Students entering New Zealand secondary schools in year 9 come from a variety of socioeconomic, cultural and ability backgrounds. They have been taught in different schools, by teachers of varying effectiveness in different classrooms using different programmes and progressed at different rates. This is reflected in the results of school entrance testing which shows the wide diversity of each school's intake in terms of National Standards and curriculum level achievement.



Despite this diversity at the start of secondary schooling, our education system measures the achievement of students in Years 11-13 using NCEA as a common yardstick. The annual league tables published by the media rank schools on the basis of their students' performance in NCEA. Parents and the public frequently make judgements about school effectiveness based on the ranking of the school.

Parents often vote with their feet by enrolling their children in schools on the basis of 'league table' rankings. In some cases, this has meant moving house to be in the zone of the preferred school. Rowe (2000). The school leagues even have an impact on property values and school zones make their appearance in real estate advertisements.

Schools face the temptation of concentrating their efforts on those students considered capable of improving their NCEA scores, while giving less attention to those perceived less likely to improve.

An inevitable result of league tables is that there are winners and losers (Saunders, 1999). If our efforts to meet increasing demands for assessment, accountability, standards monitoring, quality assurance, school effectiveness causes us to lose sight of ensuring that what we offer in school education is accessible to all students it would be counterproductive.

This leads to the question of whether league tables are a fair and valid way to compare schools and judge the effectiveness of individual schools and whether league tables contribute to a desirable outcome for our education system.

The principal argument against league tables is that the performance of a school is determined largely by the pre-existing achievements of the students when they enter it. School intakes differ markedly in this respect and some schools have highly selective entry criteria. Horse-race comparisons of schools are at best misleading and may have detrimental effects on teaching and learning. It is therefore invalid to judge the quality of the education within a school solely in terms of league tables.

At the grassroots level, Principals and teachers of schools that rank poorly in the league tables often comment that their students have made tremendous progress during their time at school. Students

in such schools may achieve below average NCEA results but they may have progressed more since entering secondary school than the students to whom they are compared.

Which is the best way to measure school performance, the percentage of students getting A, M or E grades in NCEA or the growth and improvement shown by the students during their time at the school?

Should school's effectiveness be judged on the basis of how much the students learned from the time they entered the school to the tsch is (sc)-2.0-15.8 TD[T007left2.007.3190 -t998 (o)-5 (rth an81)-5 (l)12.9sioore