

The amounts paid to Education Boards in 1918–19 and 1919–20 for the training of teachers were as follows :—

I. Training colleges—		1918–19.	1919–20.
Salaries of staffs (two-fifths charged to public-school salaries)	£	16,741	21,418
War bonus to staff (£261) and students (£3,903) ..	£	4,164	..
Students' allowances and University fees ..	£	32,110	56,967
Special instruction, libraries, and incidentals ..	£	1,437	1,420
Buildings, sites, and equipment	£	140	3,344
		54,592	83,149
II. Other training—			
Grants for special instruction in certificate subjects of teachers other than training-college students ..	£	1,800	3,162
Railway fares of teachers	£	3,529	2,759
		5,329	5,921
Totals	£	59,921	89,070

PROVISION FOR UNCERTIFICATED TEACHERS.

Apart from the provision for training colleges, a sum of £5,921, as shown above, was expended upon the maintenance of training classes for uncertificated teachers, and upon the conveyance of the teachers to the classes. The purposes for which the grants were made were :—

- (1.) Central classes for the direct personal tuition of uncertificated teachers (exclusive of pupil-teachers and probationers) in subjects required for the D certificate.
- (2.) Tuition and training in Class D subjects of uncertificated teachers (exclusive of pupil-teachers and probationers) by means of correspondence classes under the control of Education Boards, in cases in which it is found highly inconvenient to bring teachers to classes. Under this heading, however, no correspondence classes in science subjects are recognized unless the Board makes adequate provision for practical work.
- (3.) Courses of practical work in physical and natural science, in subjects of manual instruction other than those usually taught by special instructors, in vocal music, and in drawing.

GRADING OF TEACHERS.

During the year the third revision of the graded list of certificated teachers was duly completed under the amended regulations. Several improvements in the system have been made as the result of experience, and it is considered that the regulations now fairly meet nearly all the requirements of the situation.

Though there have been general and theoretical criticisms of the system and its results, it has been found that with few exceptions the criticisms cannot be justified when an appeal is made to the actual facts of the case and a specific instance is called forth. Many criticisms are due to want of careful reading and study of the regulations, remarkable ignorance of the system being often displayed even by those who are selected by branches of the New Zealand Education Institute to place before the authorities their criticisms of the system. In a similar way there is much misguided criticism due to the selection by teachers of a few cases out of over four thousand, on which slender basis sweeping assertions are confidently made.

One exception above referred to was the lack of uniformity in the grading of one education district. In all of the other eight districts a reasonable degree of uniformity was secured without difficulty two years ago, and no valid criticism of uniformity has ever been made regarding those districts. The standard of grading in the district referred to was, in accordance with regulations, on the judgment of a conference of all senior Inspectors, brought into more reasonable conformity with that of the other eight districts, and though it is claimed that the standard of grading is still slightly higher in that district than elsewhere, the difference is so slight as to be fairly free from criticism.