

**Schools' Progress  
Towards Meeting  
National  
Administration  
Guideline (NAG) 5 on  
Food and Nutrition**

**June 2008**



## Contents

Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Findings.....	2
Appendix 1: Statistics of schools in the sample for this report.....	7

## Introduction

Mission-On is an inter-agency campaign coordinated by Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) in partnership with the Ministries of Education and Health, and with support from the Ministry of Youth Development.<sup>1</sup> Its aim is to improve young New Zealanders' lifestyles through improved nutrition and increased physical activity, which includes:

- improving nutrition within schools and early childhood environments;
- encouraging and enabling student-led health promotion; and
- reducing young people's exposure to marketing of unhealthy food and drink.

In 2007 two new clauses on food and nutrition were added to National Administration Guideline<sup>2</sup> (NAG) 5. These additions came into effect on 1 June 2008, and require boards of trustees to:

- promote healthy food and nutrition for all students; and
- where food and beverages are sold on school premises, make only healthy options available.

During the first half of 2008 ERO evaluated the extent to which schools were ready to meet the amended NAG 5 requirements.

## Methodology

ERO collected data for this evaluation from 173 schools between 1 February and 31 May, 2008. All regular school reviews during Terms 1 and 2, 2008 included an evaluation of the school's readiness for the amended NAG 5 as an area of national interest.

Boards of trustees were asked to attest, through ERO's Board Assurance Self Audit Checklist, that the board had considered the actions it needed to take to meet the two new requirements.

The checklist also provided a space for other relevant comments, such as specific actions that schools had taken. ERO considered and verified each board's response and actions taken in the course of the review. The individual school findings were aggregated for this national report.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.mission-on.co.nz>.

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Education, *The National Administration Guidelines*. The new requirements are NAG 5 (ii) and (iii).

## Findings

Almost all the 173 schools (93 percent) had considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition. Slightly fewer (87 percent) had considered actions to make healthy food options available.

*Table 1: Overall findings – Considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition*

Response	Number	Percentage of sample
Yes	161	93
No	10	6
Unsure	2	1
Total	173	100

*Table 2: Overall findings – Considered actions to make healthy options available*

Response	Number	Percentage of sample
Yes	150	87
No	11	6
Unsure	2	1
Not applicable	6	4
No response	4	2
Total	173	100

All schools that had *not* carried out one or both of these actions (or, in two cases for each, were unsure whether they had done so or not) were full or contributing primary schools. It should be noted that these two school types were a significant proportion (86 percent) of the sample.

Overall, 92 percent of primary schools had considered promoting healthy food and nutrition, while 87 percent had considered making healthy options available. All secondary schools and intermediate schools in the sample had considered both aspects.

*Table 3: School type - Considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition*

School type	Yes - percent	No - percent	Unsure - percent
Full Primary (Y1-8)	92	8	0
Contributing (Y1-6)	91	6	3
Intermediate (Y7-8)	100	0	0
Secondary (Y7-15)	100	0	0
Composite (Y1-15)	100	0	0
Secondary (Y9-15)	100	0	0
Special School	100	0	0

*Table 4: School type - Considered actions to make healthy options available<sup>3</sup>*

<b>School type</b>	<b>Yes - percent</b>	<b>No - percent</b>	<b>Unsure - percent</b>	<b>N/A - percent</b>
Full Primary (Y1-8)	85	8	1	6
Contributing (Y1-6)	90	8	1	1
Intermediate (Y7-8)	100	0	0	0
Secondary (Y7-15)	100	0	0	0
Composite (Y1-15)	100	0	0	0
Secondary (Y9-15)	100	0	0	0
Special School	100	0	0	0

All large schools had considered promoting healthy food and nutrition, as had 90 percent of medium sized schools and 91 percent of small ones. While 96 percent of large schools, and 92 percent of medium sized ones, had considered making healthy options available, somewhat fewer small schools (84 percent) had done so.

*Table 5: Roll size group - Considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition*

<b>Roll size</b>	<b>Yes - percent</b>	<b>No - percent</b>	<b>Unsure - percent</b>
Small (0-150 primary, 0-300 secondary)	91	9	0
Medium (151-300 primary, 301-700 secondary)	90	5	5
Large (301+ primary, 701+ secondary)	100	0	0

*Table 6: Roll size group - Considered actions to make healthy options available<sup>4</sup>*

<b>Roll size</b>	<b>Yes - percent</b>	<b>No - percent</b>	<b>Unsure - percent</b>	<b>N/A - percent</b>
Small (0-150 primary, 0-300 secondary)	84	10	1	5
Medium (151-300 primary, 301-700 secondary)	92	0	5	3
Large (301+ primary, 701+ secondary)	96	4	0	0

High decile schools were slightly less likely than others to have considered promoting healthy food and nutrition (90 percent, compared to 96 percent for medium deciles and 93 percent for low deciles) and making healthy options available (84 percent, compared to 90 percent and 93 percent).

<sup>3</sup> Four schools (all contributing primaries) did not provide an answer to this question.

<sup>4</sup> Four schools (3 medium and 1 large) did not provide an answer to this question.

*Table 7: School decile ranges - Considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition*

Decile	Yes – percent	No - percent	Unsure - percent
Low (1-3)	93	5	2
Middle (4-7)	96	3	1
High (8-10)	90	10	0

*Table 8: School decile ranges - Considered actions to make healthy options available<sup>5</sup>*

Decile	Yes - Percent	No - Percent	Unsure - Percent	N/A - Percent
Low (1-3)	93	7	0	0
Middle (4-7)	90	4	1	4
High (8-10)	84	9	2	5

Rural schools were significantly less likely than urban ones to have considered actions, both to promote healthy food and nutrition (87 percent compared to 96 percent), and to make healthy food options available (79 percent compared to 94 percent).

*Table 9: School locality - Considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition*

Locality	Yes - percent	No - percent	Unsure - percent
Urban	96	2	2
Rural	87	13	0

*Table 10: School locality - Considered actions to make healthy options available<sup>6</sup>*

Locality	Yes - Percent	No - Percent	Unsure - Percent	N/A - Percent
Urban	94	4	1	1
Rural	79	11	2	8

In terms of ERO areas, schools in Area 2<sup>7</sup> (98 percent) and Area 5<sup>8</sup> (97 percent) were most likely to have considered promoting healthy food and nutrition, while those in Area 3<sup>9</sup> (82 percent) were least likely to have done so.

Area 2 schools were also the most likely to have considered making healthy food

<sup>5</sup> Four schools (1 low, 1 medium and 2 high decile) did not provide an answer to this question.

<sup>6</sup> Four schools (2 urban and 2 rural) did not provide an answer to this question.

<sup>7</sup> Area including Waikato, Hauraki, Coromandel, Bay of Plenty, central North Island.

<sup>8</sup> All of the South Island excluding northern West Coast, Nelson and Marlborough.

<sup>9</sup> Area including Taranaki, Waimarino, Wanganui, Manawatu, East Coast, Hawkes Bay, Horowhenua (Levin north).

options available (98 percent), with Areas 5 (79 percent) and 3 (81 percent) being least likely to have done this. It should be noted that there are a number of rural schools in Area 3.

*Table 11: ERO area - Considered actions to promote healthy food and nutrition*

<b>ERO area</b>	<b>Yes - Percent</b>	<b>No - Percent</b>	<b>Unsure - Percent</b>
Area 1	94	3	3
Area 2	98	2	0
Area 3	82	15	3
Area 4	94	6	0
Area 5	97	3	0

*Table 12: ERO area - Considered actions to make healthy options available<sup>10</sup>*

<b>ERO area</b>	<b>Yes - Percent</b>	<b>No - Percent</b>	<b>Unsure - Percent</b>	<b>N/A – Percent</b>
Area 1	94	3	0	3
Area 2	98	0	2	0
Area 3	81	13	3	3
Area 4	88	12	0	0
Area 5	79	7	0	14

A very small number of schools either answered “not applicable” to considering making healthy food options available, as food was not sold on the school premises (six out of the sample of 173), or did not provide an answer to this question (four schools).

The review officer comments on the response sheets identified common themes in terms of specific actions that schools had taken or were planning to take. These included:

- improving the school lunch menu, removing unhealthy food items and/or replacing these with healthier options;
- identifying the health status of foods through “heart ticks” or a similar marking system;
- engaging students in practical activities related to healthy eating (such as growing fruit and vegetables, or forming a student committee to implement healthy eating in school);
- consulting or surveying parents, or providing them with guidelines, about healthy eating;
- working with parents, the community and/or external agencies, such as Public Health promoters, to develop a healthy eating policy; and
- taking part in national initiatives such as Fruit in Schools or Enviro Schools.

<sup>10</sup> Four schools (1 each from Areas 1 and 3, and 2 from Area 5) did not provide an answer to this question.

## **Conclusion**

ERO found that almost all schools were well prepared to meet the amended NAG 5 requirements. All secondary and intermediate schools in the sample had considered both requirements, while almost all (92 percent) primary schools had considered promoting healthy food and nutrition, and slightly fewer (87 percent) had considered making healthy options available.

## Appendix 1: Statistics of schools in the sample for this report

Table 13: School types

School type	Number	Percentage of sample	National percentage <sup>11</sup>
Full Primary (Y1-8)	79	46	44
Contributing (Y1-6)	69	40	31
Intermediate (Y7-8)	4	2	5
Secondary (Y7-15)	5	3	4
Composite (Y1-15)	4	2	5
Secondary (Y9-15)	9	5	9
Special School	3	2	2
Total	173	100	100

The sample of schools in this evaluation closely reflected the national percentages for full primary, special and Years 7 to 15 secondary schools. There were however less intermediate, composite and Years 9 to 15 secondary schools, and more contributing primary schools, in the sample.

Table 14: School locality

Locality	Number	Percentage of sample	National percentage
Urban	110	64	71
Rural	63	36	29
Total	173	100	100

The sample of schools in this evaluation included somewhat fewer urban schools, and more rural ones, than the national percentages.

Table 15: School decile ranges

Decile <sup>12</sup>	Number	Percentage of sample	National percentage
Low decile (1-3)	41	24	30
Middle decile (4-7)	73	42	40
High decile (8-10)	59	34	30
Total	173	100	100

<sup>11</sup> The national percentage of each school type is based on the total population of schools as at 1 July 2007. For this study it excludes kura kaupapa Māori and The Correspondence School.

<sup>12</sup> A school's decile indicates the extent to which a school draws its students from low socio-economic communities. Decile 1 schools are the 10 percent of schools with the highest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities, whereas decile 10 schools are the 10 percent of schools with the lowest proportion of these students.

The sample of schools in this evaluation included fewer low decile schools, and slightly more high decile schools, than the national percentages.

*Table 16: Roll size group*

<b>Roll size</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage of sample</b>	<b>National percentage</b>
Small (0-150 primary, 0-300 secondary)	86	50	44
Medium (151-300 primary, 301-700 secondary)	41	23	27
Large (301+ primary, 701+ secondary)	46	27	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

The sample of schools in this evaluation included slightly fewer large and medium sized schools than the national percentages.

*Table 17: ERO area<sup>13</sup>*

<b>ERO area</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage of sample</b>	<b>National percentage</b>
Area 1	36	21	27
Area 2	42	24	17
Area 3	33	19	19
Area 4	32	19	15
Area 5	30	17	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

The sample of schools in this evaluation included fewer schools from Areas 1 and 5, and more from Areas 2 and 4.

---

<sup>13</sup> Area 1 includes Auckland and Northland. Area 2 includes Waikato, Hauraki, Coromandel, Bay of Plenty and the central North Island. Area 3 includes Taranaki, Waimarino, Wanganui, Manawatu, East Coast, Hawkes Bay and Horowhenua (from Levin north). Area 4 includes Wellington, Wairarapa, Kapiti, the northern West Coast, Nelson and Marlborough. Area 5 includes all of the South Island except the northern West Coast, Nelson and Marlborough.