently at University centre)

*“Hours need to reflect academic schedule, e.g. I’ve had to miss graduation before when Uni ECE was to close before the ceremony would have finished. If teaching at 8 am, need time to drop and settle children, move & park car, get to the lecture ... and not be screeching in with seconds to go.”* (Academic staff member with a child currently at University centre)

*“...the paid leave of 9 weeks should be extended to 12 weeks, the age at which babies are accepted at crèche (otherwise there is a mis-match between the two, potentially causing problems)”*. (Academic staff member)

While there would be implications in terms of staff costs and working conditions, and the management of working hours if current ECE centre hours were extended, the resulting benefits are likely to outweigh these factors.

The provision of fulltime versus part-time options is also an important consideration. Staff are likely to require full-time care given the nature of their working week whereas



students may be looking for shorter term care to cover lectures and tutorials. Most universities included in the benchmarking exercise offer full day and sessional care options with sessions usually being either four or five hours long.

### 3.4 Waiting lists

The length of waiting lists has a great bearing on accessibility for childcare. Several New Zealand university respondents to the benchmarking exercise mentioned long waiting lists with one saying that some children will never get a place.

The length of waiting lists was also noted by the benchmarking respondents from overseas universities with a number advising that for under-2 places children need to be enrolled at birth.

While the 2007 NZCER national survey of ECE services found that more services (than in 2003) were open for 40 or more hours per week, the report noted:

*“There is still some mismatch between the hours that ECE services are offering and the ECE services that are available and the needs of families. .... In this survey 24% of parents reported that their child was using more than one ECE service.” (Mitchell 2008)*

The report also noted that the survey only covered parents currently using ECE and so parents’ real needs will be understated.

More specifically, the *Women Returning to Work* project found the hours of operation for ECE centres on campus did not always fit in with hours of work. A Draft Timetable Policy currently under consideration at the University may also impact on the need to review operational hours of the ECE centres. It is important to note however that the provision of longer hours does not necessarily mean longer hours for children.

Most respondents rated the importance of short waiting lists to be either *very important* or *important*, particularly for those who envisaged using an ECE facility in the future. Of those who responded to this question, 86% said it was *very important* and 74% said it was *important*.

The 2008 ECE Management Plan states:

*“There is substantial demand for space for children under 2 years of age and we are unable to meet this. We have large waiting lists for this age group and could do with additional space. This could be combined with some redevelopment of the existing main campus services.”*

There is no waiting list at Hineteiwaiwa Kōhanga Reo or for part-time places at Te Puna Kōhungahunga. The waiting lists at other centres appear to be between one and four months as shown in the following table:

Centre	Length of waiting list
Alten Road	2-3 months for under 2's
Symonds Street	Up to 4 months, chn usually move up from Alten Road
Park Ave infant & toddler	2-3 months for under 2's
Park Ave Childcare	1 – 2 months, chn usually move up from infant centre
Epsom Ave	Already have 10 for 2009

Open-ended responses indicate a strong perception of long waiting lists.

*“Also the number of places in the ECE centres is too few, staff members cannot get places in the crèche, waiting times are simply too long.”* (Academic Staff member child currently attending a University centre)

*“Facilities at Alten Road need to be improved. I know of people who had trouble getting their children into the centre due to lack of space.”* (Academic staff member with child attending a University centre)

*“Our son was on the waiting list for almost 9 months and we didn't know whether he had been given a place until 2 weeks before I was due to go back to work. Clearly the demand is there but the number of places available is insufficient.”* (General staff member child currently attending a University)

*“It seems crazy that there is only space for 9 babies, for instance, at the whole city campus.”* (Undergraduate student child currently attending a UOA centre)

*“I would warn [others] to register the second they work out they are pregnant as the facilities are primarily for students (i.e. staff are not given preference, it is first come first served) and there are insufficient facilities for the level of demand.”* (General staff member child currently attending a University centre)

While some parents chose alternative types of care, such as play centre, a number of respondents said they had no choice but to use an alternative centre because of long waiting lists at the University. Parents/caregivers are then faced with a major decision whether to move the child when a place became available. Changing centres is often a big transition with both the child and the family needing to form new relationships:

*“... the waiting list was too long and I couldn't get in, in the timescale which I had to start work here at the University. The waiting list has also stopped me from applying for other part time jobs at the University which were more hours.”* (General staff member child currently attending alternative centre)

*“As a relatively new staff member, it would be impossible for my child to access these services. Given the waiting lists are well over a year, this is not feasible for new staff members.”* (Child currently attending alternative centre)

*“I've been waiting for more than a year for my child to have a place and I've been looking at jobs closer to home so that I can place my little one in a decent day care (at least they can advise when places are available!!!)”* (General staff member child at alternative centre)

*“I tried at first to get my daughter into the Faculty ECE service but they made it so difficult for me and made me wait so long before I could get clarity on whether they had space and what days she could be there, I gave up and enrolled her at another ECE centre.... The [ECE] centre was determined to put the interests of part time students before mine when I was needing full time care for my [child].”* (General staff member child previously attending an alternative centre)

A submission from three academic staff members in the Faculty of Education specialising in Early Childhood Education included a specific point relating to the current waiting list situation in relation to The University of Auckland's Strategic Plan:

*Objective Four and Five: "In order to promote The University of Auckland to post-graduate students and quality researchers (nationally and internationally), who are more likely to have children than are undergraduate students, the provision of sufficient placements for children under five in quality early childhood centres is essential. Currently waiting lists prohibit the use of early childhood education provision in marketing".*

Many universities advertise their childcare facilities as recruitment incentives. In advertising and thus implicitly promising the provision of childcare facilities, the reality of often long waiting lists means universities may be opening themselves up to potential legal liability.

### 3.5 Location

For some parents, accessibility means childcare being available near the home but for others it is important it is near the place of work. If parents are to have a reasonable opportunity to be involved in their children's learning, proximity to the ECE centre from their place of work/study will be essential.

There has been a trend to increasing workplace ECE centres as they are no longer seen as an expensive liability but an element of competitive advantage through being a family supportive company.

A number of studies have found on-site quality childcare to be an important factor in:

- the decision to join a company;
- the increase in employee morale and productivity through worrying less about children's safety and well-being; and
- lower absenteeism and reduced turnover.

Given the demand for quality ECE places it cannot be assumed that families will be able to access quality centres near their home or the campus where they work/study. The University of Auckland ECE Management 2008 Business Plan includes a section on Market Share and notes:

*"Within the Auckland City area there are 334 services providing early childhood care. Of these, 236 are educational and care facilities similar to that operated by The University of Auckland. Of these, only 13 are within the CBD and a number of these are corporate sites just for the employees of the organisations e.g. TVNZ Educare".*

The Human Resources submission to the strategic review also notes that:

*"Salary sacrificing arrangements and exemption from the Fringe Benefit Tax on the provision of childcare are only available where the centres are on land owned by the University and controlled by the University."*

The *Women Returning to Work* project found proximity to the University to be one of the valued qualities of the University ECE services.

Of the 56 respondents who are primary caregivers and have preschool children who currently attend a non-University ECE centre (and who don't have children also attending a University ECE centre):

- 29 said it was very important to be in easy access;
- 15 said it was important;
- 9 said a bit important; and
- 6 said not at all important.

Of the respondents who envisaged they may use an ECE facility in the future, most felt that it was either *very important* or *important* to be in easy contact with their child. Distribution of the responses is shown in the following table:

<b>Importance of being in easy contact with my child during the day</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	14	13	5	0
31 - 40	0	56	35	16	4
41 -50	1	23	13	7	0
51 and over	1	16	6	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>6</b>

The submission from the three Early Childhood Education specialists included reference to Objective 14 and 15 in The University's Strategic Plan and stating:

*"When lecturers, general staff and students know their children are close by in a professional early childhood care and education environment they are more likely to reach their employment potential."*

This was confirmed by a large number of responses to the open-ended section of the survey:

*"[The campus] location makes it very convenient especially for students with busy schedules."*

*"I was pleased to have my children close to my workplace during the day, rather than in day-care at an outlying suburb."*

*"It is very convenient to visit your child whenever you can; the open door policy is great."*

For some, the convenience related particularly to being able to continue breastfeeding:

*"Because the centre is very close to the Department where I work, I was able to continue breast-feeding my daughter."*

*"... it is close enough to my work at the city campus that I could continue to visit and breastfeed (we lasted till 20 months breastfeeding partly because of this!). The staff are supportive of parents visiting."*

*"I use the Alten Road Centre; however it is 10-15 minutes' walk from my building. This is an issue with lunchtime breastfeeding visits. It*

*would be good if there was more than one centre on city campus that had under-2's."*

One respondent said location was a critical factor in her choice of workplace:

*"As a mother of a pre-schooler, the provision of affordable, good quality childcare is the deciding factor in whether or not I can work at a given site. It probably is for most working mothers of pre-schoolers."*

For a few, an ECE centre closer to their home was more convenient and in some cases, cheaper, with one respondent citing a shared care arrangement with the children's father.

For some, the current location of University ECE centres was not ideal. In addition to concerns related to physical aspects of current locations, a number of respondents reported having to travel quite some distance to get from work to the centre their child was attending.

The issue of parking availability for parents/caregivers was raised in *Women Returning to Work* and appeared again in this survey:

*"Most childcare centres on campus are located in places that make dropping off and collecting kids unsafe and awkward at peak times."*

*"Car parking is a major issue at both Alten Road and Symonds Street - at peak times they are congested with no other recourse for parents picking but to park on the sidewalks. Students also use the Symonds Street car parks to wait for their friends which is highly annoying."*

*"The access for parents to drop off children and pick up children [at Hineteiwaiwa Kōhanga Reo]. Currently with the bar down behind the wharekai I have noticed that parents or guardians without access to the gate must park at the top of the drive and walk down to pick up the children. Can be very hard when you have to carry a car seat, lunch box, bag or even if the child is still waking from an afternoon nap."*

*"The issue of transport is also an issue for us as the university parking rates are steep, and we do not wish to take little ones on the bus every day."*

The lack of ECE facilities at the Tamaki Campus was discussed at all of the campus meetings and provoked a large number of as it did in the *Women Returning to Work* project:

*"Desperately need a facility in Tamaki campus, especially as they offer post-graduate programmes so students and staff require childcare services given this demography."*

*It is a long felt need to have a ECE centre for Tamaki Campus. In a way the Tamaki staff is deprived of having this facility in the University system. We strongly recommend have a ECE CENTRE at Tamaki campus as soon as possible. Often I have to travel 30kms back to pick up my sick child in the middle of the day and very nervous about his wellbeing within the rest of the day. Having ECE facility at Tamaki relieves many parents like me tremendously."*

*“Tamaki Campus urgently needs to be assured that an ECE facility is being established on campus and the expected timeline i.e.: when it will be available to staff and students. The lack of ECE provision has for too long been a source of inequity and cause for discontent to the campus community. Too many staff members have had babies while working here and these babies are already school age and there is still no ECE centre.”*

#### **4 Physical environment**

Physical environment has a significant impact on quality. Licensing requirements require a minimum amount of space that must be provided for each child at a centre both indoors and outdoors. While all respondents to the benchmarking survey meet legal requirements, space in relation to either the inside or outside areas was identified as problematic for many centres. Some attributed this to inner city locations where space is more restricted.

The three buildings developed to accommodate the move from Wynyard Street are low-cost given they were originally intended to be temporary until relocation into a purpose-built facility in the new Business School, however this did not proceed. The ECE Management’s 2008 Business Plan states:

*“All facilities have benefited from substantial capital improvements over the years since the relocation from Wynyard Street and this programme continues through internal generation of funds. Maintaining the facilities in a competitive environment is imperative to their ongoing viability.”*

The plan says both Symonds Street and the Park Avenue Infant and Toddler Centre are in less than ideal locations. One of the reasons given is that parents have to change location once their child turns 3, “it would be preferable to have the centres adjacent so children from 0 – 5 could be catered for on the same site (as with Park Avenue)”.

Issues related to the physical environment at University centres were raised by participants at each of the campus meetings. Key recommendations arising from these are:

- Upgrade ECE facilities and address inadequacies caused by temporary locations;
- Incorporate provision of sustainable world-class ECE centres into university planning (at each campus);
- Consideration of mixed aged centres to reduce the need for child transitions into other centres with other teachers etc.

A large number of open-ended responses to the survey also referred to concerns about physical aspects of the centres:

*“... the facilities are horrible (Epsom Ave). I find it ridiculous that the ECE at the Faculty of Education should be in such need of major renovations.”*

*“The University can’t possibly retain staff and be a class A university internationally if it is failing to meet the needs of its staff and is providing substandard ECE centres. The ECE centres in Grafton were not built to be ECE centres and consequently are ill-equipped...”*

*“The building at Alten Road is also far from suitable for an early childhood centre and creates a number of unnecessary difficulties for staff.”*

*“... in recommending both Symonds Street and Alten Road I would warn others that there are a few negatives: particularly the lack of space at the Alten Road centre for the 1-2 year age group. These children have to play, eat, paint etc. and have organised mat activities in a very small room, which is also a major thoroughfare into and out of the centre.”*

*“[It is] completely inappropriate to put small children adjacent to fumes and pollution from such a busy traffic route.”*

*“I do not think that the physical building and surrounding premises are suitable for raising my child there. ... Issues related to air ventilation, painting, double glazing windows and the presence of PVC materials needs to be addressed and solved.”*

Several respondents had removed their children from University centres after the relocation:

*“Inconvenient to get from Park Road to University campus, did not like air quality of Symonds street facility.”*

Some chose not to enrol their children at a University centre:

*“We have chosen not to send our child to The University of Auckland ECE or Kōhanga Reo because it does not currently seem to offer a quality education service. The service provided is VITAL and would attract more staff/students as well as retaining them.”*

In addition to providing a quality environment for children and ECE teachers, private space for adults to talk is among the factors regarded as supportive conditions.

Respondents to the benchmarking survey were asked to comment on the facilities for the ECE staff and parents. Their responses suggested good staff facilities might include:

- Separate office(s);
- Staff room, with comfortable chairs, kitchen and, in one centre, a TV;
- Easy access to computers for staff (including lap top) and internet connections;
- Library with in-centre resources;
- Shower; and
- Meeting space and adult furniture.

In response to facilities provided for parents, a centre at Victoria would appear to be the exemplar as it appears to be the only one with dedicated space for parents/whanau:

*“Parent’s room for crèche parents/children to use to catch up on study or have tea/coffee and enjoy a few moments peace and quiet.”*

Some centres with good staff facilities also allow parents to use the space and most of the others mentioned having a couch or other adult furniture parents could use.

### Mixed age groups

An aspect of the physical environment is whether the centre has been designed for mixed age groups and/or a mix of full day and sessional options. Many centres have mixed age groups but provide separate areas for under-2-year-olds and over-2-year-olds, while other centres have children together in one space.

A specific question relating to mixed or separate age grouping was not asked in this survey; however it is clear that a number of universities have arrangements like Park Avenue where there are separate but adjacent buildings for these groups.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of children being in centres specialising for specific age groups and in centres with mixed age groups.

Some indicated mixed age groups were very important:

*“I also know how [my children] benefited from being in a mix aged crèche and as they grew older very much enjoyed the opportunity to help the teachers with the younger children. This role-modelling for nurturing is important especially where some children will not have the experience of siblings.”*

Most respondents with children at a University centre or an alternative centre preferred children to be in centres specialising in specific age groups. The same findings were true of respondents who envisage they may use a centre in the future as shown in the tables below:

<b>Importance of ECE centre specialising for specific age groups</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	31	27	9	4
A non-University ECE Centre only	31	19	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>

<b>Importance of ECE centre specialising for specific age groups</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	5	20	6	1
31 - 40	0	52	33	13	13
41 -50	0	13	16	7	8
51 and over	1	10	6	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>

The following tables show there was less support for children to be in centres with mixed age groups:

<b>Importance of children being in centres with mixed age groups</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	6	24	19	22
A non-University ECE Centre only	7	15	18	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>41</b>



<b>Importance of children being in centres with mixed age groups</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	0	4	12	7	9
31 - 40	1	11	39	32	28
41 -50	0	9	10	18	7
51 and over	0	5	12	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>

Nearly all the respondents indicated that a small number of children in a group was a *very important* or *important* factor as shown in the following tables:

<b>Importance of small number of children in a group</b>				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	31	31	8	1
A non-University ECE Centre only	31	23	3	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>

<b>Importance of small number of children in a group</b>					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	-	13	10	7	2
31 - 40	-	51	46	9	5
41 -50	-	24	13	6	1
51 and over	-	17	7	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>

One commented they had chosen an alternative centre partly due to the large numbers at the University centre:

*“The Alten Road under-2 centre was initially our first choice because my son would be close to me during work hours. After seeing the centre and talking to other staff members who had had kids there we decided it was not a good option. Because they cater for students and staff babies fulltime and in short sessions the environment is unstable. Also they have a large number of children.”*

### **Resources**

Nearly all respondents who currently attend an ECE centre or envisage doing so in the future indicated that a well-resourced centre was *very important* or *important*.

Distribution of these respondents is as follows:

<b>Importance of being well resourced</b> (e.g. playgroup equipment, books art supplies etc)				
Respondents who currently have a child attending ECE	very important	important	a bit important	not important
University ECE centre	47	23	1	-
A non-University ECE Centre	46	13	0	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	

<b>Importance of being well resourced</b> (e.g. playgroup equipment, books art supplies etc)					
Respondents who envisage using an ECE centre in the future	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
under 30	-	23	8	0	1
31 - 40	-	68	41	2	0
41 -50	-	29	14	1	0
51 and over	-	18	6	2	0
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>138</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

Some respondents commented on resourcing in University centres:

*"I don't think the centres are adequately funded because they seem to be rather under-resourced in the way of security measures, musical equipment, furniture, good quality books and puzzles and mathematical/literacy resources."*

*"I would like to see more investment from the university in terms of buildings, playgrounds, toys and equipment."*

*"[The University ECE centre] didn't match our standard which we want for our child. The centre chosen... has a very high standard ECE, highly qualified teachers, good ratio of teacher: child, providing food (vegetarian), high health and safety standard, very clean, responsible and caring teachers, loving atmosphere, very good equipped with toys, books, etc. (all in very good condition)."*

One respondent raised concerns about age-appropriate equipment:

*"Quality and care of facilities [unsatisfactory]. Removed children from University centres at 3 years not adequate facilities and resources for 3 years +; high level of staff turnover; hours of opening too short for work day, 8-5 cf. 7.30-5.30pm elsewhere in Auckland central." (Academic staff member who currently has one child under five and one over five)*

### **Health and safety**

Nearly all respondents rated high standards of health and safety as *very important*.

*"I also appreciate the naturalness of the outdoor area's grass, shrubs, vegetable garden and water feature [Park Ave]. I am very concerned that there are no sensor lights or effective security measures to protect the outdoor area from afterhours use by drug users/homeless/deviants."*

## **5 Ownership, governance and management structures**

Information received from respondents to the benchmarking survey carried out by Victoria University of Wellington (2008) indicates four out of the seven universities (Auckland, Canterbury, Victoria and Lincoln) operate early childhood education centres as internal service units, with the other three respondents (Massey, Otago and Waikato) supporting provision of ECE by separate legal entities.

The separate legal entities include incorporated societies governed by parents, and a charitable trust. In each case these entities are provided financial support by the respective universities by way of rent-free accommodation and some relief from

maintenance/operating expenses. Where the service is internally provided the reporting line for the service unit manager is either to Student services/administration (Auckland, Victoria) or Finance (Lincoln, Canterbury). The level of financial support for internal units was not explicit in the survey.

All seven Auckland ECE centres ultimately report through to the Group Manager Student Administration. There are, however, different management structures in place:

- Alten Road, Symonds Street and the two Park Avenue centres have been managed by an independent early childhood management company (ECE Management Limited) since 2001; and
- Epsom Avenue Early Childhood Centre, Hineteiwaiwa Te Kōhanga Reo and Te Puna Kōhungahunga are each managed by a governance or management committee.

Asked whether ECE centres should be managed internally or externally, of those who indicated a preference, 150 thought they should be internally managed and 41 externally managed. Five respondents did not respond to the question and 96 had no opinion.

Responses to this question according to whether respondents currently have children attending a University centre and, of those who do, what their role is at the University are shown in the following tables:

<b>Should the management of the ECE Centres be internal or external to The University?</b>				
Currently have children attending a UOA centre	No response	No opinion	Internally managed	Externally managed
Not known	0	1	2	0
No	3	66	112	37
Yes	2	29	36	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>41</b>

<b>Type of involvement with UOA</b>	
Not currently working/studying at the UOA	7
undergraduate students	11
post-graduate students	10
academic staff	63
general staff	51
ECE teachers (ECE Centre)	8
ECE teachers (Kōhanga Reo)	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>

The submission from the three Early Childhood Education specialists raised a specific point about management of the centres in regard to specific objectives in the University's Strategic Plan:

*Objective 19: "There needs to be consistency in the governance of all the early childhood facilities across the campuses in order to be consistent with the mission and values of The University of Auckland. To be consistent ... requires educational leadership and internal governance. At the moment not all centres have internal governance."*

A key recommendation arising from Campus meeting discussions was to review management and governance structures to ensure clear accountabilities which are relevant to users of the centres.

An academic staff member with a child now at an alternative centre but formerly at a University centre said:

*“Things deteriorated markedly after the switch from having staff members directly employed to run the Centre to having the external management company “oversee” staff. Staff at the Centre hated it, communication with the parents deteriorated, and it felt like the external company was just into making money, rather than the welfare of the children. There were tangible signs of this, like poorer quality art materials purchases, deterioration of quality of food offered to children.”*

Other responses offered suggestions for management structures and accountabilities:

*“... it is less important whether management is internal or external, so long as the University takes a clear high level responsibility, and that management is accountable to the university. ... there needs to be best practice management, and clear lines of communication between parents and management. A model is required that places ECE provision at a higher and broader level than student services, and acknowledges the importance of ECE to the University's strategic objectives. ... the funding model should not be one that requires the services to recover all costs. The benefits of good ECE provision should be measured at the level of the strategic outcomes of the university, rather than in financial terms within the bounds of ECE.”*

*“... I think a combination is needed, retaining management within the University while making use of appropriate external expertise in childcare centre management.”*

## **6 Recruitment and retention**

An article published in the *Galt Global Review* (Wood 2001) highlights an increase of workplace childcare centres as they move from being seen as an expensive liability to offering a competitive advantage and family friendly organisations. The article refers to a 1997 study conducted by the Graduate School of Management at Simmons College and Bright Horizons which concluded that childcare was an increasingly important issue facing corporations and employers across the United Kingdom.

Studies cited by Wood found the specific advantages in having a family supportive company as:

- Improved recruitment with the availability of childcare on site being found to be an important factor in the decision to join a company;
- Workplace childcare playing a significant role in employee morale and productivity:

*“87% of parents worry less about their children’s safety and well-being with work-site child care. This peace of mind results in higher productivity and job satisfaction.”*

- Lower absenteeism; and
- Reduced turnover.

In 2005, the University of Melbourne conducted a Child Care Needs analysis and the resulting report - *Children, Work and Study* – notes that many universities in Universitas 21 and Go8 also understand the role of providing childcare as part of their goals to family-friendly and, in particular, to attract women both as employees and as students:

*“As the University moves forward, working to achieve its goals of attracting and retaining quality staff, post-graduate students and international students while meeting its equal opportunity obligations and maintaining its ranking as number 1 university in Australia, the number of women in the child rearing age group can be expected to increase. ... The University has experienced a 50% growth in post-graduate students over the last three years. More than half of these students are women and the highest proportion is women in the childrearing age group 25 – 40 years.”*

The rate of growth for academic and general staff women at The University of Auckland is also steadily increasing as shown in the following tables:

<b>Growth rate of academic women at The University of Auckland</b>								
<b>25 – 45 years*</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Academic Women FTE	288.3	301.73	307.45	318.18	329.35	340.96	363.28	371.19
Academic women % of all academic staff	40.12	41.85	41.41	40.93	41.95	42.18	44.43	47.23
Total academic staff FTE	718.67	721.07	742.40	777.33	785.13	808.36	817.63	785.89

\* The age band for data is wider than that used in the Melbourne study.

<b>Growth rate of general staff women at The University of Auckland</b>								
<b>25 – 45 years*</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
General Staff Women FTE	471.48	427.27	472.03	506.61	534.35	583.77	644.04	637.37
General Staff Women % of all general staff	52.21%	58.13%	59.77%	60.12%	60.12%	60.69%	62.17%	61.03%
Total general staff FTE	729.68	743.98	789.69	842.66	888.83	961.88	1035.97	1044.28

\* The age band for data is wider than that used in the Melbourne study.

While specific data for post-graduate and undergraduate women students in the childbearing age group was not available for this report, general trends show an increase in the number of women students:

<b>Growth rate of all Women Students at The University of Auckland</b>								
<b>Students</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Women Students	14,563	15,546	16,648	17,764	23,623	22,839	21,945	22,229
Percentages	51.8	52.8	52.8	53.7	58.3	57.9	57.9	57.7
Total	28,092	29,465	31,502	33,226	40,498	39,420	37,924	38,502

<b>Growth rate of post-graduate women students at The University of Auckland</b>								
<b>Students</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Women PG Students	3362	3629	4059	2547	2670	2732	3084	3290
Percentage	51.3	52.7	52.2	54.1	55.3	57.8	60.1	59.9
Total PG	6,553	6,882	7,782	4,706	4,827	4,728	5,132	5,493

The University is also striving for excellence. Objective 13 in the 2005 – 2012 Strategic Plan includes the objective to “*recruit and retain a high quality staff and student body, striving to create equal opportunities for all those of ability to succeed in a university of high international standing*”. The three formal submissions to the strategic review each made a strong reference to this objective.

The Human Resources Division’s submission explains their strong commitment to Objective 13 and a focus on enabling Auckland to be a world-class place to work. Quality ECE for students and staff on each of the major campuses is considered extremely important towards achieving this objective:

*“The pool of available talent will shrink over the next decade with the increasing pace of baby boomer retirements, continued levels of brain drain and increased competition for staff nationally and internationally.*

*The organisations that will be most successful in attracting and retaining high quality staff are those that offer a value proposition that meets the diverse needs of staff. The organisations that provide benefits and facilities that set them apart from other employers are more likely to have strong employment brands and be more successful at recruiting and retaining engaged and motivated staff.*

*The provision of quality, affordable and flexible Early Childhood Education Centres for the children of staff is a powerful and attractive benefit of working at the University.”*

The submission from the three Early Childhood Education specialists also notes in relation to Objective 7 and Objective 13:

*“There is great competition amongst early childhood teacher education providers for student teacher numbers ... High quality early childhood centres will attract parents to study at The University of Auckland.”*

*“Recruiting and retaining a high quality staff and student body requires equally high quality early childhood education centres ensuring equal educational and employment opportunities for all groups.”*

The Pacific Reference Group's (PRG) submission also draws particular attention to Objective 13 and notes the declining recruitment and retention of Pacific staff at the University as shown in the following table:

<b>Pacific academic and general staff FTE and %</b>		
Year	Pacific academic staff	Pacific general staff
2005	49.5 FTE 2.50%	118.6 FTE 5.00%
2006	49.8 FTE 2.50%	122.1 FTE 5.10%
2007	43.2 FTE 2.30%	107.4 FTE 4.80%

Providing good quality, affordable child care is seen as necessary to address this serious equity issue and to attract and retain early career Pacific women in particular. The PRG also notes that the Pacific population is one of the highest growing populations in this country, together with Māori, and states that *“given the University’s interest to both groups (as in its Strategic Plan 2005 – 2012) it is in its best interest to provide a high quality service capable of meeting their needs”*.

PRG refers specifically to Objective 7 to *“achieve a high quality student body with an annual growth of equivalent full-time students of 1%. This student body to be composed as follows: 78% in undergraduate, 12% in taught post-graduate and 10% in research post-graduate programmes”* and notes:

*“An analysis of the number of students interested in accessing higher education from The University of Auckland shows that school leaver Pacific applications to Auckland have the greatest percentage increase between 2003-2007, i.e. Pacific at 68% compared to Maori at 56%, Asian at 10.2% and Pakeha at 26%.*

*Currently most Pacific staff and student parents at Auckland rely on extended family for childcare. A quick look at the demographics of children who attend University centres illustrates this point.*

*Given that Pacific women have one of the highest fertility rates in New Zealand, the number of Pacific parents and/or grandparents needing childcare facilities when they join the university as staff or students are likely to increase.”*

A key recommendation in the PRG submission is *“that the University investigates ways in which affordable childcare could be incorporated into future Pacific staff and student recruitment and retention strategies”*.

The table below shows how the provision of ECE relates to the attraction of the University as a place to work. The table includes a breakdown of respondents who do not currently have children under 14 but who also think the provision of ECE is very important or important:

<b>Provision of ECE very important or important to be an attractive place to work or study</b>		
	Total number of respondents	Those who are not primary caregivers for children under 14
Not currently at Auckland	21	7
Undergraduate students	23	11
Post-graduate students	16	6
Academic staff	113	33
General staff	90	20
ECE teachers (ECE Centre)	12	7
	<b>275</b>	<b>84</b>

A large number of responses to the open-ended section pointed out the correlation between the provision of quality ECE centres and recruitment and retention of staff and students:

*"We need to ensure that there [are] the facilities to encourage staff to establish their family in Auckland. A facility that is set up for students is not necessarily suitable for staff, especially when the management are totally unsympathetic to staff needs. By catering for staff's families needs you will get content staff who are more productive..."*

*"I am a qualified post-doc who will be leaving at the end of the year permanently and will not be coming back. I feel that the university has failed me. The ECE centres are inadequate and no one is willing to take responsibility for this. I feel as though I have no option but to give up work and stay at home to look after the kids. Furthermore, 5 months ago I returned to work from maternity leave and I would have jumped at the chance to use university facilities to allow me to express milk for my infant. At the time though this was impossible! With the lack of adequate resources from the University it has been too difficult to work with 2 children in the ECE centres.... If the University is serious in wanting to retain qualified staff - women returning to work, then some serious changes have to be made."*

*"You can't work effectively if you're uncertain or unhappy with the care your children are receiving. Provision of these facilities the sign of a good employer who treats their employees right."*

*"Being able to have [my child] on campus made a significant difference to the timely completion of my PhD and my progress as junior faculty."*

*"A good quality Kōhanga Reo would be an incredibly important part of my decision to return to The University of Auckland as a student (or staff member). I believe the University must be committed to providing a Kōhanga Reo of a high quality with strong workers, good structures and a commitment to health and safety. It is vital that as a parent I can trust my child's cultural, emotional and physical needs are being met appropriately."*



*“The university must be sensitive to the parenting responsibilities of Pacific students and staff by acknowledging the barriers they face to achieving higher education success. Having affordable and easily accessible (proximity wise) childcare facilities can help overcome some of these barriers.”*

Prospective students and staff must have easy access to information about available facilities and know that they are of quality. With the exception of Te Puna Kōhungahunga, the University has minimal information available on of ECE. At the time of the benchmarking study only the names of centres, hours and contact details were provided.

Superior university ECE centre websites include details and pictures of centres, enrolment and waiting list information, routines, staff details, examples of programmes, philosophy, policies and procedures, parent newsletters, copies of reports and reviews relating to the centre.

The University of Waikato Campus Crèche (<http://creche.waikato.ac.nz/index.php>) provides a good example as does Te Puna Kōhungahunga at Auckland’s Epsom Campus (<http://tepunaKōhungahunga.Māori.nz/>).

**Who should be able to use University ECE centres?**

The benchmarking study found most universities provide ECE centres catering for children of staff and students together. In some cases, one group will have priority admission over the other; in others, separate ECE centres are provided for the children of staff (sometimes including post-graduate students) and students. Often the ECE centres for the latter group are run or have been set up by the Students’ Association.

The benchmarking study did not identify whether any of the University centres also cater for staff and/or students with full/partial care responsibilities for children (e.g. grandparents, de facto parent, other family/whanau), however the Auckland survey showed high support for such access.

The University of Auckland ECE centres are currently available to children of students and staff. Two centres give priority to children of students (Alten Road and Symonds Street). The Kōhanga Reo, Kōhungahunga, and Epsom Avenue Centres are also open to children from the wider community.

Distribution of the responses to the question “who should UOA ECE Centres and Kōhanga Reo be available to” is provided in the table below:

<b>Who should UOA ECE centres and Kōhanga Reo be available to?</b>					
<b>Available to:</b>	no response	very important	important	a bit important	not important
Children of staff	1	249	36	3	3
Children of students	0	211	57	21	3
Staff with care responsibilities (e.g. grandparent, de facto parents, other family/whanau)	5	155	95	32	5
Students with care responsibilities (e.g. grandparent, de facto parents, other family/whanau)	3	144	101	36	8

Consideration of expanding the criteria for admission to include children of grandparents and other caregivers is recommended in the Pacific Resource Group submission:

*“Retention of experienced and excellent Pacific staff as well as job satisfaction will be enhanced if family involvement with ECE does not presuppose European family relations as the norm and instead describes and undertakes this involvement in culturally appropriate terms. For example, relative to Pacific values, grandparents should be able to enrol grandchildren at the University’s ECE Centres even if they are not primary caregivers; and in cases where grandparents are the primary caregivers they should have the same access on the same basis as parents.”*

An additional consideration is to extend ECE availability to the children visiting academics and post-graduate students. An example of this was provided by the Deputy Dean of Engineering:

*“Scandinavian PhD students are required to spend six months’ study in another country. Engineering has a flow of these students and it is very important that we can offer ECE facilities to enable them to come and study here.”*

An accompanying letter (see Appendix 3) shows the value to this approach.

## **7 Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga**

Kōhanga Reo provides programmes totally in Te Reo (Māori) and Tikanga Māori for mokopuna and their whanau from birth to school age.

Objective 10 in the University’s Strategic Plan relates to Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi: “...fulfil the responsibilities and obligations of the University under Te Tiriti o Waitangi”.

The submission from specialist Early Childhood Education staff at the Faculty of Education includes specific recommendations to this objective:

*“The University’s commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi should extend to affirmative action in relation to attracting Māori lecturers and students. A greater visibility and presence for Kōhanga would enhance this.”*

Another submission from the Pacific Reference Group, Staff Subcommittee, endorses the provision of Kōhanga Reo:

*“PRG also recognises the success model of Kōhanga Reo in providing Maori students and staff the opportunity to have their children in culturally appropriate early childhood settings.”*

While only 28% of the 289 respondents said the provision of Kōhanga Reo would influence their own choice of work or study place to a *high extent* or *quite a lot*), 66% of 288 respondents said it was *very important* or *important* for the University to provide Kōhanga Reo to be an attractive place to work or study.

A large number of comments in the open-ended sections related specifically to either the Kōhanga Reo or Kōhungahunga:

*“I think they [Te Puna Kōhungahunga] could really benefit from some additional funding to help staff and family with their Te Reo Māori. I would also like to see more support provided for the Kōhanga Reo - Hineteiwaiwa who find it difficult to get qualified staff who are also Māori speaking staff.”*

*“The Kōhanga is under-utilised given the expertise and caring environment available. Wider advertising is necessary.”*

*“If I am still working for the University and the decision to move the courses taught at the Epsom campus to the City or Tamaki I would definitely have to reconsider my employment options, especially if there was difficulty in gaining a place at the City Campus Kōhanga.”*

*“As Māori medium ECE centre [Te Puna Kōhungahunga] it is an excellent mix where she learns Māori tikanga, beliefs, etc, has a great whanau atmosphere and is able to learn the language without being fully immersed. It has transformed our household and we use a lot more Māori than ever before and sing waiata all the time, etc.”*

*“I believe the University must be committed to providing a Kōhanga Reo of a high quality with strong workers, good structures and a commitment to health and safety. It is vital that as a parent I can trust my child’s cultural, emotional and physical needs are being met appropriately.”*

## **8 Catering for other languages and cultures**

The survey also asked about the importance of providing ECE Centres catering for other languages and cultures:

- 22% of 286 respondents said centres catering for other languages and culture would influence their own choice of work or study place (to a *high extent* or *quite a lot*); and
- 46% of 291 respondents said it was *very important* or *important* for the University to provide ECE centres catering for other languages and culture to be an attractive place to work or study.

The Pacific Reference Group submission states:

*“... the University can only help Pacific peoples achieve their educational aspirations by actively engaging with Pacific communities. This involves recognising that they have familial and parenting contexts that do not necessarily mirror those of mainstream New Zealand society. The University must be sensitive to the parenting responsibilities of Pacific students and staff by acknowledging the barriers they face to achieving higher education success. Having affordable and easily accessible (proximity wise) childcare facilities can help overcome some of these barriers.”*

A key recommendation in the PRG submission is that the “the University build on the success of Kōhanga Reo and investigate the establishment of a Pacific Language Nest on one of its campuses.”

Some respondents also recommended providing centres for Pasifika students:

*“It would be good to see a Pasifika ECE Centre that linked with the Pasifika ECE specialisation of the BEd (Tchg) at the Faculty of Education. This could be the basis of a research programme into quality ECE with Pasifika children, quality tertiary education for Pasifika ECE teachers, community engagement, supporting excellent people. In addition the Centre could be utilised for practicum placements by ECE teachers (pre- and in-service). The matter of which language(s) and culture(s) might be prioritised in the Centre can be worked through in planning. For now, the Centre could be based at Epsom, with planning for its inclusion in a new Faculty of Education facility at City Campus. This would align well with the Fale.”*

One respondent in the open-ended section survey asked for other languages to be offered, such as Chinese.

## **9 University ECE Centres as exemplars**

A number of universities highlight their ECE centres as exemplars or centres of excellence. This includes opportunities to highlight best practice in ECE for students, attracting visiting international scholars and as sites for research. Staff in centres of excellence are also sometimes involved in teaching in undergraduate programmes.

The University of Melbourne 2005 report on Children, Work and Study states:

*“The University already provides services which are very likely amongst the best in the world. The families and the staff involved with them are confident about the care and programmes they offer and regard the services as being of very good quality. Already the University gains from this excellence in service through the many teaching and research activities that take place in the services.”*

The New Zealand early childhood education curriculum *Te Whariki* is highly regarded internationally. New Zealand is also internationally recognised as having all childcare services for 0 – 5 year olds under the umbrella of the Ministry of Education. Many academics and educators in ECE are in demand as speakers at prestigious conferences around the world and New Zealand attracts high numbers of international visitors to New Zealand who wish to visit centres to see exemplars of ECE. ECE centre situated within universities are in a prime position to become exemplars of ECE.

Key recommendations from participants at the campus meeting discussions were:

*“The University of Auckland to make a commitment to the provision of world class quality ECE centres which link into research opportunities. Leading edge through a research informed integrated model with a wide range of services such as parental support and development. Extensive possibilities for the utilisation of research and training opportunities through the University resources and facilities, including educative sessions for carers/parents.”*

The submission from three academic staff members in the Faculty of Education included a number of specific points relating to the need for the University's ECE centres to be enhanced in order to be exemplars. These were linked to specific University Objectives and include:

*Objectives 1 & 8: “With the amalgamation of The University of Auckland and Auckland College of Education early childhood teacher education is a recent addition to the teacher education programmes at the University. It is imperative that the University early childhood education centres reflect the quality of the early childhood programmes being offered by the Faculty of Education.”*

*Objectives 3 & 6: “World class early childhood education facilities on all The University of Auckland campuses would contribute significantly to the development of a high quality research environment. Other university’s have ‘state of the art’ early childhood education facilities – for example the current Centre of Innovation Research Project at Massey University.”*

*Objectives 9 & 10: “The quality of the early childhood centres must reflect the standard of the early childhood programmes offered at the Faculty of Education. At the moment this is not the case. For example the physical environments and external management of the services negate many of the quality goals of the teaching in our programmes. Visiting scholars are taken outside the University to illustrate quality practices and environments.”*

*Objectives 16 & 17: “To safeguard the long-term viability and financial autonomy of the University, quality early childhood services need to be maintained in order to continue to attract students with young families to The University of Auckland. Quality early childhood centres attract quality early childhood teaching staff, and in turn attract researchers for research contracts. These contracts contribute to increasing the University’s revenue.”*

*Objective 18: “In order to provide an infrastructure that supports teaching, learning, research and community engagement of the highest quality, the University’s early childhood facilities need to be of the highest quality, staffed by high quality professional teachers in an educational environment that the University can be proud of.”*

*Objective 20: “The University needs to benchmark the early childhood facilities across all campuses in order to compete for national and international recognition. Currently our centres in general fall well below the quality of other New Zealand University early childhood facilities. This means we do not meet international benchmarks either.”*

Many respondents strongly endorsed that the University’s ECE centres be exemplars:

*“If the University is serious about attracting and retaining top flight staff and also post-graduate students, then excellent ECE centres are a perfect way of doing this - only problem is that major improvements need to be made to achieve this. As to looking at other crèches as models for the University to learn from, have a look at Otago University’s crèche.”*

*“The provision of ECE Centres could be linked to ECE teacher education - both for practicum and for research activity.”*

*“Should be of high quality to ensure attractiveness to staff and students and that we stay in the top 1% of Uni’s. If it’s run by private companies, it should be quality controlled by Uni. The most important thing is to link research and teaching (education) into the ECEs. UoA has the opportunities to make these ECEs models for best practise for the rest of NZ (internationally). After all, don’t we train these teachers? There’s an opportunity in Tamaki (it’s a quite specific community) to link research in with children and offer to parents the opportunity to be involved in programmes in population health (e.g. growing up in NZ) and audiology, speech therapy,) and also involve others (e.g. science in ECE at Tamaki could be a strong point - have biologists, chemists, Landcare Research & MAF at Tamaki) and a community feel. UoA shouldn’t just provide ECE centres to keep up to speed with other NZ companies and public institutions, it should be pushing boundaries and seen as proving the model for everyone else. At Tamaki, ECE should be seen as a core activity and not shoved over on Colin Maiden Park”*

*“This University gives a lot of lip service to the importance of work/family balance but provides relatively few services and policies to support parents/caregivers of young children. Providing a wider range of services is essential.”*

*“It is imperative that an institution which promotes the furtherance of high quality educational possibilities for adults also offers this same facility and opportunity for children - this is where the main focus should be. This is also an ideal opportunity to facilitate centres of excellence which demonstrate high quality teaching and learning.”*

*“As the leading provider of early childhood teacher education in New Zealand, it is critical that the university be “seen” to be doing what it teaches. At present we do not have a centre that I would feel at all comfortable inviting visiting academics into. Buildings are dilapidated, scruffy, lack resourcing and staffing and clearly do not meet the criteria for centres of excellence or innovation.”*

## **10 Other childcare facilities and services**

While the provision of before-school, after-school and school holiday care are not the primary focus of this review they are relevant as a component of the wider provision of childcare services and facilities.

The survey conducted by the Department of Labour and the National Advisory Council on the Employment of Women (1998) found that the:

*“Highest demand for different types of ECE and care was in the provision of before and after school care programmes.”*

The 2005 *Work-Life and Family Responsibilities Survey* (cited in *Women Returning to Work 2007*) asked how The University of Auckland could provide more support for staff with family responsibilities and found that:

*The majority of suggestions for improvements related to more flexible employment, promoting a ‘family friendly’ workplace culture, the need for improved childcare facilities, after-school care and holiday programmes and better parking arrangements for staff with children.”*

One of the recommendations made in *Women Returning to Work* that “the Strategic Review of Early Childhood Education Centres be progressed to attend to the childcare issues that were raised in this (and former) projects”.

The terms of reference for this review include the consideration of the needs for wider childcare services and facilities, e.g. school holiday and after-school care programmes and breastfeeding facilities.

The benchmarking survey asked respondents to comment on whether there was provision for these wider services at their university. Five of the Australian Go8 and/or U21 universities who responded review survey provide after-school and/or school holiday care. Of these, two exemplars appear to be:

- UBC for providing the most extensive service. The university offers extensive programmes with wraparound school hours and fulltime in summer holiday programmes. One programme caters for 27 5-year-olds and another catering for 110 6–12-year-olds. Further facilities are under construction.
- *“MUSHP [Monash University School Holiday Programme] is a workplace sponsored program that provides school holiday care for primary school aged children of Monash University families and the local community. MUSHP is accredited with the National Childcare Accreditation Council (NCAC), recently achieving a result of High Quality across all 8 Quality Areas (QA).*

Other programmes offered by universities include:

- The Student Union at The University of Melbourne operates a vacation care programme which is contracted to an external for-profit provider.
- Nottingham University provides a Holiday Play scheme *“for children aged 4 years to 12 years, and also offers cover for school inset days. As a work/study based nursery we take children from a number of different local authorities, each with their own policies, therefore we are flexible about sessions to accommodate different needs of parents depending on locality within which they live. Open throughout all holidays with the exception of Bank Holidays (8), University days (5) and 2 inset days for Childcare Services staff”.*
- UNSW runs Vacation care at Kanga’s house Childcare Centre through January when the day care centre is closed. It runs from 8.30 to 6.00 for children from 3 months old to school age. The respondent also notes that provision currently being looked at with the aim to expand all child care provisions at UNSW.

In New Zealand, after-school care and/or school holiday care is provided at five universities:

- Canterbury provides Kidz time before school (7.30am until drop-off at school) and after school from 3pm– 6pm. The school holiday programme runs from 8.15am– 5.30pm.
- Massey has a Kid’s club which provides after school care including escorted pick up from school. School holiday care is also provided by the club.
- Otago Childcare Association runs OSCAR after school programme from 3pm– 5.30pm. There are places for 40 children in years 1–6. They provide a staffing ratio of 1:6. A school holiday programme is also run. No financial support is provided from the University for the care of school age children.
- Lincoln University allows children who have left the ECE centre to attend school an opportunity to be booked in for school holidays up until they turn six if there are spaces available.

- Information on the Waikato website indicates a school holiday programme is provided by the campus crèche for children.

A number of respondents said their university had explored the possibility of offering these services but had not succeeded in operating them, particularly in relation to providing after-school care.

The Auckland survey asked “How important is the provision of additional childcare facilities by The University of Auckland?” In relation to provision of school holiday programmes and after school programmes:

- 87% of 290 respondents rated the provision of school holiday programmes as *very important* or *important*.
- 75% of 287 respondents rated after-school programmes *very important* or *important*.

Comments in the open-ended sections of the survey were nearly all supportive of additional childcare facilities being provided:

*“School holiday programmes would be fabulous! Given that our breaks from teaching often don't match up with the children's school holidays, being able to bring them to the University and having them go to a programme together would be ideal. We'd definitely participate in a good University-based school holiday programme!!”*

*“School holiday programmes would be brilliant if possible. After school care would not be useful to staff but could be useful for students”*

*“Also if the uni was going to do school holiday programmes etc then a new centre it could be linked to a hall or something for that - a perfect place would be near the current recreation centre at the city campus.”*

Breastfeeding facilities are also important with 84% of 289 respondents rating them as *very important* or *important*. The University, through the EO Office, has made considerable improvements in this area in response to recommendations in the *Women Returning to Work* project (2007).



## Conclusion

The findings of this review support those of the University's 2007 *Women Returning to Work* project and other related surveys which highlight the importance of a *family friendly* culture which includes affordable quality childcare.

While the number of people who participated in the consultation process is relatively low and self selected, it is important to note the responses were consistent with other studies using different methodology and also with what is known about best practice in Early Childhood Education.

This review found strong endorsement from the participants in the consultation process to retain the current *Work, Life and Family Policy* including by those who have not had children participating in ECE (either at the University or elsewhere). Unfortunately, the current provision of ECE at The University of Auckland does not meet the quality standards articulated in the policy or the extent of provision and this must be addressed.

The strategic review findings show the provision of high quality ECE centres including Kōhanga Reo and Kōhungahunga to be important in achieving objectives in the University's Strategic plan (in particular, objectives 4, 7, 10 and 13) and is in keeping with the EEO policy.

The University of Auckland is competing with others to attract and retain quality staff, and post-graduate and international students. Demographics at the University, as with many other benchmark universities, show the number of women (and their partners) in the childbearing age band to be steadily increasing. There is a strong trend for universities to review their current provision ECE and other childcare facilities in order to retain a competitive edge in the recruitment and retention of quality staff and students.

The findings give a clear mandate for the University to retain and commit to the current *Work, Life and Family Policy*. In doing so, it will be important to ensure that steps are taken to urgently enhance the current provision and to ensure that current campus planning addresses the need for quality provision on each campus. There is also the opportunity to strive for excellence in keeping with the current strategic plan and to provide ECE facilities that are of international standing.

## References

Day, H. (2008) *Early Childhood Education ("child care") services at New Zealand Universities*. Equity Office, Victoria University of Wellington.

Department of Labour and National Advisory Council on the Employment of Women. (1999). *Childcare, families and work. The New Zealand Childcare Survey (1998): A survey of early childhood education and care arrangements for children*. Wellington: Labour Market Policy Group.

Duncan, J., Bowden, C., and Smith, A. B. (2005). *Early childhood centres and family resilience*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Emlen, Arthur C.; Koren, Paul E. (1984). *Hard To Find and Difficult To Manage*. A Report to Employers distributed at a forum on Child Care and Employee Productivity: The Workforce Partnership (Portland). Available from Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University.

Ihaka, R., and Gentleman, R. (1996). *R: A language for data analysis and graphics*. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 5, 229-314.

McNabb, S., and Toft, P. (2007). *Women Returning to Work: An analysis of women's experiences in returning to work from parental leave with recommendations on strategies to eliminate barriers*. The Association of University Staff of New Zealand and The University of Auckland.

Ministry of Education (2002). *Pathways to the Future: Nga Huarahi Arataki. A 10-year Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Mitchel, L. (2008). *Provision of early childhood education services and parental perceptions*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Mitchel, L., Wylie, C., and Carr, M. (2003). *Outcomes of Early Childhood Education: Literature Review. Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Mitchel, L., Cubey, P., (2003). *Characteristics of effective professional development linked to enhanced pedagogy and children's learning in early childhood settings. A best evidence synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

R Development Core Team (2006). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. ISBN 3-900051-07-0

Wood, L. (2001). *Workplace childcare centres increasing in numbers*. The Galt Global Review (11/08/08) [galtglobalreview.com](http://galtglobalreview.com)

WWW Communications Pty Ltd. (2005). *Report of the Needs for Child Care Provision at the University of Melbourne*.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1 - Working Committee

Trudie McNaughton	Pro Vice-Chancellor (EO)
Jim Peters	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori)
Prue Toft	EEO Manager
Margaret Taurere	Māori Equity Advisor
Peter Fehl	Director, Property Services
Jane Adams	Auckland Regional Officer, Association of University Staff
Sophie Klinger	Auckland University Students' Association
Allen Bartley	Faculty of Education Senior Lecturer
Bronwyne Hawkins	Student Administration
Jarrod Shearer	HR Manager
Ema Wolfgramm-Foliaki	Lecturer, PRG
Deidre Brown	Parent
Leslie Den Harder	NZEI Field Officer
Ilze Ziedins	Senior Lecturer Statistics, Faculty of Science

## Sponsors

Trudie McNaughton	Pro Vice-Chancellor (EO)
Jim Peters	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori)
Adrienne Cleland	Director, Systems Development
Kath Clarke	Director, HR

## Reviewer

Kim Hope

## Advisers

Debora Lee, Lecturer in Teacher Education Practice  
Linda Mitchell, Senior Lecturer, ECE,  
School of Education, University of Waikato

## Appendix 2 - Research methodology

The research was carried out in two stages.

### Benchmarking

The benchmarking exercise completed in the first stage of the Strategic Review was based on a survey (see Appendix 4) asking about the provision of early childhood education services and facilities, which was sent to:

- all New Zealand universities;
- the Group of Eight (Go8) Australian universities; and
- a selection of Universitas 21.

A total of 17 surveys were returned from 14 universities (six from New Zealand, five in Australia, one in Canada and two in Britain). Two universities had more than one respondent relating to different centres at different campuses.

Information from three reports describing the findings of research related to the provision of early childhood services in universities was also incorporated where appropriate. These reports were:

- *Children, Work and Study: University of Melbourne Child Care Needs Analysis (2005)* this report was produced by the University of Melbourne's Child Care Advisory Committee in collaboration with the Children's Services Student Programmes and the Student Union.
- *Women Returning to Work: an analysis of women's experiences in returning to work from parental leave with recommendations on strategies to eliminate barriers (2007)*. This study was a joint project conducted by the Association of University Staff (AUS) and The University of Auckland focussed on women staff who had taken paid and/or unpaid leave between January 2000 and September 2005 following childbirth or adoption. The investigation explored specific issues relating to women re-entering the workplace and made recommendations for improved services. Access to quality and affordable childcare was found to be a priority for parents who participated in the study.
- *Early Childhood Education ("child care") services at New Zealand Universities (June 2008)*. This was a benchmarking study looking at the provision of early childhood education services in New Zealand universities conducted by the Equity Office at Victoria University of Wellington in April 2008. All New Zealand universities replied and the report provides valuable benchmarking data.

In addition, a web search was also conducted on New Zealand and Go8 Australian universities. Information gained from this has been included where practicable.

### Strategic review survey and submissions

The Strategic Review Working Committee determined that all staff, students and the wider university community should be invited to participate in the review consultation process.

In addition to invitations to make submissions, an anonymous on-line survey was used. (see Appendix 5). The survey was designed in consultation with key advisors and, where appropriate questions relating to the quality provision of ECE were aligned with a 2007 national survey conducted by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) reported in *Provision of early childhood education services and parental perceptions (2008)*.

The survey was approved by the Review Working Committee and The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee. The survey and supporting information were available on the University website in English and in Te Reo Māori. Hard copies were also available.

Initial publicity about the review was sent out through a number of major University email lists and an advertisement in *University News*. This information explained the strategic review and where further information could be found (on the EO website). The publicity also included an invitation to attend one of five meetings (one held on each campus and one additional evening meeting on the City Campus) which provided an opportunity for further information, discussion and feedback.

An advertisement encouraging participation in the survey was placed in the student magazine *Craccum*. Posters were also delivered to key points of contact on each campus for display, such as the University Bookshop, Library, cafes and all ECE centres.

The Student Association also supported efforts to publicise the review through class representatives and communication with their constituents.

Each of the five campus meetings was facilitated by the Pro Vice-Chancellor EO and supported by members of the Working Committee and the External Reviewer. Notes were taken of key points raised at these meetings.

The online review survey written submissions were open for four weeks (25 August - 19 September). As a result of concerns expressed at the campus meetings regarding access to the internet, information related to the review together with written copies of the surveys and pre-paid envelopes (to ensure anonymity) were delivered to each ECE centre for distribution to parents/caregivers and teachers. Written responses were returned to the EO administrator who entered the data into the online survey.

## **2.1 Survey response profiles**

A total of 292 surveys were returned. Respondents were predominately women (82%) with most identifying themselves as Pakeha/European/New Zealander (67%). Of the remaining respondents, 9% were Māori, 8% Pacific, 9% Asian and 7% were from other ethnic groups. There were two non-responses to the question on ethnicity.

More than half (58%) were aged under 40; 25% were between 41 and 50 and 17% were over 50.

Of the respondents:

- 150 indicated they are currently a primary care giver for one or more preschool children (i.e. under 5 years old)
- 136 have no children under 5 years
- 94 have children between 5 and 15 years old.
- 45 have children in both the under-5 and the 5 – 14 years bracket.
- 3 who had children 5 – 14 did not answer the question in relation to having children under 5 and one respondent with a child under 5 didn't respond to the question in relation to having a child over 5.

The highest number of responses was from academic staff members. Profiles and the current number of children they have under 14 years old are shown in the table below:

Type of involvement with UOA	No response	No Children under 5	Currently have chn under 5	Currently have chn 5 – 14
Not currently working/studying at the UOA	0	8	15	4
Undergraduate students	0	17	10	8
Post-graduate students	0	10	6	4
Academic staff	3	54	60	39
General staff	2	38	57	36
ECE teachers (ECE Centre)	1	9	2	3
ECE teachers (Kōhanga Reo)	0	0	0	0
	<b>6</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>94</b>

Of the respondents with children under 15 years, 22 described themselves as a single parent or caregiver. Distribution of these respondents is:

Single Parent/Caregiver						
	number of children under 5 years			number of children 5 - 14 years		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Not currently at the UOA	2	0	0	1	1	0
undergraduate students	5	0	0	5	0	1
post-graduate students	0	0	0	1	0	0
academic staff	3	0	0	0	2	0
general staff	4	1	0	2	1	1
ECE teachers (ECE Centre)	1	0	0	0	1	0
ECE teachers (Kōhanga Reo)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>

Respondents who currently have children under 5 were asked whether they were currently using a University ECE centre or a non-University centre for their children. They were also asked on which campus they spent most of their time.

Of the 67 respondents who are currently primary caregivers and have preschool children currently attending a University ECE centre:

- 7 are not currently studying or working at the University;
- 47 spend most of their time on the City Campus;
- 10 on Epsom Campus;
- 6 on Grafton Campus;
- 2 on Tamaki campus; and
- 2 did not provide information as to which campus.

Of the 56 respondents who are primary caregivers and have preschool children who currently attend a non-University ECE centre (and who don't have children also attending a University centre):

- 11 attend a centre near the campus they work or study at;
- 24 attend a centre near their home;
- 8 attend a home based ECE or family day care service; and
- 13 attend another service.

Distribution of these respondents is:

Location of ECE	Campus where respondents spend most of time						Total
	N.R.	City	Grafton	Tamaki	Epsom	Tai Tokerau	
Centre near campus work/study	0	6	1	4	0	0	11
Centre near home	0	16	0	5	3	0	24
Home-based ECE	0	3	0	5	0	0	8
Another service	1	7	0	3	2	0	13
	1	32	1	17	5	0	56

A total of 26 respondents who are currently primary caregivers for children under 5-years-old do not have children using any kind of ECE service.

The survey also asked respondents if they envisaged using an ECE centre in the future. A total of 26 respondents who do not currently have children under 14 indicated it was *unlikely* or *not at all likely* they would require ECE in the future. Distribution of these respondents is shown in the table below:

Don't envisage using ECE in future	
Type of involvement with UOA	Number
Not currently working/studying at the UOA	2
undergraduate students	6
post-graduate students	2
academic staff	8
general staff	8
ECE teachers (ECE Centre)	-
ECE teachers (Kōhanga Reo)	-
	26

A total of 212 respondents said they envisage using ECE in future. Their location and association with the University Auckland of these respondents is shown in the table below:

Respondents who envisage that using ECE in the future						
Type of involvement with UOA	City	Grafton	Tamaki	Epsom	Tai Tokerau	Total
Not currently UOA	7	-	4	6	-	17
Undergraduate students	13	-	-	7	-	20
Post-graduate students	3	-	6	1	-	10
Academic staff	50	3	20	13	1	87
General staff	46	4	15	4	-	69
ECE teachers (ECE Centre)	2	5	0	2	-	9
ECE teachers (Kōhanga Reo)	-	-	-	-	-	
	121	12	45	33	1	212

Respondents not currently working or studying at the University were asked if they were considering doing so in the future: Of the respondents:

- 2 were considering studying as an undergraduate;
- 6 were considering studying as a post-graduate;
- 1 was considering working as an academic staff member; and
- 1 as a general staff member.

In its Work Life and Family Policy, the University states it is “committed to providing high quality ECE centres on campus, and as an educational institution, the University has a commitment to excellent standards in early childhood education”.

Nearly all the respondents, 97%, think it is *very important* or *important* to retain the objective. Of these:

- 23 are not currently working or studying at the University;
- 25 are undergraduate students;
- 15 are postgraduate students;
- 115 are academic staff;
- 94 are general staff; and
- 12 are ECE staff.

## **2.2 Analysis of survey data**

Most of the questions were in the form of closed questions with boxes to select. Answers to open-ended questions were categorised and coded.

All tabulations were carried out using R (see *Ihaka and Gentleman, 1996* and *R Development Core Team, 2006*). Since all staff, students and the wider university community were invited to complete the on-line survey and/or send a submission, this is a self selected sample.

## **2.3 Submissions**

In addition to the Review survey responses, six submissions were received. Three of these were formal submissions sent by:

- Human Resources Division;
- Pacific Reference Group, Staff Subcommittee (PRG) which is an advisory group to the Vice-Chancellor via the Equal Opportunities (EO) Committee and the Pro Vice-Chancellor EO; and
- Three academic staff members from the Faculty of Education who specialise in Early Childhood Education.

A fourth, anonymous, submission was received concerning an operational matter which was outside the terms of reference for the strategic review and was referred to the appropriate person.

Two email submissions were received:

- One provided additional information to a review survey response and attendance at one of the campus meetings; and
- The other was from an academic staff member incorporating a letter from a visiting PhD Student and Associate Professor whose child attended a University ECE centre for the duration of their three-month visit (see Appendix 3).



## Appendix 3 – Client letter

To whom it may concern

We were visiting Engineering Science Department at the University of Auckland to work on research projects with Professor David Ryan in September - November 2006. An important issue before leaving Denmark was to figure out who would take care of our 4-years old daughter Anya. To our surprise and delight we discovered that the University of Auckland operated Early Childhood Education Centres for children of students and employees.

The first visit to the 26A Symonds Street was exciting and slightly frightening: how would a non-English speaking child be accepted and spend three months among unfamiliar and unfamiliarly speaking children and grown-ups? Our worries were however groundless. From the moment we entered the Centre, Anya was involved in a drawing activity, while a teacher made sure that a simple communication started between our daughter and a couple of girls. Forty minutes later Anya told us that she was already comfortable there on her own and we could therefore leave! We have not experienced such a quick acceptance of a daycare centre even with a Danish-speaking staff!

Every day was full of exciting and educative activities, such as singing, playing games, listening to the stories, playing with a puppet theatre, dressing up, engaging in activities outside, going on longer trips, drawing, painting and creating all sorts of hand-made articles from materials we do not even know the names of! We simply *had* to take some of the most creative pieces home to Denmark, although the luggage space was very limited.

It was fantastic to listen to our Danish/Russian speaking girl singing a Maori song! Too bad we did not understand it and could therefore not learn the words. We can still remember how we tried to suppress our laughs hearing Anya sing her first learned English children song with a lovely kiwi accent: "Taweenkle, taweenkle, little starr...".

Moreover, on behalf of the music teacher at Anya's Danish school we would like to thank the Symonds Street ECE Centre teachers for memorising a song called "Baby shark" with the kids so well that Anya recently (two years after our visit to NZ!) performed it from the beginning to the end in front of her whole class. The song was so catching, it was written down and taught to other kids in her music class.

On our way back from New Zealand, summing up the events of the past three months, we asked our daughter what daycare centre she liked the most: one of the two she attended in Denmark or the one in Auckland. She answered without any hesitation: "Of'course, the kiwi one!"

We would like to thank the staff of the Symonds Street Early Childhood Centre for making our daily life in Auckland less complicated and worry-less. Our daughter looked forward to come to your daycare every single morning. Without your professional approach to children in general and non-English speaking children in particular we would have been worrying about our daughter and spending time on taking care of her instead of concentrating on our research during the time of our visit to New Zealand. And what a wonderful and productive visit it was!

Best regards

Natalia J. Rezanova  
Ph.D.-student  
University of Denmark

Jesper Larsen  
Associate Professor  
University of Denmark

August 19, 2008

## Appendix 4 - Benchmarking Survey

### Provision of Early Childhood Education Services and Facilities in Universities

*Please complete this survey in relation to the ECE centres and Services as appropriate for the role you have. If you prefer not to use this questionnaire please provide the information requested either in written form or contact us to arrange a phone discussion. Contact details are provided at the end of this form.*

1. Name of your University: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Your role at the University \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does your university have general policy related to the provision of early childhood services for children of students and/or staff?

If appropriate please specify.

4. Name of Centres
  - a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_
5. When were the ECE centre/s established?
  - a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_
6. Ages and numbers catered for in each ECE centre
  - a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_
7. Hours open
  - a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

8. Length of waiting list/s

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

9. Who can access the centre? (e.g. children of students/staff or wider community)

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

10. Teacher/Child ratios

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

11. Number of children the centre is licensed for

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

12. Proportion of qualified staff

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

13. Have the centres been purpose built?

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

14. Please comment on the size of the indoor and outdoor space

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

15. Management Structure

- a. Centre 1 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Centre 2 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Centre 3 \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Centre 4 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Centre 5 \_\_\_\_\_

16. What is the provision for staff meetings?

17. What is the provision for staff to access professional development opportunities?

18. What facilities are there for staff in the centre/s?

19. Is there provision for a family/whanau space in the centres?

20. What provision is there for parents to be involved in the centre?

21. Does your University provide after school or school holiday care?  
(If yes please give details)

22. Does your University provide breastfeeding facilities?  
(If yes please give details)

23. Are there any other comments you would like to make in relation to the provision of ECE centres and services at your university?

**24. We would appreciate it if you would also provide a copy of your information relating to the fees charged.**

If you would like to receive a copy of the findings from this benchmarking exercise please provide your name and email address below

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for completed this survey please return by 8<sup>th</sup> August  
eo.admin@auckland.ac.nz or fax to Prue Toft, Equal Employment Office (64-9  
373 7024)

*If you have any questions or would prefer to provide this information by phone  
please don't hesitate contact Prue Toft (E.O Manager, 64 9 3737 599 ext 88316  
[p.toft@auckland.co.nz](mailto:p.toft@auckland.co.nz)) or Kim Hope (Independent Reviewer, 64 9 44 63244 or  
[kimhope@xtra.co.nz](mailto:kimhope@xtra.co.nz))*

**Strategic Review of Early Childhood  
Education Centres, Facilities, Services and  
Kohanga Reo  
at The University of Auckland**

» Take the survey

The University of Auckland is committed to providing high quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) centres and Kohanga Reo.

It is currently undertaking a strategic review of ECE centres, facilities, services and Kohanga Reo to provide recommendations and a framework for The University of Auckland to enhance its status as a world class place to work and study.

The University of Auckland welcomes responses from all students and staff in this review, whether or not they have children, through the completion of the questionnaire and/or by further written submission.

Demographic data is requested to enable analysis of the information according to key groups. All information will remain confidential and in the reporting of responses the researchers will ensure no respondents are identifiable.

The term Early Childhood Education Centres (ECE) has been used in accordance with current educational practice. This term includes previous terms (crèches, childcare centres etc). There are currently five Early Childhood Centres and two Kohanga Reo (total Maori immersion childcare centres).

» Take the survey

**This survey is available on line. Please go to:**

**[www.eo.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.eo.auckland.ac.nz)**

**If you are filling it in as a hard copy you will need to provide attachments for written comments to certain questions.**

**Any enquires to Margaret Freeman EEO Office Manager  
ext 87855, email [ms.freeman@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:ms.freeman@auckland.ac.nz)**

## Strategic Review of Early Childhood Education Centres, Facilities, Services and Kohanga Reo at The University of Auckland Survey

1. Are you currently working or studying at The University of Auckland? Choose which best describes you.

- No
- Yes - Student - undergraduate
- Yes - Student - postgraduate
- Yes - Staff Member - academic
- Yes - Staff Member - general
- Yes - ECE Teacher - ECE Centre
- Yes - ECE Teacher - Kohanga Reo

2. Are you considering working or studying at The University of Auckland in the future? Choose which best describes your plans.

- No
- Yes, as a Student - undergraduate
- Yes, as a Student - postgraduate
- Yes, as a Staff Member - academic
- Yes, as a Staff Member - general

3. For how many children under 5 years are you a primary caregiver (this can include whangai/fostering, grandchildren etc)?

- None
- one child
- two children
- more than two children

4. For how many children between 5 and 14 are you a primary caregiver (this can include whangai/fostering, grandchildren etc)?

## Strategic Review of Early Childhood Education Centres, Facilities, Services and Kohanga Reo at The University of Auckland Survey

1. Are you currently working or studying at The University of Auckland? Choose which best describes you.

- No
- Yes - Student - undergraduate
- Yes - Student - postgraduate
- Yes - Staff Member - academic
- Yes - Staff Member - general
- Yes - ECE Teacher - ECE Centre
- Yes - ECE Teacher - Kohanga Reo

2. Are you considering working or studying at The University of Auckland in the future? Choose which best describes your plans.

- No
- Yes, as a Student - undergraduate
- Yes, as a Student - postgraduate
- Yes, as a Staff Member - academic
- Yes, as a Staff Member - general

3. For how many children under 5 years are you a primary caregiver (this can include whangai/fostering, grandchildren etc)?

- None
- one child
- two children
- more than two children

4. For how many children between 5 and 14 are you a primary caregiver (this can include whangai/fostering, grandchildren etc)?



- Yes, please specify which centre/s in the next question

10. If you have previously had any children attending a University of Auckland or Auckland College of Education ECE Centre or Kohanga Reo, please specify which centre/s and whether you would recommend them to others.

11. Have you previously had children under five attending an alternative ECE Centre or Kohanga Reo (i.e. not a University of Auckland/College of Education Centre - includes kindergarten and other services)? Please describe.

- No (please go to question 14)
- Yes, i. At an ECE centre near the campus you work/study at
- Yes, ii. At an ECE centre close to home
- Yes, iii. Home-based ECE or family day care service (e.g. Barnardos)
- Yes, another service

12. Please give the reasons for your choice of ECE provision.

13. Were you a student/staff member at the UoA at the time any of your children were previously attending alternative ECE?

- Yes
- No

14. Do you envisage that you may require ECE /Kohanga Reo in the future (as a parent, grandparent, primary care giver etc)?

- highly likely
- very likely
- possible

- unlikely
- not at all likely

15. What characteristics do you look for in a good ECE/Kohanga Reo service?

a) I can afford the cost of the ECE/Kohanga Reo service

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

16. b) Qualified teachers

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

17. c) Parents/whanau teach their own children

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

18. d) Parents/whanau involvement in running the service e.g. committees, parent help

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

19. e) I can be in easy contact with my child during the day

- very important
- important

- a bit important
- not at all important

20. f) Good Education Review Office (ERO) Reports

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

21. g) Children are happy and settled

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

22. h) High numbers of teachers/educators to the number of children

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

23. i) Small number of children in a group

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

24. j) Children in centres specialising for specific age groups (e.g babies and toddlers or for over 2 1/2 year olds)

- very important
- important
- a bit important

not at all important

25. k) Children in centres with mixed age groups

very important

important

a bit important

not at all important

26. l) High standards of health and safety

very important

important

a bit important

not at all important

27. m) Well resourced e.g. playground equipment, books, art supplies, puzzles etc.

very important

important

a bit important

not at all important

28. n) Warm and nurturing teachers/educators

very important

important

a bit important

not at all important

29. o) Good communication between parents/whanau and teachers/educators

very important

important

a bit important

not at all important

30. p) Good reputation

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

31. q) A chance for parents/whanau to be involved in planning their children's learning

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

32. r) Total immersion in Te Reo Māori (Te Kohanga Reo)

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

33. s) Teaching in a language/culture other than English or Māori (e.g. a Pacific language)

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

34. t) Hours available

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

35. u) A short waiting list (maximum 6 months)

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

36. In its Work, Life and Family Policy The University of Auckland states that it is "committed to providing high quality Early Childhood Education Centres on campus, and as an educational institution, the University has a commitment to excellent standards in early childhood education". How important is it for the University to retain this objective?

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

37. To what extent could the provision of ECE Centres influence your own choice of work or study place?

- to a high extent
- quite a lot
- a little
- not at all

38. More generally, how important is it for The University of Auckland to provide ECE Centres to be an attractive place to work or study?

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

39. To what extent could the provision of Kohanga Reo influence your own choice of work or study place?

- to a high extent
- quite a lot
- a little

- not at all

40. More generally, how important is it for The University of Auckland to provide Kohanga Reo to be an attractive place to work or study?

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

41. To what extent could the provision of ECE Centres catering for other languages and culture (e.g. Pacific languages) influence your own choice of work or study place?

- to a high extent
- quite a lot
- a little
- not at all

42. More generally, how important is it for The University of Auckland to provide ECE Centres catering for other languages and culture (e.g. Pacific languages) to be attractive place to work or study?

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

43. Should the ECE Centres be run on a cost recovery basis or subsidised by the University?

- Full cost recovery
- Subsidised by the University

44. Should the management of the ECE Centres be internal or external to the University?

- no opinion
- internally managed

- externally managed

45. Who should The University of Auckland ECE Centres and Kohanga Reo be available to?

a) Children of Staff

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

46. b) Children of Students

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

47. c) Staff who have responsibilities for caring for children (e.g. as grandparents, de facto parents, other family/whanau)

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

48. d) Students who have responsibilities for caring for children (e.g. as grandparents, de facto parents, other family/whanau )

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

49. How important is the provision of additional childcare facilities by The University of Auckland?

Please also indicate if you think you would make use of any of these provisions now, in the future, or would have found any useful in the past



a) Breast feeding Facilities

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

50. b) School holiday programmes

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

51. c) After school programmes

- very important
- important
- a bit important
- not at all important

52. Any further comments you wish to make about the provision of ECE Centres, Services and Facilities and Kohanga Reo at The University of Auckland?

53. Some final demographic data

Gender

- Female
- Male

54. Age bracket

- Under 30

- 31 - 40
- 41 - 50
- 51 - 60
- Over 60

55. Ethnicity

- Pākeha/European/New Zealander
- Māori
- Pacific
- Asian
- Other ethnic group

56. Which Campus do you spend most of your time at?

- City
- Grafton
- Tamaki
- Epsom
- Tai Tokerau

Send in your Survey

EEO  
**Work, Life and Family**



**THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND  
NEW ZEALAND**

**HR Policy**

## Policy

The University of Auckland is committed to:

- supporting a balance between work, family and personal life
- providing flexible employment practices and conditions which support a balance between work, life and family needs
- accommodating the reasonable requirements of staff members' work, life and family responsibilities, wherever practicable
- providing high quality childcare facilities on campus
- actively promoting information, policies and guidelines relevant to the achievement of a work, family and 'life' balance for staff

## Procedure

### Introduction

The University of Auckland recognises that both the employee and the organisation benefit when staff can balance work, family and personal life. This policy is designed to ensure that the University workplace accommodates the reasonable requirements of staff members' work, life and family responsibilities.

### Family/Life

The term 'family' is used in the broadest sense and encompasses single people, relatives of all ages including the elderly, whanau, culturally-diverse family groupings, de facto and same sex relationships. Further important aspects of a person's 'life' can encompass significant community, cultural and other commitments.

### Related Documents

The following documents are related to this policy.

#### **Academic Staff, General Staff and other Collective Agreements**

These agreements include provisions for:

- Parental Leave
- Special Paid Parental Leave
- Re-entry after absence due to childcare
- Sick Leave, including sick leave for domestic purposes
- Bereavement/Tangihanga Leave
- Study Leave
- Resolution of Employment Relationship Problems

#### **Parental Leave and Employment Protection Act 1987**

This Act provides for leave without pay for various forms of parental leave for both female and male staff, and for employment protection rights.

#### **Paid Parental Leave Act 2001**

This Act provides for paid parental leave, which may be taken as an alternative to (in most/all cases) the more generous Special Paid Parental Leave provisions in the relevant collective agreement.

#### **Human Rights Act 1993**

This Act prescribes prohibited grounds of discrimination in the workplace, including Sex, Marital status, Religious belief, Ethical belief, Colour, Race, Ethnic or national origins, Disability, Age, Political opinion, Employment status, Family status, and Sexual orientation.

#### **International Labour Convention 156: Workers with Family Responsibilities**

The International Labour Organisation has published Convention 156, which deals with work and family responsibilities. This policy has been developed after taking account of this convention. The convention is available through:

<http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/convdisp1.htm>

**Further Advice**

Please contact the EEO office or Human Resources for further assistance. The EEO Office is able to assist with an Information package containing guidelines on:

- Parental leave
- Working from Home
- Children on Campus
- Childcare Facilities
- Flexible Working Arrangements
- Report on the Review of Work and Family Policy

Approved:

Vice Chancellor