

### Unelected Bureaucrats Claim Children for State

It was in September that former Family Court Judge Graeme MacCormick proposed loony plans to intervene into every family in New Zealand seven times during each child's first 14 years to profile the parents, to approve their "licence" to continue parenting as it were. Not to be outdone, the Children's Commissioner, Cindy Kiro, brought up again in October, for us to get used to the idea, her loony plans to intervene into every New Zealand family four times in each child's first 16 years to assess the children. She first brought this scheme into the open back in February, possibly as a kite-flying exercise. It seems more than that now: it's definitely on the menu.

Her ideas have "progressed" since February....she now intends to appoint a "primary professional" (social worker) to each and every child to ensure "the child and family have access to services and advice they need."<sup>1</sup> As nice as this sounds, one must probe further before dismissing it. Who decides if they "need" these things? If it is the family, free to choose, then great. It is handy to have lots of information freely available. But if the family is told they need this stuff by the social worker who has been assigned to keep tabs on them, then perhaps their freedoms are being infringed upon.

The scheme has a name: Te Ara Tukutuku Nga Whanaungatanga o Nga Tamariki: Weaving Pathways to Wellbeing. It is called a "framework" on which to build "*a better future for our children by taking action*" says Kiro.<sup>2</sup> Here we have a non-elected person repre-

senting a government-funded organisation telling us how they are going to compel you to accept a social worker to oversee your child; and how they are going to compel you to submit your children to this person's assessments in the areas of health (have they had their inoculations?), education (are they keeping up with their peers?) and social skills (have they learned to cope with bullies yet?); and how they are going to compel you to accept that they can provide your children (who they

call "our" children) with a better future (better than what?...the future your family was planning?); and how they are going to compel you to submit to the action they are unilaterally going to take. (I'll come back to this idea of being compelled a bit later, in case some of the readers don't believe this will happen.)

What qualifications does Kiro or any government department have to lay these things on us? None in comparison to the many thousands of parents with proven track records, who were neither consulted nor given an opportunity to vote on these highly invasive schemes of Big Brother. Kiro is a political appointee with a PhD in Social Policy, whose website at [www.occ.org.nz](http://www.occ.org.nz) shows a preoccupation with making criminals out of any parents who

### Toddler as Teacher's Aide

Most people would immediately conclude that it must be disruptive. But an Upper Hutt primary school is adamant that the arrangement is beneficial, teaching empathy and social skills.

Teacher Kim Davidson brings her 18 month old toddler Isabella with her each day while she teaches a class of 32 pupils aged 8-10 at Plateau School in Te Marua. One of the pupils is rostered each day to help take care of Isabella. The pupils got to see Isabella's first steps, helped teach her to talk and based some class work around her – such as a project on the environmental effects of disposable nappies.

This is not a temporary arrangement – when Ms Davidson is off ill, they arrange for a relief teacher who also has a young

child to bring along. Both the MoE and the ERO have officially given their ok, saying that if it seems to work, why change it.1

As home educators we can learn a bit about the state system: it can at times be rather flexible, especially if everyone seems happy and can surround the practice with positives like "it teaches empathy and social skills." So it is clear that academics is not the only thing or even the most important thing on the school classroom menu. And classes of 32 children are obviously not uncommon.

Home educators also often have toddlers around the place to add a different dimension to education and teach practical and social skills. So next time the MoE or ERO mention concern about so-

*(Continued on page 3: Toddler)*

would dare to use reasonable force, however light, in correcting, training or disciplining their children while showing no inclination to do anything at all about school bullying and indecent assault, drug and alcohol abuse among children, child pornography, gratuitous and sexualised TV and video violence or the premeditated killing of unborn children by their own mothers. Government departments have the universally recognised trend toward greater and greater government centralisation and control coupled with ever-increasing government spending for ever-decreasing social benefits. Plus layers and layers of bureaucrats motivated by enough self-interest to ensure the continued growth and funding of the bureaucracy.<sup>3</sup>

Kiro briefly outlined her scheme like this: “*Individual plans, owned by the child and held by the family, will be developed in partnership with children and families.*”<sup>2</sup> This is nothing short of the central government in the person of Cindy Kiro giving notice that she is going to be meddling in your family affairs from now on. Look at what is in this statement: “Individual plans” – each child will have a plan mapped out

for it. Who does the mapping? Parents are not mentioned, but the “family” is and the child is, so the third party is clearly the state. This plan is owned by the child. It is not owned by the parents. The parents, presumably as part of the “family” get to “hold” these plans. Who is monitoring them and making sure they are being implemented? Yes, the government. That is what Kiro’s four interventions are all about: to make sure the child is tracking along the lines set for it by the state “in partnership with children and families”.

We know this is going to be compulsory for every child because the language used is about “every child” and makes no hint that only some or only the “at risk” will be monitored. The idea of Kiro’s four interventions and MacCormick’s seven interventions is to first of all identify the definitely “at risk”. This in itself is problematic as to what “at risk” means....it is a set of values held in a policy statement by a collection of unelected child-advocacy groups, a policy statement that can change according to the politically correct flavour of the month. Helen Clark

made it plain last year that she would view any mum who desired to stay permanently at home for her children as “at risk” of not contributing to the economic viability of the country. What is to stop Kiro coming to the conclusion that any home educator who does not follow the National Curriculum Guidelines is “at risk” of ruining the child’s educational future?

Here is what Kiro actually said in her press release: “This [framework] would provide *a systematic approach to monitoring the development of every child and young person in New Zealand* through coordinated planned assessment at key life

stages and supporting families to make sure children have the opportunity to reach their full potential. *The assessments would take into account the whole child: their physical, social, educational, emotional, and psychological development.*”<sup>2</sup> Who is deciding what is acceptable in each of these areas? And most importantly, by what standard are these things to be assessed? Is the standard likely to be the same as the one you use with your own family, or will it be downright subversive or antithetical or hostile to your own family’s standards? The state’s standards will be secular and politically correct and reflect the policies of Cindy Kiro. So if you are among the 80% of parents who believe you should be able to use reasonable force to correct your children, or hold sincere religious beliefs you intend to pass on to your children, you are already assured a rough ride at your first assessment. Dr Lean was at Otago University earlier this year seriously proposing that legislation be passed to control the food supply and head off an obesity epidemic!<sup>4</sup> So perhaps Kiro will check what food parents give the children, what books, TV or internet access is allowed and disallowed. Will she check what religious/political/ethical beliefs you teach since these things will have an effect on the child’s emotional and psychological development?

Compulsion was also implied by Barnardos New Zealand Chief Executive Murray Edridge as he welcomed the launch of Kiro’s four interventions, calling them “a long term initiative directed at offering every child the best possible start in life.”<sup>2</sup> He went on to say these interventions “will require an enormous commitment of engagement and resources by the government and community”, since “every child” has to be monitored.<sup>2</sup> Green MP Sue Bradford is more upfront than just using the inclusive language of “all children”. She said, “I realise some parents will be horrified by the idea that their children will have regular checkups.”<sup>5</sup> She got that one right.

And we mustn’t forget Judge MacCormick’s suggestions that any parents who refuse to submit to being

## TEACH Bulletin

is a monthly publication of the Home Education Foundation and is concerned with those things which may have an impact on home educators. Articles will deal with political developments, statist and professional trends, correspondence with educationalists and other items of general interest to home educators. Information herein is not to be construed as legal advice. Opinions expressed in *TEACH Bulletin* are those of the writer and should not be assumed to reflect those of the Home Education Foundation Trustees or Board of Reference Members. *TEACH Bulletin* is available for a subscription of \$16 per year for 11 issues (none in December) or two years for \$30.

### All correspondence to:

The Editor, Craig S. Smith  
PO Box 9064  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand  
Ph.: (06) 357-4399  
Fax: (06) 357-4389  
mail@hef.org.nz

**www.hef.org.nz**

Hear, my son, your father’s instruction,  
and reject not your mother’s teaching.  
— Proverbs 1:8

# Trading Post



## For Sale:

Saxon Maths Algebra 1/2 set.... \$70  
“ Algebra 1 set.....\$70  
“ Algebra 2 set.....\$70  
“ Advanced Mathematics set  
(includes Solutions Manual).....\$90

## Contact:

Barbara Henare  
18 Whitemans Road  
Kawakawa 0210  
Bay of Islands  
Phone: (09) 404-0688  
email: j.b.henare@xtra.co.nz

## Wanted:

### Pen Pal

Hello! My name is Angus Rae. I'm 11 years old and live in NSW. I have been home educated my whole life. I like playing tennis, bird-watching, playing the piano and reading exciting books. I'd love a pen pal from New Zealand, so if you're a boy between 10 and 13 I'd love to hear from you. My address is:

“Badenoch”  
Lowreys Rd.  
Bulahdelah, NSW  
Australia 2423

profiled by the state agents should first have their family benefit suspended and second be referred to CYFs with a view to having their children removed.<sup>6</sup> Compulsory interventions into each and every one of our families is to become the standard New Zealand way of life.

They seem especially keen to interfere with how we parents raise our own children. Take the vehemence with which Bradford, Kiro and all the child advocacy groups (Plunket, Barnardos, Save the Children, Parentline, UNICEF, EPOCH, etc.) have been calling for the repeal of Section 59, for example. Section 59 *justifies* only one kind of parental force: that used for correction. The newly proposed Section 59 *criminalises* only one kind of parental force: that used for correction! Correction has always been the only motivation allowed by law if you used force with your children. Now they want correction to be the one

motivation specifically not allowed by law! And this proposed replacement for Section 59 does so while specifically *justifying* reasonable force *to prevent* criminal, offensive or disruptive behaviour but not *to correct* it! Believe it or not, the proposed replacement for the present Section 59, proposed by the Parliamentary Justice and Electoral Select Committee, says that to correct such behaviour with reasonable force will be illegal, but to prevent it with reasonable force will be fine.

You see, the repeal lobby's rhetoric has been trying to get us to believe it was the “reasonable force” they wanted to ban, for they claimed it leads to violence and abuse. But their real agenda has been revealed! We see now that it is the *correction* of children they want to ban, not the use of reasonable force! It is OK in their minds for parents to compel children *to stop behaving* in a certain way, but it is not OK in their minds for parents to compel children *to behave* in a certain way.

That is where these ideologues have the problem with Section 59: that it justifies those parents who actually believe it is their duty to correct, train and discipline their children into a set of behaviours that reflect the same set of values and standards and attitudes of right and wrong, good and bad, wise and unwise to which the parents adhere.

The repeal lobby reckon they can tolerate parents using reasonable force to prevent their children from conforming to certain behaviours (criminal, offensive and disruptive) when the children seem inclined toward such behaviors. But they make it clear they will not tolerate parents using reasonable force to ensure their children do conform to other behaviours (obedience, respect and honesty) when the children do not seem inclined toward these behaviours. An agenda that is more anti-parent, anti-family, in fact, one that is more foolish, illogical, nonsensical and counter to all that makes for a peaceful and orderly society would be hard to imagine.<sup>7</sup> With this kind of social monitor-

ing and control on the horizon, I trust home educators can see the obvious implications: that we are likely to be viewed as too far out of the main stream for Big Brother's convenience in observing our children. We must oppose these moves, not only to preserve our own family's privacy and integrity from the excessive government interventions being proposed, but also for the sake of future generations of New Zealanders' social health, peace and orderliness in general.

## Notes:

1. Newstalkzb, 26 October 2006, “Cindy Kiro unveils her vision for children”, <http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/newsdetail.asp?storyID=106334>
2. Children's Commission, Press Release, 26 October 2006, “Children's commissioner details future vision”, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0610/S00305.htm> (emphasis added.)
3. Muriel Newman, *Newman Weekly*, 3 December 2006, “An inconvenient reality”, [www.nzcpd.com](http://www.nzcpd.com).
4. NZPA, 26 September 2006, “NZ could help halt obesity epidemic – expert”, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3809607a11,00.html>
5. Green Party Press Release, 27 October 2006, “Cross-Party Family Violence Group could mediate Kiro plan”, <http://www.greens.org.nz/searchdocs/PR10268.html>
6. *NZ Herald*, 19 September 2006, “Parents should sit licence test, say experts”, [http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/story.cfm?c\\_id=1&ObjectID=10401922](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/story.cfm?c_id=1&ObjectID=10401922)
7. How did Plunket and Barnardos get mixed up in this idiocy? Plunket has rejected the philosophical foundations of its founder, Dr Sir Truby King, and Barnardos has completely repudiated the Christian faith which motivated its founder, Dr Thomas Barnardo. This left them both philosophically vulnerable to new, untested ideas and movements whose greatest asset is their novelty.

(Continued from page 1: **Toddler**)

cialization or not doing enough work because of other smaller siblings around, make reference to this scenario in Upper Hutt and insist that they note this as a definite positive, not a negative, about your home education programme.

## Note:

1. *Dominion Post*, 15 Nov 2006, “Teachers aide at 18 months”, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3861216a7694,00.html>

## Grudging Praise for Home Educators

Federal, state and local governments have spent billions of dollars in placing computers into the nation's schoolrooms. Yet, according to an education professor at the University of Wisconsin, the digital revolution has actually worked greater wonders in home schooling than in public schooling.

Michael W. Apple has nothing but praise for Larry Cuban's *Oversold and Underused: Computers in the Classroom* (Harvard University Press, 2002), which questions the value of the twenty-year investment in wiring, hardware and software that is used infrequently in the traditional classroom. As Cuban puts it: "The quantities of money and time have yet to yield even modest returns or to approach what has been promised in academic achievement, creative classroom integration of technologies and transformation of teaching and learning."

However, Apple sees a dynamic that Cuban misses: that the Internet-linked computer has yielded high dividends to parents who educate their children at home. Apple sees the computer not only providing a plethora of lesson plans and materials for parents and students but also helping to form vital networks among home-schooling families that serve social, educational and political purposes. No fan of the home school, Apple nonetheless understands how the computer has empowered home instruction while fueling what he fears: the dramatic growth of the home-school movement, which he says now accounts for more students than do charter public schools.

The University of Wisconsin professor marvels — although somewhat begrudgingly — at how home schooling represents, unlike the public education establishment, the same innovation, creativity and ingenuity that the computer represents. Particularly troubling to him is how networks of home-schooling parents in California are forming themselves, with the blessing of public school authorities, into "charter" schools. He notes how in one small school district, a home

charter school grew from 80 to 750 students in two years, providing both greater state revenue for the school district and a wealth of materials and instructional support for the home-based parent-teacher.

As much as Apple is troubled by what a growing home-school movement may pose to a public education system that he laments is also politicized, he ought to realize that home schooling, like the computer, is here to stay.

(Source: Michael W. Apple, "Are We Wasting Money on Computers in Schools?" *Education Policy* 18 [July 2004]: 513-522, as it appeared in World Congress on Families Research Abstract of the Week, [http://www.worldcongress.org/WCFUpdate/Archive06/wcf\\_update\\_601e.htm#c](http://www.worldcongress.org/WCFUpdate/Archive06/wcf_update_601e.htm#c).)

---

### Focus Not on the Family

Schools are considering a programme to bring newborn babies into the classroom on a regular basis. This is to allow students to see what babies look like, follow their progress, celebrate milestones, interact, etc. They reckon it helps decrease the bullying and name-calling that is such a regular and worrying part of life within these state institutions.

Principals Federation president Pat Newman said schools already had a crowded curriculum, but he supported the programme anyway. This is further evidence that socialisation is a lot more important to the overall ethos of state schools than is generally known. While it is not mentioned in the Education Act, the socialisation aspect of state schools is constantly referred to in MoE documents, ERO reviews and, as every home educator knows, in Exemption Applications.

Mr Newman reveals a common state-school system attitude toward private parents and families when he said, "If families were functioning as they supposedly should be, then we wouldn't have to be doing this because children would be learning about nurturing

at home."<sup>1</sup> All of us are caught up in this sweeping generalisation of condemnation. It is a certainty that Mr Newman has not surveyed the families of any school to ascertain who has rarely been around babies and whether or not such exposure would contribute positively to their socialisation or not. Instead he has simply accepted what the Canadian Roots of Empathy Scheme, from which this idea is borrowed, has said about having babies visit classrooms. The scheme certainly acts as another pull to get more attention focussed on state schooling institutions as the providers of all useful information and experiences for children, making these institutions, rather than families, the more important centres of social cohesion and influence.

Mr Newman does of course allude to a real problem: that more and more "families" are dysfunctional and woefully lacking in basic life skills and experiences and knowledge. As this trend continues, the state will step in more and more, striving to institutionalise and regulate our very home lives to ensure we don't "fall through the cracks". Even though only a small minority of households are this badly dysfunctional, the state does not want to discriminate lest the truly dysfunctional become "stigmatised".<sup>2</sup> Consequently every family, with no exceptions, will be targeted for intervention by government agents, just as Children's Commissioner Kiro and former Family Court Judge MacCormick have indicated.<sup>3, 4</sup> They can see plenty of other beneficial spin-offs: it allows the various state bureaucracies which feed on this dysfunction to maintain and justify their own existence as well as more effectively lobby for greater funding, more staff, extended powers of intervention, etc., to make their services equally utilised by all. The statistics gathered by being able to intervene into every family and snoop around will also help with future planning and control.<sup>4</sup>

If we can maintain our exemptions in such an intrusive political environment, home educated children will stand out more and more as already well-grounded in the reality of well-functioning homes. It is already unusual to see mums and dads

fully-engaged with the education and training of their children. And we home educating parents have discovered, simply by personally shouldering all our parenting responsibilities ourselves (as opposed to delegating them to out-of-home minders), that we are fully qualified to teach and train and educate our children to a better-than-average level of competence in both the academic and social arenas. Many of us have also discovered that such competence, once as common as grass, is today perceived as very intimidating to others and viewed with suspicion by agents of the state.

### Notes:

1. *Dominion Post*, 1 June 2006, "How babies can beat the bullies", <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3686150a7694,00.html>
2. NZ Centre for Political Debate, "A Licence for Parents", 23 Sept 2006, <http://www.nzcpd.com/weekly50.htm>
3. *TEACH Bulletin No. 108*, October 2006, "Totalitarians talk openly of total state control."
4. Children's Commission, Press Release, 26 October 2006, "Children's commissioner details future vision", <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0610/S00305.htm>

---

## Day Care for Under 3s No Good

A tired old Fish & Chips shop in Palmerston North recently had a facelift and opened for business as an in-home child care operation. "From birth until they start school" it says across the building. It would seem that many people now view children as little more than accessories....you should have one to qualify as an experienced adult, but the actual care, nurturing, training, discipline, correction, love and bonding required on a day-by-day basis are tiresome, low-status, unpaid and unfulfilling tasks that can be farmed out to all manner of people willing to do the job for pay. OK, so they are just minding the child most of the time, making sure it doesn't get hurt too badly by the other kids in care. But no harm's done, right?

Common knowledge of past generations being nearly lost these days, it takes a group of so-called "eminent child-care experts" to raise serious concerns about the long-term effects

of putting very young children into such day nurseries before people start to take notice.

A group including the psychologist and author Steve Biddulph, Sir Richard Bowlby, the president of the Centre for Child Mental Health in London and Prof Allan Schore, the renowned American child psychologist, wrote to *The Daily Telegraph* (UK) on 21 October this year to demand a clearer vision on what babies and very young children need to develop emotionally and to ask whether children under three should be cared for by anyone other than trusted and familiar figures in their lives.

Sir Richard wrote a 2,600-word paper (circulated to 30 of the world's leading experts and approved by most of them) laying out all available evidence about the best way to care for children, particularly in the crucial period between birth and the age of 30 months.

He concluded: "In a society which encourages both parents to work outside the home while their children are under three, it is 'attachment-focused' child-care arrangements that have a crucial role to play in facilitating healthy emotional development."

In an interview with *The Daily Telegraph*, Sir Richard said: "It is far more difficult for a day-care nursery to provide an environment in which a child will develop normal emotions than it is for a mother, or in her absence, a father, grandparent or child-minder."

Sadly, Sir Richard demonstrated that he is of the nanny-state mindset still when he said, "Rather than funding day-care nurseries through Sure Start, the Government should make it easier for parents to use their child-care allowances to pay a grandmother or other relative to look after their children, or to use it themselves as 'pay' to look after the child themselves." This is simply accepting that the state should "pay" family members to look after their own children. Our home education al-

lowance from the Ministry of Education can be viewed similarly to this, and for this reason we need to exercise caution in how we view it. The Correspondence School parents, not home educators, lobbied for it, saying they should be paid for doing the government's job: that of educating their own children. Those arguments make my blood run cold. My children are emphatically not the government's children nor are they the government's responsibility. As soon as you relinquish the responsibility for your children, you lose the authority over them as well. Never forget this...and never let it happen.

Mr Biddulph, an Australian psychologist who has written a series of respected books on parenthood, said: "The psychological neurological evidence is clear that this [farming babies out to child care institutions] is not adequate care for proper brain development in the under-two child. The proper development of the infant cortex depends on one-to-one loving care, yet we have never had an economy or a government that puts less value on love."

"We need people who are calm, caring, able to bond and be close. We are breeding the very opposite."

Sue Palmer, the author of *Toxic Childhood* and joint organiser of a letter to *The Daily Telegraph* signed by 110 experts in September that drew attention to the sinister cocktail of influences that its signatories said were ruining childhood, said, "This will make uncomfortable reading for many parents because they have chosen to leave their tiny children in day care, and they know inside themselves that it is often not the right thing to do."

Although we home educators already knew we were doing the best for our children by devoting ourselves to them, it is nice to have it reinforced by a group of academics with PhDs trailing after their names, for it is people within this crowd who often view us with the greatest degree of disapproval.

(Extracts from "Day nursery may harm under-3s, say child experts", 21 October 2006, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/10/21/nursery21.xml>)

# Coming Events

For updates on this information, see [www.hef.org.nz](http://www.hef.org.nz) and click Coming Events

## Sat, 20 Jan 2007

### Workshop in Nelson

**Time:** 7:30pm-9:00pm

**Venue:** Richmond Baptist Church, 123 Salisbury Rd., Richmond, Nelson.

**Cost:** \$5 per family

**Contact:** Karen Dawson, (03) 544-0752, [kmdawson@xtra.co.nz](mailto:kmdawson@xtra.co.nz)

- 3 Electives
- Reforming the Future Through Christian Home Education - Craig Smith
  - Training Our Children's Minds, Tools of Learning and Motivation - Barbara Smith
  - Princesses with a Purpose and Titus 2 Bootcamp (for young ladies) Genevieve Smith

## Mon, 22 Jan 2007

### Workshop in Westport

**Time:** 3:00pm-9:00pm

**Venue:** Union Church, cnr Queen & Wakefield Sts.

**Cost:** \$10

**Contact:** Bridget Kitchin, (03) 789-6464, [kitchinfamily@xtra.co.nz](mailto:kitchinfamily@xtra.co.nz)

#### Programme

**3:00** - Registration

**3:30-5:00** 2 Electives

- Reforming the Future Through Christian Home Education - Craig Smith
- Training Our Children's Minds, Tools of Learning and Motivation - Barbara Smith

**5:00** - Please bring a contribution for the shared dinner. Hot drinks provided.

**6:00-7:30** 3 Electives

- Dad's Essential Role in Christian Home Education - Craig Smith
- Training Our Children/Youth to Be Pure - Barbara Smith
- Princesses with a Purpose and Titus 2 Bootcamp (for young ladies) Genevieve Smith

**8:00-9:00** - Getting Things into Perspective - Craig Smith

## Tue, 23 Jan 2007

### Workshop in Hokitika

**Time:** 7:30pm-9:00pm

**Venue:** Hokitika Church of Christ, cnr Stafford & Sale Sts.

**Cost:** \$5.00

**Contact:** Sonya McGarvey, (03) 755-5300, [megarveys@snap.net.nz](mailto:megarveys@snap.net.nz)

## Sat, 27 Jan 2007

### Workshop in Invercargill

**Time:** 2:00pm-8:00pm

**Venue:** Otatara Community Church, 46 Oreti Rd., Otatara

**Cost:** \$10 per family

**Contact:** Joy Gibson, (03) 214-4493,

[briangibson@xtra.co.nz](mailto:briangibson@xtra.co.nz); Liz Tosh, (03) 248-5084

#### Programme

**2:00pm** - Registration

**2:30 - 4:00** 2 Electives

- Getting Started, dealing with MOE/ERO, pulling children out of School, doing exemption form, etc- Craig Smith
- Training Our Children's Minds, Tools of Learning and Motivation - Barbara Smith

**4:00 - 4:30** Afternoon Tea

**4:30 - 6:00** 2 Electives

- Reforming the Future Through Christian Home Education - Craig Smith
- Avoiding Burnout—Keepin' Going When the Going Gets Tough - Barbara Smith

**6:00** - Please bring a contribution for the shared dinner. Hot drinks provided.

**7:00 - 8:00** Getting Things Into Perspective - Craig Smith

## Mon, 29 Jan 2007

### Workshop in Dunedin

**Contact:** Yolanda, (03) 477-3039, [roland.storm@clear.net.nz](mailto:roland.storm@clear.net.nz)

## Tue, 30 Jan 2007

### Public Meeting, Oamaru

**Time:** 7:30pm-9:00pm

**Venue:** The Drill Hall, Itchen St.

**Cost:** \$5.00

**Contact:** Margaret, (03) 434-5552, [blackdash@xtra.co.nz](mailto:blackdash@xtra.co.nz)

**Address:** Is It Possible to Discipline Children in Our Undisciplined Society - Craig Smith

## Thur, 1 Feb 2007

### Workshop, Christchurch

**Contact:** Paulette, (03) 312-9557, [mpfawcett@xtra.co.nz](mailto:mpfawcett@xtra.co.nz)

## Fri, 2 Feb 2007

### Workshop in Blenheim

**Time:** 7:30pm-9:00pm

**Venue:** Riverdale Community House, 131 Budge St., Blenheim

**Cost:** \$5.00

**Contact:** Reena, (03) 570-5143, [tatts.family@slingshot.co.nz](mailto:tatts.family@slingshot.co.nz)

#### Programme

- Discussion with Craig & Barbara Smith: bring your questions.
- Staying at Home vs Going to School by Genevieve Smith (To help students determine whether to stay at home or go to school for secondary years.)

## Wed, 7 Feb 2007

### Not Back to School Day Celebration, Palm Nth

**Time:** 11am to 1pm

**Venue:** Square, Te Awe Awe's cnr.

**Cost:** Free

**Programme:** BYO picnic lunch.

## Sat, 10 Feb 2007

### PN 2nd Annual Home Education Curriculum Fair

**Time:** 10am to 4pm

**Venue:** Reformed Church, 541 Ruahine St., Palmerston North

**Contact:** Sandra Elliott, (06) 354-5678, [elliotts@xnet.co.nz](mailto:elliotts@xnet.co.nz)

**Cost:** \$2 per family. First 50 home educating mums through the door receive complimentary goodie bags. Spot Prizes.

**Café:** Nothing over \$2.50. Coffee & Tea provided free.

**2nd Hand Books:** Bring & Buy table managed by volunteers who ask that you bring each item to sell already priced and with an envelope.

#### Vendors:

\*LearnEx Education Services  
[www.learnex.co.nz](http://www.learnex.co.nz)

\*CENZ (Christian Education NZ)  
[www.cenz.org](http://www.cenz.org)

\*Home Education Foundation  
[www.hef.org.nz](http://www.hef.org.nz)

\*Geneva Books  
[www.genevabooks.org](http://www.genevabooks.org)

\*Tisa Education Services  
[www.tisa.co.nz](http://www.tisa.co.nz)

\*Creaky Corner  
[kathycreek@maxnet.co.nz](mailto:kathycreek@maxnet.co.nz)

\*Issacharian Books  
[www.freewebs.com/issacharian/](http://www.freewebs.com/issacharian/)

\*Eduquip Ltd  
[www.eduquip.co.nz](http://www.eduquip.co.nz)

#### Programme

**10:00am** - Registration

**10:10am** - Presentation by Eduquip Ltd (10 min.)

**10:30am** - Building a Biblical Work Ethic (45min.) by Ray Green of CENZ

**11.20am** - Discovering Your God Given Design (45min.) by Ray Green of CENZ

**12:20pm** - Presentation by Issacharian Books (10 min.)

**12:40pm** - Presentation by Home Education Foundation (10 min.)

**1:00-2:00pm** - 2 electives:

- Is It Possible to Discipline Children in Our Undisciplined Society? by Craig Smith
- Staying at Home vs Going to School by Genevieve Smith (To help students determine whether to stay at home or go to school for secondary years.)

**2:15pm** - LEARNEX (10 min.)

**2.45pm** - Understanding God's Way of Handling Money (45min.) by Ray Green of CENZ

**3:40pm** - Creaky Corner (10 min.)