

Cabinet Christchurch Earthquake Recovery Committee

GREATER CHRISTCHURCH EDUCATION RENEWAL: PROPOSALS FOR ARANUI

1. I propose that Cabinet note I intend to proceed with a year 1-13 campus in Aranui; note that I am considering whether Chisnallwood Intermediate School should be part of this campus or retained as a separate institution; and note the next steps in the process.

Executive Summary

2. In August 2012 Cabinet agreed to a \$1 billion investment in the renewal of education in greater Christchurch over the next ten years to address both pre-existing and earthquake related issues. In September I announced the overall plan for education renewal, including proposals for 38 schools to close or merge. Two schools closed in January, and I announced my interim decisions for 31 schools in February.
3. I extended the consultation period for the five schools in Aranui until 7 March, and they provided me with their feedback on the proposal to close the schools and establish a year 1-13 campus with wrap-around sports and community facilities and social services. The Ministry of Education established a cross-disciplinary team to thoroughly analyse the submissions and provide detailed advice.
4. Under the process established by the Education Act 1989, at this stage I need to decide whether schools 'should' close. I will then make a final decision following a further period of consultation. I intend to decide that we should proceed with the year 1-13 campus on the site of the existing Aranui High School, to be operational from 27 January 2016. A single campus would provide high-quality education facilities and allow easier transitions from early childhood education, between phases of schooling, and to tertiary education providers or employment. Other government agencies have already indicated they would be interested in co-locating health and social services if the campus proposal proceeds.
5. I intend to decide that four of the schools should close on that date but I am considering further whether the fifth school, Chisnallwood Intermediate School, should be closed or continue in the medium term and its viability and place in the network reviewed after the campus has been operational for up to two years (i.e. in 2018).
6. I propose that each of the schools affected is visited and the school leadership is told about my interim decision by senior Ministry of Education staff on the morning of 7 May. I will also communicate directly with parents/caregivers through a letter, as will the Ministry through the Shaping Education website and community meetings. I will make a formal media announcement after this, and also invite the Board chairs and Principals to meet with me in the afternoon.

Background

7. On 13 September 2012, I announced the Government's overall plan to renew education in greater Christchurch following the earthquakes of 2010-11. This plan responds to pre-existing and earthquake related issues, and is supported by a \$1 billion investment over the next ten years. The plan included proposals for 38 schools to close or merge:
 - 13 schools were proposed to close with children being accommodated elsewhere in the network;
 - 18 schools were proposed to merge to create 9 schools;
 - 5 schools in Aranui were proposed to close and a year 1-13 campus to be formed on an undetermined site; and,
 - 2 schools in Akaroa were proposed to close and become part of the Akaroa Area School, whilst continuing to operate on their existing sites.
8. All the Boards consulted with their communities about the proposals. Two of these schools – Hammersley Park and Le Bons Bay – applied for voluntary closure, and closed in January. I decided to extend the consultation period for the five schools in Aranui until 7 March.
9. The Boards of the remaining 31 schools provided their feedback in December, and on 18 February I announced interim decisions on the proposals. I decided to proceed with six mergers (affecting twelve schools) and seven closures, but not to proceed with proposals to merge or close twelve schools. The Boards of schools had until 28 March to provide feedback on the interim decision, and I will announce final decisions in May. The Ministry of Education provided support for Boards to run a further period of consultation with their community if they wanted to do so.

Consultation with schools for closure

10. The school closure process is governed by sections 154 and 157 of the Education Act 1989 (the Act). These sections require the Minister of Education to consult the Board of the school concerned and the Boards of any state schools where the roll might be affected before making an initial decision to close a school. The Minister then gives the Board of the school proposed for closure 28 days in which to provide any further arguments or information in favour of the decision not proceeding.
11. On 28 September 2012, I wrote to the Board chair of each of the 38 schools (including the five in Aranui), copied to the Principal, and Ministry staff hand delivered each letter to the affected school. The letter initiated the formal consultation phase set out by the Education Act 1989. The Ministry also consulted 70 Boards of schools whose rolls may be affected if the proposals were to go ahead.
12. In further recognition of the unique circumstances in greater Christchurch a number of additional supports were put in place. These included:
 - providing each school in Aranui with \$6,500 to appoint an independent facilitator to gather information, coordinate community consultation and draft the school's submission;
 - an 0.2 relief teacher per school allowing a staff member a day per week to focus on the process;
 - a Teachers Only Day; and,
 - establishing an online digital community forum to facilitate greater participation.

13. In addition, the Ministry established a dedicated taskforce, appointed a sector facing specialist advisor (Trevor McIntyre, who stepped down from his position as Headmaster of Christchurch Boys' High School), and facilitated the establishment of three community based advisory groups to oversee the educational renewal programme, Māori and Pasifika involvement and interests. I also appointed a Ministerial Advisor, Karen Sewell (former Secretary of Education, Chief Review Officer, and Chief Executive of the NZ Qualifications Authority) to maintain relationships and communications directly with schools.
14. After the school holidays, on 12 October, the Ministry provided each school with a detailed rationale for the proposal affecting them. This included information about each school's land and buildings issues (and an indicative cost to remediate them), as well as updated information about school rolls based on new July 2012 enrolment data and local population changes. The Ministry offered to meet all affected schools to discuss the rationale, and clarify any of the information provided. This included arranging meetings with the engineers who had undertaken the land and buildings assessments at each school.
15. On 16 October, I wrote to the Boards of the 36 schools¹ offering to meet them and their communities to directly hear their concerns and feedback. Thirty-five Boards accepted my invitation (North New Brighton did not), and I visited each of the schools in late October and early November. My visits included the 5 schools in the Aranui cluster. Individual Boards determined how the meetings would run, and in some cases over 100 parents and other interested people attended. Principals and/or teachers spoke at every meeting. Overall, over 2,000 people attended the meetings.
16. I was able to hear first-hand from parents, Principals, teachers and other staff about the impact that the earthquakes have had and are continuing to have on them, their children and the wider community. A wide range of views were expressed, and it was clear that a number of Boards had been giving serious thought to alternative proposals. Some Boards asked for an extension to the consultation process to allow their communities more time to consider the issues. Given the complexity of the proposal for Aranui, I extended the consultation period for those five schools until 7 March 2013.
17. The Boards of the five schools in Aranui all submitted their responses by the deadline of 7 March. On 11 March, the Ministry provided me with a copy of each submission, including all the material the Boards used to support their analysis and proposals. Following the same process as for the original 31 submissions in December, the Ministry's cross-disciplinary team thoroughly analysed all submissions. This team included staff members with substantial experience of working directly with schools in greater Christchurch. Additional expertise was brought in from property, the school network, special education, and early childhood education (ECE) teams. This team commissioned and considered additional data about demographics and the local school network, as well as property and financial information. This allowed an informed consideration about all the options which Boards had raised.
18. The Ministry's legal advisers have been involved throughout this period to advise on whether the analysis and process were robust and met the Ministry's responsibilities under the Act. They also reviewed the draft education report.

¹ Excluding Hammersley Park and Le Bons Bay Schools.

19. On 28 March 2013, the Ministry provided me with a detailed education report for the proposal. The Ministry's report carefully considers each argument and proposal which has been made by Boards in their submissions, and sets out the Ministry's response and recommendations. The report includes the Ministry's analysis of the effect of the proposal on children's access to school provision, and the financial and property implications of different options. Before being submitted, the report was considered by a governance group consisting of senior officials from Christchurch and Wellington, and the final report was signed off by the Deputy Secretary, Regional Operations. I have subsequently had meetings with officials to carefully consider the analysis and recommendations.
20. I have been conscious of the Ministry's previous advice, which examined the evidence on the quality of education in middle and intermediate schools and small schools. I have also considered the submissions I received previously from the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB), the Post Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA), New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) and other interested bodies to ensure the voices of significant stakeholders have been heard.
21. It is important that parents/caregivers and schools are able in a timely way to see the information I considered when making decisions and, following the same process as in February, I intend to publish the education report on the website dedicated to Christchurch Education Renewal – Shaping Education – at the same time as I announce my decisions. An 0800 line will also be available.

Decisions about the schools in Aranui

22. As set out by the Act, decisions about school closures are the responsibility of the Minister of Education. At this stage of the process, the Act requires that I make decisions about whether schools 'should' close, followed by final decisions about whether they 'will' close after Boards have had 28 days to provide further feedback. In this case I will provide a longer timeframe, six weeks with submissions due by 20 June 2013.
23. Aranui is a suburb located approximately 8km to the east of the CBD. It is one of the poorest and most ethnically diverse areas in greater Christchurch. It is also one of the communities that has been most badly affected by the earthquake. Much of the land which borders the Avon River is part of the CERA red zone. Whilst levels of achievement in Aranui have improved recently, they are still low. In 2011, 42% of school leavers achieved NCEA Level 2. This is just under half of our Better Public Services target for 2017.
24. There are currently five state schools in the Aranui area, as well as one state integrated school (St. James School, a contributing primary with 86 children on the roll). Maps of the area are attached as Appendix 1, and a table with details of the schools and the proposals is attached as Appendix 2. The table below provides information about the roll at each of the five schools:

School	Decile	Roll ² (2013 ENROL roll)	Year levels	Ethnicity of students ³
Aranui School	1	149 (159)	1-8	48 (32.2%) Māori 40 (26.8%) Pasifika 0 (0.0%) Asian 60 (40.3%) European 1 (0.7%) Other

² As at 1 July 2012. March 2013 roll data (sourced from ENROL) is provided in brackets.

³ Based on 2012 data. This does not include international students.

Avondale School	2	335 (303)	1-6	94 (28.1%) Māori 20 (6%) Pasifika 9 (2.7%) Asian 210 (62.7%) European 2 (0.6%) Other
Wainoni School	1	92 (103)	1-8	39 (42.4%) Māori 19 (20.7%) Pasifika 1 (1.1%) Asian 33 (35.9%) European
Chisnallwood Intermediate School	5	746 (693)	7-8	123 (16.4%) Māori 30 (4%) Pasifika 13 (1.7%) Asian 570 (76.2%) European 10 (1.3%) Other
Aranui High School	2	502 (498)	9-13	169 (33.3%) Māori 80 (15.7%) Pasifika 29 (5.7%) Asian 221 (43.5%) European 3 (0.6%) Other
Total Roll		1,824 (1,756)		

25. My original proposal was to close all five schools in Aranui to establish a new Aranui community campus. Like the other proposals, this responded to the damage to land and buildings, and subsequent people movements, as a result of the earthquakes. Between July 2010 and July 2012, the combined rolls of the five state schools in Aranui fell from 2,277 children to 1,824 children. Provisional roll returns for March 2013 indicate that there are around 120 fewer children on the roll of the five schools than there were in March 2012. If this fall is reflected in the July 2013 rolls, then the combined rolls will have fallen by around 25% in three years.

26. This has resulted in substantial spare capacity in the local network. For example, Wainoni School is operating at just 30% of capacity. The proximity of the red zone and the absence of any current proposals for substantial residential development in the area means that rolls are unlikely to grow in the near future.

27. All five schools suffered earthquake damage to varying degrees. Together with the need to resolve pre-existing weathertightness issues and meet new building standards, it would be very expensive to repair this damage and remediate the properties more generally. The combined ten year property costs for the five schools is \$36.9 million. Whilst this is less than the cost of establishing a new campus, the extent of the over-capacity in the area means that repairing all the schools and retaining the network as it is at the moment is not a viable option. The need for some changes was recognised by the Boards of all the schools in their submissions.

28. Instead of making a very significant investment to restore the network in its current condition, we have the opportunity to remodel the network to improve the quality of education and provide easier access to a range of other government and community services. This would include providing modern learning environments to allow teachers to use more collaborative and flexible practices. It also responds to pre-existing issues in the local area. For example, there have been issues in school governance at Aranui High School, and the Ministry has had at least one statutory intervention for the school for five out of the past six years. Instead of having four or five separate school Boards in a small area, we could consolidate governance and strengthen a single Board's capability.
29. Developing a campus which provides schooling from year 1 to year 13 would allow easier transition between phases of schooling. We know that the transition between different phases of education is often difficult for children, particularly from lower socio-economic groups and can lead to children disengaging from their studies or even dropping out altogether. A single campus (with shared governance between schools) should lead to more joined-up working to support children throughout their time in education. This includes the opportunity to work more closely with tertiary providers to more effectively provide access to and manage transitions to training, employment or further education. With early learning provision already existing on the Aranui High site, parents have the option for their children to remain in one location for the entirety of their schooling.
30. It also provides greater opportunities to share specialist resources and teaching (e.g. of te reo Māori or Pasifika languages) and to locate a technology hub, taking advantage of what will be a highly effective modern learning environment with significant access for digital literacy. This provides an opportunity to lift student achievement, particularly of our priority groups.
31. Whilst not unique in New Zealand, this schooling structure would be new in the state sector in greater Christchurch. There are already successful examples in New Zealand of schools being co-located and collaborating with each other, including sharing governance and facilities, and schools working with other social services. The submission from the Board of Wainoni School acknowledges initial scepticism from their community about the proposal, but states that after discussions and reflections, many people saw the opportunities which could be possible in such a campus.
32. I want to involve the community in identifying the appropriate configuration of the campus together with the nature of the services that could operate from this site. I will therefore consult further about the structure of the year 1-13 campus, in particular, whether it would be better to have a single year 1-13 school (and gain views on how this should be organised), or separate primary and secondary schools with shared facilities and services, with shared governance between the schools. I also want to consult about the possibility of co-locating a special education school on the campus.
33. A vital part of the proposal is for co-location of other services with the campus. We know that during their time in school, many children (or their families) face a range of issues which can have an adverse impact on learning and educational achievement unless they are resolved. Because teachers have daily contact with children, they are often well-placed to identify these problems, but need to be able to have easy access to other agencies and specialist services to resolve them. Other government agencies, including Christchurch City Council and the Canterbury District Health Board, have indicated that they would be interested in co-locating health and social services on the site of the year 1-13 campus if it does go ahead, providing better access for children and their families.

34. The Ministry would ensure that many of the school's facilities were available for public use, providing additional education and recreation options for local residents. These new facilities in one of the communities which suffered the greatest damage in the earthquakes would provide an exciting example of the Government's commitment to the renewal of greater Christchurch.

35. I intend that the campus should be built on the current site of Aranui High School, which is large enough to accommodate the new school and a range of other facilities. The original proposal did not identify a site. The Aranui High site has emerged as a result of submissions made by Aranui School and Aranui High School. The Ministry has assessed these submissions and considers the site to be viable. It is also well located to provide access for local families. Because the Ministry already owns the site, we would not have to undergo a site selection and acquisition process, meaning the new school could be ready in January 2016, one year earlier than I originally proposed. The size of the site means it will be possible to build a new campus while continuing to operate the secondary school. We expect to invest around \$44 million in building the new campus.

36. The Boards of Aranui High and Wainoni Schools agreed with the original proposal. The Board of Aranui School proposed that the school should merge with Wainoni Primary, and co-locate with Aranui High School, as two schools with shared governance on the Aranui High site. They thought that Avondale School could be included in the merger, but that Chisnallwood should not be. The Boards of Avondale and Chisnallwood Intermediate Schools did not support the original proposal.

37. The Board of Avondale School proposed that the school should either be retained as a separate institution (with shared facilities with Chisnallwood), or merge Wainoni and Aranui Schools on the Avondale School site to create one contributing primary school for the area. I am not persuaded that either option adequately responds to the challenges faced and nor does it offer the same level of opportunities for future education achievement as the proposal does.

38. The Board of Chisnallwood Intermediate School has proposed that the school is retained in the network, either on its existing site or relocated further north. The Board did not provide an indication of the specific area it considers it should relocate to or make a detailed case for relocation to another area. Chisnallwood currently draws from a much wider catchment area than the other four schools in Aranui. Its enrolment zone extends north to Windsor School, and draws students from across the Aranui and Parklands areas, and to a lesser extent the Brighton, Linwood and Shirley areas. The Ministry's data indicates that only around 145 children are from the Aranui area, with around a further 150 from within Chisnallwood's enrolment zone. Over 400 children attend the school from outside its zone. The table below shows the current situation:

School catchment	Total Chisnallwood Intermediate students by catchment ⁴
Merged Burwood / Windsor School ⁵	148 ⁶
Aranui Community Campus	145
Parkview School	61
Merged Freeville / North New Brighton School	57
Linwood North School	46
Queenspark School	46
Shirley Intermediate School	45
Merged Central New Brighton / South New Brighton School	40
Linwood Avenue School	29
Bromley School	27
Marshland School	14
Mairehau School	10

39. The Ministry has advised that there are three options for the future of Chisnallwood that are viable for analysis and for my consideration. These options are to close the school as per the original proposal, relocate the school to another part of its current catchment, or retain the school and review its viability when the proposed changes in the wider network have settled and in particular when the new campus has been in operation for two years.

40. The proposal to close the school was part of consideration across the network in the area surrounding the school, together with the total cost of remediation of buildings in the schools in the area. Five schools make up the Aranui cluster and there is significant over capacity in order to meet the schooling needs of children in the area. The total cost of remediation is very high in comparison to the opportunity to provide children and their families in the area with a new modern approach to education and social service infrastructure and delivery.

⁴ This table shows school catchment areas where 10 or more children attend Chisnallwood, based on the 731 children for whom address data are available.

⁵ The table assumes that the interim decisions about the proposed mergers of Burwood and Windsor, Freeville and North New Brighton, and Central and South New Brighton are confirmed. The catchment areas for the newly merged schools are assumed to be the current catchment areas for the two schools.

⁶ The merged Burwood/Windsor School is to be a contributing primary (Year 1-6). These students may attend Shirley Intermediate School.

41. I consider that the campus option for Aranui children is viable without the need to immediately close Chisnallwood. This is the case because currently only 145 children from the Aranui area go to Chisnallwood. That aside in considering the efficiency of the education network and my aim to direct as much funding as possible into providing quality teaching, it is also true that there is sufficient ability for the schools in the network to take the children should Chisnallwood close. This is partly because the catchment in terms of where the children live will once other changes are made consist of 12 other schools and partly because the cost of increasing capacity at these other schools is less than remediating Chisnallwood. While closure remains a viable option that I am considering, I am also aware that Chisnallwood does provide a sound education focus and is a school that parents from a wide ranging area have confidence in. That this is the case has been a strong feature of submissions from the school Board of Trustees.
42. The second option is relocation. I carefully considered two possible alternatives for the relocation of Chisnallwood. The first is in the Parklands area. This would mean Chisnallwood would be well positioned to serve children who live in the north of its current enrolment zone, including those children who currently attend Burwood and Windsor Schools. Parklands is also experiencing population growth. However, even with this growth, the Ministry's analysis shows that the roll of the relocated school would only be around 275 children. It is not efficient to make a significant investment in building a new school for this relatively small number of children. The Ministry estimates that the new build would cost around \$12 million. If the school was built for a roll of 450 it would cost \$15.9m.
43. It would be possible to increase the roll of the relocated Chisnallwood Intermediate School by reducing the years and number of students attending three local full primary schools so they become year 1-6 schools and no longer serve year 7 and 8 children. However, there is no actual education driver to make this amount of change. It is likely to be unpopular with the communities served by those schools, would cause additional disruption in the network and would potentially threaten one or more of these schools' viability.
44. A second possibility for relocation is in the Prestons Road (Shirley) area. However, this option faces similar issues around the relocated school's size, viability and cost, including reducing the number of years at Marshlands Primary school from year 1-8 to year 1-6. Additionally, my decision to retain Shirley Intermediate means there is already an adequate supply of intermediate places in the local network and relocating Chisnallwood may threaten the future of Shirley Intermediate school. I do not propose to pursue either option for relocation.
45. The third option is for Chisnallwood to remain open but for its future viability to be reviewed in 2018 two years after the campus is in operation and at a time when the majority of the other changes to schools in the network have also been made and will have settled to some extent. I do not consider given the amount of change across the network that it is sensible to make a call now on the future viability of Chisnallwood. This is because of the extent of change to the network in the East of Christchurch which with the creation of a more modern education network will provide parents with education options that they don't currently have. This means it is not possible at this time to definitively state what parents may do when all of the changes are made and when they therefore face a different set of choices for their children.
46. If Chisnallwood is retained, its roll would be smaller to reflect the need to address over-capacity in the local network. The Ministry proposes that a roll of 450 students would be sufficient to provide access and sufficient choice within the network, and we would need to reduce the enrolment zone (and manage the zones of other local schools) to reflect this, and ensure the viability of all the schools in the network.

47. The Ministry estimates that it would need to spend up to \$10 million over the next five years on remediating Chisnallwood's property if it is maintained in the network with a roll of 450 students. The full cost of remediation and maintenance would be \$12.5m but \$2.5m of maintenance would be deferred pending the outcome of the proposed review of Chisnallwood's viability. Remediating its property and maintaining the current roll would cost a similar amount. These costs would be additional to the spending on the new Aranui campus.

48. Having worked through all options, this third option is the one I am currently giving most consideration to.

Cost of the options

49. The cost of the option to close all five schools and proceed to build a Year 1-13 campus is \$43.72 million.

a. If the school is Year 1-13:

A new Year 1-13 school	
Site	Aranui High School
Year levels on site	Y1-13
Estimated Roll	1242
Estimated staffing	70.3 FTTEs
Property Cost	\$41.42M
Ten additional teaching spaces at various schools	\$2.30M
Total Property Cost	\$43.72M

b. If the Year 1-13 campus is split into two schools:

A new Year 1-6 and a new Year 7-13 school		
Site	Aranui High School	
Year levels on site	Year 1-6	Year 7-13
Estimated Roll	600	642
Estimated staffing	28.2 FTTEs	43.7 FTTEs
Property Cost	\$41.42M	
Ten additional teaching spaces at various schools	\$2.30M	
Total Property Cost	\$43.72M	

50. Under both options extra teaching spaces will be required at full primary schools in other clusters to accommodate Year 7-8 students who would have attended Chisnallwood Intermediate School previously.

51. The cost of establishing the new Year 1-13 schooling provision in Aranui and of retaining Chisnallwood Intermediate School until its viability is reviewed in 2018 is \$52.8 million. This reflects the same figures as above but with an additional \$10 million to repair Chisnallwood Intermediate School. The number of additional teaching spaces at other schools decreases from ten to six (\$2.30 million to \$1.38 million). Depending on the results of a review in 2018, a further \$2.5m of deferred maintenance will be necessary, bringing the total cost to \$55.3m.

52. The majority of costs will fall in 2014/15 and later years, and funding will be sought as part of the Business Case for the whole education investment being submitted in August 2013. It is expected that up to \$6.5m may be spent on this project in 2013/14 and that will be funded from the Ministry's baseline.

Communications with schools and the wider community

53. I have received positive feedback from school Boards and Principals about how the February interim decisions were relayed to the schools, and intend to follow the same approach for the schools in Aranui. I will again ensure that there is a focus on ensuring that parents/caregivers are carefully informed about decisions about their options for the future education of their children. They will have access to timely and comprehensive information through letters, the Shaping Education website, paid advertisements and media interviews. We will also ensure that local stakeholders are properly informed.
54. Following the process for the February announcement, on the morning of 7 May 2013, senior staff from the Ministry will visit each school to deliver and discuss my interim decision with the Board chair and the Principal. They will provide a full information pack and the material which supported the decision, and detailed information about the next steps and timescales, including the support which the Ministry will be making available. The school leadership will be offered a follow-up visit in the next 48 hours to go through the information in more detail, once they have had the opportunity to talk to their communities.
55. After the five schools have been told, I will hold a press conference. I also intend to invite all Board Chairs and Principals to meet me later on the same day. They will already know the decisions at this stage, but the purpose of the meeting is to give them the opportunity to discuss these decisions.
56. As with the February announcement, I want to be as open and transparent as possible about the decision-making process, the advice I received from the Ministry and the factors that were considered. To support this, when the schools are notified of the decision, they will receive a copy of the Ministry's education report. This report, as well as the detailed information packs which schools will receive, will be publicly released on the same day.

Next steps

57. I intend to relay and announce my interim decision on the proposal on 7 May. Note that at the end of the same month, I expect to be in a position to announce my final decision on the other schools currently subject to an interim decision about closure or merger.
58. The Education Act requires a further period of consultation where I have decided that a school should close. I intend to ask the Boards of the five schools to provide any additional information to me by 20 June 2013. This is longer than the 28 days required and reflects the same amount of time given to the other schools recently subject to an interim decision about closure or merger. I will discuss my intended final decision with Cabinet before making an announcement in early August.

59. If the decision becomes final, there will be further consultation with the community about the organisation of the campus structure; the potential relocation of a special school; and the possibilities for co-location of particular social and community services on the same site.

60. I recognise that school Boards and staff will need a range of additional support throughout what will inevitably be a difficult period. If the final decision is for these schools to close, the Ministry will support the Boards to help maintain the quality of teaching and learning in existing schools, whilst ensuring a smooth transition to the new school. Nearer the date of closure, the Ministry will appoint a change manager to support the Boards, as well as a residual agent, who has a key role in ensuring that Boards continue to effectively and prudently manage public funds throughout the process. The Ministry's response teams will continue to provide tailored programmes to support the well-being of children, parents and staff. The Ministry continues to work with other agencies, including CERA, to ensure that communities are properly supported through the change process.

Consultation

61. The Treasury, the State Services Commission and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority have been consulted on this paper, and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet has been informed of its content.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 1 **note** that I continue to be mindful of the significant impact of the earthquake on children, parents, school staff and the wider community in greater Christchurch, and I am committed to ensuring appropriate support continues to be provided to students, their parents and teachers as the closure and merger process continues;
- 2 **note** the process of consultation which I have undertaken with the five schools in Aranui proposed for closure;
- 3 **note** that I intend to decide to proceed with a year 1-13 campus on the site of Aranui High School, to open in January 2016 and that there will be community consultation on the configuration of the campus.
- 4 **note** that the Ministry will work with other agencies and providers to provide early childhood education and a range of other services on the same site;
- 5 **note** that I am considering whether Chisnallwood Intermediate School should be retained in the network, repaired to a reduced roll level and its viability reviewed in 2018, or closed alongside the other four schools;
- 6 **note** that I am providing six weeks for the Boards of each school to provide any further arguments, feedback or information about my interim decision. This is more than the 28 days of further consultation required by the Act and will conclude on 20 June, with final decisions being announced in early August; and

7 note that a draft communications plan has been developed, which gives full consideration to the manner in which affected schools are informed about decisions, and provides transparency about the decision-making process.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hekia Parata', written in a cursive style.

Hon Hekia Parata
Minister of Education

10 / 4 / 13