

Date: 29 June 2015

To: Diocesan School Boards of Trustees

From: Mike Nolan

The Diocesan Schools' 2015 – 2026 Property Programme (12YPP)

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	page 1
2. Proposed Principles to underpin the 12YPP	page 1
3. Order and Quantum of Capital Works	page 2
4. Clarification Opportunities	page 3
5. Feedback Process	page 4
6. Appendix A - First Draft (October 2013) of the PP	page 5
7. Appendix B - Feedback and Reflection on the First Draft of the PP	page 10
8. Appendix C – Indicative \$ per Student Summary Table	page 21

Introduction

This second draft of the property programme for diocesan schools follows the first draft of the 5-year property programme (5YPP) of 18 October 2013 (*Appendix A, page 5*), and the subsequent approach by the Bishop (and nine other state-integrated school proprietors) to the Minister of Education for consideration of a one-off capital injection for schools in Greater Christchurch, and reflection on the first draft 5YPP feedback received (*Appendix B, page 10*).

The confidential approach to the Minister of Education for a one-off additional capital funding injection schools in Greater Christchurch was unsuccessful at this point.

With this additional funding stream declined, at this point in the Government's budget, the Bishop is now in a position to consult on this second draft of his property programme. This second draft is a 12-year property programme (12YPP).

Proposed Principles

- (a) The proposed nine principles that underpin the Bishop's proposed 12YPP remain as per the 18 October 2013 first draft 5YPP, a property programme that primarily dealt with seismic strengthening and seismic remediation works only (*Appendix A, page 5*) – this provides the order in which schools will enter the 12YPP for both the seismic & the modern learning environment (MLE) component of this 12YPP capital works programme.
- (b) The five schools that had less than \$125,000 strengthening and seismic remediation works component of the capital works programme (Hokitika, Rangiora, Greymouth (St Patrick's School), Pleasant Point and Sacred Heart (Timaru)) will each have capital works of \$200,000 provided in 2020, i.e. at the end of the strengthening and seismic remediation works component of the capital works programme.

- (c) Once the seismic strengthening works have been completed (some of which, given the nature of the work required, include all MLE works) then modern learning environment (MLE) upgrade works will be undertaken, in the same order as per (a).

Based upon the proposed principles as per (a), (b) and (c) above, the following the following table summarises the 12YPP order and quantum of works:

Order	School	\$	Possible Year (when project commences)	Status
1	Marian College	\$2,500,000	2011	Complete
2	St Anne's, Woolston	\$570,000	2011	Complete
3	OLA, Hoon Hay	\$1,029,000	2012	Complete
4	St Peter's, Beckenham	\$1,100,000	2013	Complete
5	CTK, Burnside	\$2,500,000	2012	Complete
6	St Bernadette's, Hornby	\$980,000	2013	Complete
7	John Paul II, Greymouth	\$3,000,000	2014 - 2019	Work In Progress
8	St Mary's, Christchurch	\$1,400,000	2015 semester 2	
9	St Mary's, Hokitika	\$20,000	2013	Complete
10	St James, Aranui	\$1,100,000	2016 semester 2	
11	Catholic Cathedral College*	\$3,000,000	2018 - 2020	*
12	Marian College*	\$18,000,000	2018 - 2024	*
13	St Joseph's, Papanui	\$2,400,000	2017 - 2019	
14	St Paul's, Dallington**	\$820,000	2012 - 2014	Complete
15	Mairehau**	\$8,400,000	2014 - 2019	Work In Progress
16	OL Star of the Sea, Sumner	\$480,000	2017 semester 1	
17	St Albans Catholic School	\$620,000	2017 semester 1	
18	St Patrick's, Bryndwr	\$1,250,000	2017 semester 2	
19	Sacred Heart, Addington	\$1,075,000	2017 semester 2	
20	St Teresa's, Riccarton	\$975,000	2018 semester 1	
21	New Brighton Catholic School	\$1,000,000	2018 semester 1	
22	St Patrick's, Kaiapoi	\$960,000	2018 semester 2	
23	OLV, Sockburn	\$975,000	2019 semester 1	
24	St Joseph's, Rangiora	\$16,000	2013	Complete
25	OLS, Methven	\$135,000	2013	Complete
26	St Joseph's, Fairlie	\$365,000	2019 semester 1	
27	St Joseph's, Ashburton	\$1,100,000	2019 semester 2	
28	Roncalli College	\$3,050,000	2020 - 2022	
29	St Joseph's, Temuka	\$365,000	2014 - 2015	Complete
30	St Joseph's, Timaru	\$231,000	2014 - 2015	Complete
31	St Patrick's, Waimate	\$185,000	2015	Complete
32	St Mary's, Hokitika	\$200,000	2020 semester 1	
33	St Joseph's, Rangiora	\$200,000	2020 semester 1	
34	St Patrick's, Greymouth	\$200,000	2020 semester 1	
35	St Joseph's, Pleasant Point	\$200,000	2020 semester 1	
36	Sacred Heart, Timaru	\$200,000	2020 semester 1	
37	OLA, Hoon Hay	\$1,300,000	2020 semester 2	
38	St Peter's, Beckenham	\$20,000	2021 semester 1	
39	CTK, Burnside	\$100,000	2021 semester 1	
40	St Bernadette's, Hornby	\$20,000	2021 semester 2	
41	Catholic Cathedral College	\$250,000	2021 semester 2	
42	St Mary's, Hokitika	\$1,000,000	2022 semester 1	
43	St Patrick's, Greymouth	\$300,000	2022 semester 2	
44	St Joseph's, Papanui	\$900,000	2023 semester 1	
45	St Albans Catholic School	\$100,000	2024 semester 1	
46	Sacred Heart, Addington	\$55,000	2024 semester 2	
47	St Teresa's, Riccarton	\$300,000	2024 semester 2	

48	New Brighton Catholic School	\$220,000	2025 semester 1	
49	St Anne's, Woolston	\$335,000	2025 semester 1	
50	OLV, Sockburn	\$185,000	2025 semester 1	
51	St Joseph's, Rangiora	\$955,000	2025 semester 2	
52	OLS, Methven	\$245,000	2026 semester 1	
53	St Joseph's, Ashburton	\$637,500	2026 semester 1	
54	Roncalli College	\$1,000,000	2026 semester 1	
55	St Joseph's, Temuka	\$420,000	2026 semester 2	
56	St Joseph's, Timaru	\$1,275,000	2026 semester 2	
57	St Patrick's, Waimate	\$35,000	2026 semester 2	
58	St Joseph's, Pleasant Point	\$300,000	2026 semester 2	
59	Sacred Heart, Timaru	\$1,250,000	2026 semester 2	

* = The Bishop will not be in a position to scope the exact works associated with Marian College (Christchurch) until after the Bishop completes his consultation in this regard and reflects upon the feedback received. The timing of these works is dependent upon the consultation process. At this point it is anticipated that \$18 million will be expended in the 2018 - 2024 period. In addition, given the current site and building sharing between Marian College and Catholic Cathedral College at the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament site, the seismic strengthening works associated with Catholic Cathedral College will be delayed, from that anticipated in the first draft 5YPP of October 2013, until the 2018 – 2020 period.

** = The replacement building work associated with the red-zoned St Paul's School (formerly of Dallington) is incorporated into the new buildings for the development of the new parish primary school entity for St Francis of Assisi Parish, Mairahau.

Please Note: Any unforeseen and urgent health & safety works that have to be undertaken may necessitate a delay in the timing of planned projects. Such works, however, will not alter the order in which planned projects will happen, only their timing. The cost of any such urgent health & safety works will be deducted from the planned project budget when that school's next project is undertaken.

Clarification Opportunities

I will be available to meet with board members who might wish to ask questions of clarification or comment on any matters arising from the proposed principles that underpin this second draft of what is now the Bishop's next 12YPP (2015 – 2026).

The dates and times for these clarification meeting opportunities are as follows:

Date	Time	Venue
Monday 12 October 2015	5.30pm	Roncalli College, Timaru
Wednesday 14 October 2015	5.30pm	Christ the King School, Burnside
Tuesday 20 October 2015	5.30pm	John Paul II High School, Greymouth
Thursday 22 October 2015	5.30pm	St Joseph's Parish Centre, Papanui

Feedback Process

Please provide any written feedback your board of trustees might wish to make regarding the above principles by 1 December 2015.

Please email or post your comments to:

Mike Nolan, Manager, Catholic Education Office, PO Box 4544, Christchurch 8140

mnolan@chch.catholic.org.nz

On behalf of Bishop Barry Jones, I thank you for the work you so willingly provide in service to the Mission of the Church.

May God's peace be with you and your family.

Kind regards

**Mike Nolan
Manager
Catholic Education Office**

(29 June 2015)

Appendix A



Catholic Education Office

122 Barbadoes Street
PO Box 4544
Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

Date: 18 October 2013

To: Diocesan School Boards of Trustees

From: Mike Nolan

Re: The Diocesan School Property Strengthening Programme

Further to my previous (22/03/13) correspondence (<http://www.chchceo.org.nz/?sid=98>) regarding the 5YPP moratorium, I write to provide an update on:

- the current “state of play” regarding earthquake strengthening and the detailed engineering evaluation (DEE) process; and
- nine draft principles that might underpin and set the priority listing for the Bishop’s 5-Year Property Programme (5YPP) ... *I seek your board’s feedback on these draft principles.*

Current Situation

We have now completed the detailed evaluation phase to determine the seismic capacity of all diocesan school buildings throughout the Diocese. Each school board has received their DEE report. The summary % of the standard required for an equivalent new building at the time of assessment (%NBS) for all school buildings in each diocesan school is enclosed.

Draft Principles & Priorities

Bishop Barry Jones will meet his health & safety obligations to the students and staff of diocesan schools. To this end the Bishop has resolved to ensure the seismic capacity of each diocesan school building/block is as near as practicable to at least 67% NBS (assessed at IL3).

This health & safety work forms the basis of the Bishop’s current 5YPP – a programme of health & safety works that will be finalised at the completion of this consultation process.

The likelihood is that this work will be completed within the 5 year timeframe of this current 5YPP.

When all this required health & safety strengthening work is within 12 months of completion, planning for the Bishop’s next 5YPP will commence. I will provide boards with an annual update on progress towards completion of the Bishop’s required seismic strengthening work projects at his diocesan schools.

In order to establish an order for the Bishop’s 5 year programme of health & safety work the following nine draft principles are provided for your board’s comment ...

Principle 1

Firstly, permanently strengthen the earthquake prone (<34%NBS) classroom blocks at the 5 Christchurch schools (*Burnside, Hoon Hay, Hornby, Beckenham & St Mary’s*) where students were required to be taught in tents in order to undertake urgent rudimentary strengthening works to ensure

the classroom blocks were no longer earthquake prone & provide replacement classrooms for the recently determined (07/10/13) earthquake prone and unviable to strengthen two-storey concrete frame section of Block A at John Paul II High School (Greymouth).

Principle 2

Secondly, permanently strengthen the earthquake prone classroom blocks where rudimentary strengthening works were undertaken (*but students were not required to be moved into tents*) to ensure the classroom blocks were no longer earthquake prone.

Principle 3

Thirdly, strengthen those classroom blocks at schools where the classroom blocks are not earthquake prone but are less than 67%NBS, i.e. classroom blocks that are $34\% \leq \text{NBS} \leq 67\%$.

Principle 4

Within each of the categories that result from the implementation of principles 1, 2 and 3 the priority order is firstly determined by the technical category of the land - with TC3 land coming before TC2 land; and TC2 land coming before TC1 land; and TC1 land coming before land with no technical category (e.g. Rangiora).

Principle 5

Within each of the categories that result from the implementation of principles 1, 2 and 3 the priority order is secondly determined by the %NBS of the classroom block with the lowest seismic capacity.

Principle 6

If the implementation of principles 5 and/or 6 result in a tie, the schools will be separated by ballot.

Principle 7

The seventh principle being that once we commence the seismic strengthening work for one classroom block at a school (*as determined by principles 1 to 6 above*) all strengthening work at that school will be undertaken and completed.

The reason for this is that in many instances we have to bring relocatable classrooms on site in order to move students out of a classroom block to carry out the required strengthening work and we want to bring these relocatable classrooms on site once, and once only.

Principle 8

With the exception of the 6 schools identified in Principle 1 (*where 4 of the 6 (with 1 in the planning stage) seismic strengthening projects commenced prior to this list of nine proposed principles*), the order in which regions will undergo strengthening work will be according to the degree of the seismic hazard factor for that region (*from greatest to least hazard*). The degree of seismic hazard factor being as follows:

Seismic Hazard Factor	Region
0.37	Hokitika & Greymouth
0.3	Christchurch (including Rangiora & Kaiapoi)
0.25	Methven
0.24	Fairlie
0.2	Ashburton
0.17	Pleasant Point & Temuka & Timaru
0.14	Waimate

Principle 9

Whilst a large project is being undertaken, e.g. a project that involves bringing relocatable classrooms on site in order to move students out of a classroom block to carry out the required strengthening work (as per Principle 7), we will take the opportunity to complete:

- smaller seismic strengthening projects at schools further down the priority list order - e.g. the planned strengthening of Classroom 5 in Block 2 at St Joseph's School, Rangiora;

- the removal of any brick cladding (*and its replacement with light weight cladding*) that the structural engineers have identified as being a potential hazard in the event of an earthquake (*even though the building may be above 67%NBS*) and ought be removed - e.g. the already completed recladding of Block 1 at Our Lady of the Snows School, Methven.

Please Note: When undertaking seismic strengthening work, that most often involves intrusive work to flooring and wall lining removal, we will take the opportunity to also undertake appropriate upgrade work that has been previously identified by condition assessments as being appropriate for that room/block – e.g. carpet replacement; pinboard replacement, etc.

What order would the implementation of the above principles generate?

Using the %NBS information from the DEEs, this is the order of the 5YPP's seismic strengthening works that would result from the implementation of the nine suggested principles ...

Order	Seismic Hazard Factor	Principle	Technical Category	Lowest Classroom Block %NBS	School	Status
1	0.3	1	TC3/2	<34%	OLA, Hoon Hay	C
2	0.3	1	TC3/2	<34%	St Peter's, Beckenham	C
3	0.3	1	TC2	<34%	Christ the King, Burnside	C
4	0.3	1	TC1	<34%	St Bernadette's, Hornby	C
5	0.37	1	n/a	<34%	John Paul II, Greymouth	WIPS
6	0.3	1	TC3	<34%	St Mary's, Christchurch	
7	0.37	3	n/a	60%	St Mary's, Hokitika	C
8	0.37	n/a	n/a	67%	St Patrick's, Greymouth	CN
9	0.3	2	TC3	35%	St James', Aranui	
10	0.3	2	TC3/2	34%	Catholic Cathedral College	
11	0.3	2	TC2	34%	St Joseph's, Papanui	
12	0.3	2	TC2	34%	Our Lady of Fatima, Mairehau	
13	0.3	2	TC2	54%	Star of the Sea, Sumner	
14	0.3	3	TC3	50%	St Albans Catholic School	
15	0.3	3	TC2	34%	St Patrick's, Bryndwr	
16	0.3	3	TC2	35%	Sacred Heart, Addington	
17	0.3	3	TC2	35%	St Teresa's, Riccarton	
18	0.3	3	TC2	36%	New Brighton Catholic School	
19	0.3	3	TC2	37%	St Anne's, Woolston	
20	0.3	3	TC2	37%	St Patrick's, Kaiapoi	
21	0.3	3	TC 1	35%	OLV, Sockburn	
22	0.3	3 & 9	n/a	37%	St Joseph's, Rangiora	WIPS
23	0.25	3 & 9	n/a	34%	OLOS, Methven	C
24	0.24	3	n/a	39%	St Joseph's, Fairlie	
25	0.2	3	n/a	53%	St Joseph's, Ashburton	
26	0.17	3	n/a	41%	Roncalli College	
27	0.17	3 & 9	n/a	76%	St Joseph's, Temuka	WIPSbr
28	0.17	3 & 9	n/a	>100%	St Joseph's, Timaru	C
20	0.17	n/a	n/a	95%	Sacred Heart, Timaru	CN
30	0.17	n/a	n/a	>100%	St Joseph's, Pleasant Point	CN
31	0.14	n/a	n/a	73%	St Patrick's, Waimate	CN

Status Key:

C = completed

CN = completed – no seismic strengthening work required

WIP = work currently in progress

WIPS = work currently in planning stage

WIPSbr = work in the detailed planning stage (brick recladding)

Please note that the work associated with St Paul's School (formerly of Dallington) will be incorporated into the new buildings for the development of the new school entity of St Francis of Assisi Catholic School, Mairehau.

Please also note that the Bishop will not be in a position to scope the work associated with Marian College (Christchurch) until after the geotechnical report on the College's North Parade site has been received – it is anticipated that the Bishop will receive this report in December 2013.

I will be available to meet with board members who might wish to ask questions of clarification or comment on any matters arising from these proposed principles to underpin the Bishop's next 5YPP.

The dates and times for these meeting opportunities are as follows:

Date	Time	Venue
Thursday 7 November 2013	5.30pm	Roncalli College, Timaru
Thursday 14 November 2013	5.30pm	St Joseph's School, Temuka
Thursday 21 November 2013	5.30pm	Christ the King School, Burnside
Tuesday 26 November 2013	5.30pm	John Paul II High School, Greymouth
Thursday 28 November 2013	5.30pm	Catholic Cathedral College, Christchurch
Tuesday 3 December 2013	5.30pm	St Joseph's Parish Centre, Papanui

Please provide any written feedback your board of trustees might wish to make regarding the above principles by 1 March 2014.

Please email or post your comments to:

Mike Nolan, Manager, Catholic Education Office, PO Box 4544, Christchurch 8140

mnolan@chch.catholic.org.nz

On behalf of Bishop Barry, I thank you for the work you so willingly provide in service to the Mission of the Church.

May God's peace be with you and your family.

Kind regards

**Mike Nolan
Manager
Catholic Education Office**

Appendix 1: 5YPP Works Undertaken Since September 2010

At the time of writing, and since September 2010, 5YPP works associated with the earthquakes (e.g. temporary seismic strengthening works, DEEs, purchasing and leasing relocatable classrooms, permanent strengthening works, etc.) totalling \$7.01 million have been undertaken.

By way of information I note those schools where, to date, such works have exceeded \$75,000:

School	\$
Sacred Heart School, Addington	\$97,001.06
St Peter's School, Beckenham	\$438,960.64
Christ the King School, Burnside	\$1,031,005.12
St Mary's School, Christchurch	\$83,172.89
Our Lady of the Assumption School, Hoon Hay	\$1,016,341.75
St Bernadette's School, Hornby	\$611,797.98
Our Lady of the Snows School, Methven	\$133,632.56
Our Lady of Victories School, Sockburn	\$80,902.01
St Anne's School, Woolston	\$151,054.59
Catholic Cathedral College	\$163,968.91
Marian College	\$2,021,306.57
All Schools*	\$617,736.76

Please Note: All Schools* = five relocatable classrooms that are moved on site in order to move students out of a classroom block to carry out the required strengthening work at a school.

These five relocatable classrooms will be released to schools with school property guide deficits when all the seismic strengthening works are complete.

Appendix 2: Detailed Engineering Evaluation Process

In order to provide you with some further background information of a more technical nature, regarding the %NBS numbers that have been determined by the structural engineers from Opus International Consultants Ltd for our school buildings, I note the following:

- All the diocesan school buildings are being, or have been, assessed against the standard for a building of Importance Level 3 (IL3).
- An IL3 building (facility) in the school context is a primary school or secondary school facility (building) with a capacity greater than 250.
- The difference between designing and assessing a building to IL3 against designing and assessing a building to Importance Level 2 (IL2) is a factor of 1.3 times.
- Thus if one has a standard classroom (with a capacity of 30 students) and it is assessed with a 34%NBS using IL3 for the assessment, this equates to a 44%NBS if one was to assess the building using IL2 for the assessment.
- The reason for assessing against the IL3 for seismic design is that the Diocese wishes to maximise the safety for students and staff and the amount of damage sustained to an IL3 building will be less than in the same building designed for IL2.
- A final consideration regarding the %NBS numbers lies in the fact that where any assumptions are necessary in the structural engineers' assessments, conservative assumptions have been made.

Feedback and Reflection on the Bishop's first draft 5YPP

(a) Greater Christchurch, Mid Canterbury & West Coast

Feedback

The feedback from boards of trustees in Greater Christchurch, Mid Canterbury & the West Coast was understanding of the situation and supportive of the principles and priorities of the draft 5YPP.

For example:

- “We think the principles outlined are reasonable, fair and logical. We appreciated the opportunity to discuss these with you in December and thank you for making that time available to us.”
- “After going through the Diocesan School Property Strengthening Program, we are agreeable to the 9 principles in setting the priority listing for the Bishop's 5-year Property Program.

With these principles in place, we are able to explain as a board on when repairs and strengthening of our respective schools will take place and at the same the board can also prepare for the repairs and strengthening through your annual updates. Our parents will also be well informed on the status of the repairs and strengthening with these principles.

Much as we would love to have the repairs done to our school as soon as possible, these 9 principles will serve as the basis on why Sacred Heart School is 16th on the list.”

- “Principles seem like a very logical and well thought out process and given the magnitude of what needs to be rectified, I don't see any better or fairer way of approaching this.”
- “Several members of the BOT of Our Lady Star of the Sea have reviewed the documents & proposals enclosed, we agree that the draft principles seem clear & well thought out.”
- “We felt overall, it was a sound document and appreciate the amount of time and work that would have been put into it.”

It was also noted by some boards that it is highly desirable for extra capital works over and above necessary seismic strengthening works to also be undertaken over the coming years.

For example:

- “It would be good to get clarification of what is going to happen with other capital and minor capital works beyond earthquake strengthening in regards to school roll growth, specialist rooms, buildings coming to end of economic lives (like our double portacom) during this time. It is important for Boards to understand this as school will be faced with increased maintenance bills as they try to extend out the lives of buildings.”

Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

The boards of trustees in Greater Christchurch, Mid Canterbury & the West Coast are supportive of the principles and the resulting school priority order for undertaking seismic strengthening and associated building upgrade works.

The matter of addressing school property guide deficiencies and replacement/upgrade of aging, yet seismically strong, classrooms within a ten - fifteen year timeframe is one that can only be met by securing an additional capital funding stream (as per the APIS's current approach to the Minister of Education) or by way of voluntary parent contributions and/or a significant increase in attendance dues – see (4) below for additional comment in this regard.

(b) South Canterbury

Feedback

The feedback from boards of trustees in South Canterbury was understanding of the situation your Bishop faces:

For example:

- “We fully understand the dilemma the Bishop is under in order to meet his health and safety obligations to all schools within our diocese while being aware of the obvious need for ongoing maintenance within our schools.”
- “We appreciate the unique position created by the earthquake and the Bishop’s priority of ensuring health and safety for all in his diocese which has led to the need for these priority procedures.”
- “I acknowledge the Bishop is in a very difficult position regarding his obligations to staff and students to ensure all schools within the diocese meet recommended seismic guidelines. It is understood priority must be given to ensuring all such schools meet these criteria and the draft principles and priorities are a necessary and appropriate response to this issue.”

However, the South Canterbury boards noted a number of matters they wished to be considered:

(1) Feedback

“We are very concerned that while there continues to be a hold on previously scheduled building and maintenance projects for the next five years, additional to the three years that have already passed under the moratorium, that the buildings and fixtures at our schools will continue to deteriorate.”

“We wish to acknowledge that we are living in extraordinary times since the destructive impact of the Christchurch earthquake and we understand and appreciate the need of the bishop to have had to make a careful planned response to this situation and initiate the original moratorium however the new Draft Principles and Priorities effectively extends this moratorium for a further 5 years. We are very concerned about their immediate maintenance issues and those that will need to be addressed in the next 5 years and with no guarantee that school identified projects and maintenance priorities will make the next 5 year property plan, this could have an accumulative effect of over 13 years with little or no financial support from the diocese.”

“There needs to be a dual process - earthquake related strengthening etc. and ongoing maintenance/upgrading of buildings. Otherwise there will be major repercussions for the integrity of buildings over the years. It has already been 4 years since some projects that were at the top of list were put on hold. These were deemed to be necessary then and still are, however these projects won’t meet the narrow criteria set and schools not affected by the earthquake will see no upgrading of buildings for 8-10 years at the very least.”

“All South Canterbury Catholic schools have been subject to a moratorium of scheduled maintenance/capital works since Christchurch’s earthquakes. Again, it is recognised this was a unique event requiring an urgent and comprehensive response from the Bishop. The Draft Principles and Priorities effectively extends this moratorium for a further 5 years (in addition to the 3 years which have elapsed since the first earthquake). As you have heard from a number of school representatives at November’s meeting a lack of maintenance is reaching a critical point in some schools.”

(1) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

As Bishop (Proprietor) my primary obligation to use my Policy One funding to address health & safety matters - this means upgrading, fixing or replacing items that if they fail will close the school. Once such health & safety matters have been addressed, as Bishop I must then address essential infrastructure matters – projects to ensure the integrity of the building’s structure and services

(including earthquake strengthening, leaky buildings, roofing, etc.). When both health & safety and essential infrastructure matters have been addressed then modern learning environment provision can be addressed – these are projects to upgrade and enhance learning environments (upgrades of classrooms to design quality learning spaces, classroom reconfiguration, toilet upgrades, etc.).

I am of the view that the first draft of the 5YPP is appropriate as it addresses both the health & safety and essential infrastructure matters. The earthquake strengthening of a number of schools was and is a health & safety matter as a number school blocks were below 34%NBS and were required to be closed immediately - although rudimentary repairs were able to be undertaken in many schools to keep classroom blocks open their repair was temporary in nature and permanent repairs are scheduled in the draft 5YPP.

Please also note that the first draft of the 5YPP states “[w]hen undertaking seismic strengthening work, that most often involves intrusive work to flooring and wall lining removal, we will take the opportunity to also undertake appropriate upgrade work that has been previously identified by condition assessments as being appropriate for that room/block – e.g. carpet replacement, pinboard replacement, etc.” In other words, the draft of the 5YPP (*within its funding constraints*) provides for a dual process - earthquake related strengthening and some ongoing maintenance/upgrading of buildings.

By way of example, I note that as a result of the structural engineers identifying (through the detailed engineering evaluation (DEE) process) that the brick cladding on Block 1 at St Joseph’s School (Timaru) was a potential hazard in the event of an earthquake (even though the block was >100%NBS). The brick cladding was replaced and upgrade work (double glazed windows, doors, toilet areas, carpet, etc.) was undertaken at the same time – at a total cost of around \$231,000.

I am of the view that the statement that “[a]ll South Canterbury Catholic schools have been subject to a moratorium of scheduled maintenance/capital works since Christchurch’s earthquakes”, whilst not untrue does not reflect the full picture. All schools in the Diocese of Christchurch are subject to the same “moratorium”; i.e. South Canterbury schools are in the same position as all other schools in the diocese.

In addition to seismic strengthening and essential infrastructure works, as Bishop I have also undertaken numerous essential works in the past 24 months. For example:

- Roof replacement – Hall at Roncalli College (\$39,000)
- Part roof replacement – Block 1 at St Albans Catholic School (\$15,000)
- Roof replacement – Block 1 at Our Lady of Victories School (\$54,000)
- Electrical switchboard replacement - Roncalli College (\$17,000)
- Special Needs fencing – St Paul’s School @ Champion Street (\$11,000)
- Special Needs fencing – St Joseph’s School, Rangiora (\$33,000)
- Special Needs space – St Teresa’s School, Riccarton (\$89,000)
- Special Needs/First Aid space – St Peter’s School, Beckenham (\$52,000)
- Roof replacement – Block 1 at Sacred Heart School, Addington (\$19,000)

In other words, as Bishop I have undertaken (and will continue to undertake) ongoing essential maintenance/upgrading of buildings as required by condition assessment to protect the integrity of the building, or by Ministry of Education (Group Special Education) requirement in order to provide a safe environment for a particular student with special needs.

I also note that I have, in conjunction with the Minister of Education, undertaken SNUP capital works in a number of my primary schools; my share of cost of this work (\$221,130) has been met from my Policy One monies.

(2) Feedback

“You stated at the meeting that schools can raise funds for capital projects. As you are aware we are a small rural school and we are very proactive in fundraising for our school each year to provide much needed resources. Of recent years funds have gone to some projects that would previously have been met by the diocese.”

(2) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

I note and acknowledge that school communities have always raised funds to achieve capital works projects in advance of the timeframe that I, as Bishop, would be in a position to provide the same capital works projects. Please see (4) for further comment on this feedback.

(3) Feedback

“Our parents pay school attendance dues in order for the diocese to provide our school with buildings and fixtures that are up to modern learning expectations. It is very difficult for them to understand why they pay attendance dues with this expectation and yet they cannot see any direct benefit from these fees while the present building and development restrictions are in place.”

(3) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

The use to which attendance dues is as follows:

Revenue received by the proprietors from attendance dues shall be used solely for the purpose of paying in respect of the school or group of schools in respect of which it is received for such improvements to the school buildings and associated facilities as may be required by any integration agreement or integration agreements pursuant to section 40(2)(c), or for such capital works as may be required by the Minister pursuant to section 40(2)(d), or for meeting debts, mortgages, liens, or other charges associated with the land and the buildings that constitute the premises of the school or schools (Private Schools Conditional Integration Act 1975 section 36(3)).¹

My attendance dues funds are fully committed to cover current costs. Attendance dues are audited annually and provided to the Ministry of Education.

My proprietorial Policy One funding provides the main vehicle for the provision of modern learning upgrade provision.

(4) Feedback

“Our main request is that each school be allowed to retain a proportion of the school attendance dues in order for us to manage our ongoing maintenance and building projects. This would be done in a fair and equitable way for approved projects. It would also allow for a robust paper trail to show where the money is spent.”

“I acknowledge your advice (on behalf of the Bishop) that individual capital projects could still be progressed through individual fund raising efforts on behalf of an individual school, but this does not address the concerns expressed regarding school buildings and resources deteriorating due to lack of maintenance.

Two primary proposals were suggested at the meeting to address this concern.

1. Identify individual amounts contributed by each South Canterbury school in terms of funds centrally allocated to the Diocese and attendance dues; and allowing each school to retain a portion of these funds to be “ear marked” for scheduled maintenance.
2. Allow schools to increase attendance dues with this increase being allocated for scheduled maintenance (and approved capital works).

I acknowledge this proposal will require extensive consultation with each school’s parents and caregivers. It was hoped each school could develop and implement surveys shortly after the November meeting, but on reflection it was noted the end of the academic year is not the ideal for

1

http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1975/0129/latest/DLM437585.html?search=ts_act%40bill%40regulation%40deemedreg_private+schools+integration+act_resel_25_a&p=1

these inquiries – given the pressure of the calendar and because it may miss an entire cohort of incoming parents/caregivers.

However, inquiries to date disclose attendance dues for the Canterbury diocese are significantly below dues charged in other dioceses throughout New Zealand; in some cases by almost 50%. While this can be viewed as a positive, as stated above we are faced with a unique and unprecedented problem which could be easily resolved by an increase (even if temporary) in attendance dues.

I recognise there are other potential solutions which doubtless have been considered by the Diocese, including loans and the rationalisation of church/building stock, but I acknowledge these are matters which require extensive consultation and a careful, considered (and thus time consuming) approach.. The advantages of the above proposals are they can be implemented in a timely fashion and are complementary to the Draft Principles and Policies.

As indicated I shall be reporting again following the completion of our survey processes, but would welcome any comments in the meantime.”

(4) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

It is important to clarify that it is only I, as Bishop and Proprietor, who have the ability to charge and collect and apply attendance dues:

“The proprietors of an integrated school may enter into an agreement with the parents or other persons accepting responsibility for the education of a child providing that, as a condition of the enrolment and attendance of that child at that school, the parents or other person shall pay attendance dues schools (Private Schools Conditional Integration Act 1975 section 36(1)).”²

Thus, a school board of trustees is unable “to retain and use attendance dues in order for [them] to manage [their] ongoing maintenance and building projects.”

I note that attendance dues are pooled and the funds generated across all diocesan schools are fully utilised to cover current costs. Indeed, attendance dues for diocesan schools will increase to the following levels in 2015 and 2016 in order to cover the increase in insurance costs for my diocesan school buildings following the Christchurch earthquakes³:

Year	Diocesan Primary School Attendance Dues	Diocesan Secondary School Attendance Dues
2014	\$161.00 (current rate)	\$299.00 (current rate)
2015	\$184.00	\$322.00
2016	\$207.00	\$345.00

By way of background information, I record the 2010 – 2013 diocesan secondary school attendance dues collection rates:

School	Decile	Years	Attendance Dues Invoiced	Attendance Dues Received	Collection Rate
Total		2010 - 2014	\$2,330,556	\$1,972,157	85%

The matter of having differential attendance dues for schools in the diocese requires careful consideration.

²

http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1975/0129/latest/DLM437585.html?search=ts_act%40bill%40regulation%40deemedreg_private+schools+integration+act_resel_25_a&p=1

³ Attendance Dues letter (07/03/14) to Parish Priests, Boards of Trustees & Principals

All diocesan schools currently have a common attendance dues rate. Attendance dues are pooled in the diocesan collective and the funds generated across all diocesan schools are fully utilised to cover current costs.

For me to accept and confirm an increased attendance dues rate at a particular school, I would need to identify a particular capital project to which the increased portion of the attendance dues (i.e. that amount over and above the common attendance dues rate) would be apportioned – be that by way of borrowing by me as Bishop or by retaining in trust until the appropriate capital sum is raised in order that a contract may be let by me and construction undertaken and costs met as approved invoices are presented for the project.

Clearly a significant majority of the particular school community would need to ascent to such a proposal before it was instituted as attendance dues, once levied, are a legally enforceable charge:

“Should any parent or other person who has accepted the responsibility for the education of a child, and has pursuant to subsection (1) entered into an agreement to pay attendance dues, fail to make such payment, any payment not so made shall be recoverable from that parent or person in any court of competent jurisdiction as a debt due to the proprietors (Private Schools Conditional Integration Act 1975 section 36(6)).”⁴

If this increase in attendance dues approach was accepted by me, as Bishop and proprietor, for a particular school it is clear that it is the Office of the Bishop that is charging the attendance dues (not the school) and it is me your Bishop who is the principal to any agreed contract (not the school) as the Office of the Bishop is the owner of the building(s).

There is an alternative approach that ought be considered in this regard. A particular school board might request me to give my proprietorial consideration to the institution of a school building contribution for a particular building project at the school. Such building project contributions would be a donation from parents to the Office of the Bishop for a particular building project at the College; the funds would be held in trust until the target fundraising level is reached and the project is undertaken by the Office of the Bishop. Any retention of such voluntary contributions in the school board's account would render these contributions as Crown funds; and Crown funds are not able to be used for a capital building project, as capital building projects are the right and responsibility of the Office of the Bishop to undertake and then have integrated.

The advantage of this approach is that each parent has a contribution choice as such a contribution is a voluntary donation to the Office of the Bishop.

I note that Villa Maria College, St Thomas of Canterbury College and St Bede's College have instituted such school building contributions:

- Villa Maria College has a “parent contribution to building fund” of \$250 per annum, per child (capped at \$500 per annum, per family);
- St Thomas of Canterbury College has a “school building contribution” of \$150 per annum, per child; and
- St Bede's College has a “school building contribution” of \$500 per annum, per child.

Marian College has formed a Marian Foundation that has a development financial contribution for wider purposes than just school buildings of \$180 per annum, per child (capped at \$360 per annum per family).

4

http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1975/0129/latest/DLM437585.html?search=ts_act%40bill%40regulation%40deemedreg_private+schools+integration+act_resel_25_a&p=1

By way of background information I provide the following “proprietary” data for all Catholic secondary schools in the Diocese of Christchurch:

School 2105	Decile	Attendance Dues	Building Contribution	Proprietor Contribution	Total
St Bede's	9	\$1,535	\$500	\$160	\$2,195
Villa Maria	9	\$435	\$250	\$120	\$805
St Thomas'	8	\$735	\$150	\$0	\$885
Marian*	8	\$322	\$180*	\$0	\$502
Roncalli	7	\$322	\$0	\$0	\$322
John Paul II	6	\$322	\$0	\$0	\$322
Cathedral	4	\$322	\$0	\$0	\$322

* = a contribution to the Marian Foundation (not the Bishop/Proprietor) for wider purposes than just school buildings.

I note that in either case, if I was not of a mind to increase the level of debt over my school property portfolio, there would likely be a significant time gap between the imposition of an increase in attendance dues (or the seeking of parental contributions towards a building project) to enable a sufficient cash total to accumulate to achieve the project. By way of example only, if the 2016 attendance dues levels was to rise by \$100 per annum for each school in South Canterbury their annual cash accumulation towards any such approved project would, using the 1st July 2014 roll as a basis, be as follows:

School	1 st March 2015 Roll	2016 Attendance Dues Rate	Attendance Due Rate + \$100	Sum towards Capital Project
Fairlie	45	\$207.00	\$307.00	\$4,500
Pleasant Point	62	\$207.00	\$307.00	\$6,200
Temuka	98	\$207.00	\$307.00	\$9,800
Timaru	179	\$207.00	\$307.00	\$17,900
Timaru North	188	\$207.00	\$307.00	\$18,800
Waimate	27	\$207.00	\$307.00	\$2,700
Roncalli	498	\$345.00	\$445.00	\$49,800

Of course, an increase of \$200 per annum would double any such annual capital sum.

As per the pooling of attendance dues, I note that it is my proprietary ability to pool my Policy One funding that enables me to undertake major projects in a timely manner for all his schools – pooling enabled the Catholic school system to undertake major temporary strengthening works and for all schools to remain open in the aftermath of the earthquakes; pooling enabled Marian College to move temporarily to the St Bede's College site and then to the Cathedral precinct site and thus remain open in the aftermath of the earthquakes; pooling enables major projects to be undertaken in a timely manner without the need for the Office of the Bishop to wait until there is enough notional funding for a particular school community's project to be undertaken – in other words pooling overcomes “paralysis” across the system as notional funding is only received quarterly.

(5) Feedback

"When our BOT met with Bishop Barry in 2012 during his parish visitation he told us that a settlement had been reached which would grant integrated schools the same funding for building as state schools. If this is so then how will this extra funding be distributed?"

(5) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

I believe there is some confusion regarding this statement. No such settlement has been achieved. I presume this statement might relate to the ongoing quantity funding issue that the Association of Proprietors of Integrated Schools (APIS) has been discussing with various governments over many years – this matter is yet to be resolved.

(6) Feedback

"If the sole focus is earthquake strengthening, health and safety will become an issue as areas will be overlooked that will quickly deteriorate into problem areas e.g. toilets.

The Ministry states that *"Funding is provided to proprietors to modernise existing accommodation to keep the school in a state of repair comparable to state schools. The priorities for Policy One expenditure are essential infrastructure and health and safety work and if there is any left to upgrade buildings to provide modern learning environments"*.

It would seem that a narrow focus on earthquake strengthening does not cover essential infrastructure and health and safety work previously identified as urgent in 2009 or allow for upgrading of school buildings. It is not going to keep the school in a state comparable to state schools in our area. South Canterbury schools were already disadvantaged following the network review that occurred in the area. Local state schools have had major upgrades of buildings at that time and Catholic school buildings look third world in comparison. This has implications wider than buildings in the recruitment of staff, enrolments etc."

(6) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

I have addressed this matter in (1) above:

The draft of the 5YPP (within its funding constraints) provides for a dual process - earthquake related strengthening etc. and ongoing maintenance/upgrading of buildings. By way of example, I note that as a result of the structural engineers identifying (through the detailed engineering evaluation) that the brick cladding on Block 1 at St Joseph's School (Timaru) as being a potential hazard in the event of an earthquake (even though the block was >100%NBS) the brick cladding was replaced and upgrade work (double glazed windows, doors, toilet areas, carpet, etc.) was undertaken at the same time.

It is a fact that the then Minister of Education provided a capital funding injection for major upgrade of State schools as a result of the previous network review in South Canterbury. As Bishop I did not receive an equivalent funding injection.

The approach to the Minister of Education, by the me and nine other state-integrated school proprietors, for a one-off additional capital funding injection to the schools' proprietors, if successful, would enable a significant revision of my 5YPP to be considered – a successful outcome to the approach to the Minister would enable more of the "competing" viewpoints to be accommodated within my 5YPP as annual funding levels to the Office of the Bishop would be significantly increased.

(7) Feedback

“The compliance costs of involving project managers from outside the local region are a concern. In the projects completed in South Canterbury in recent years, project management from Christchurch has had issues due to there not being someone on the ground to sort things as they occur. Local knowledge of the integrity of tradesmen used etc., follow ups on a regular basis were hard to do from Christchurch. Considerable cost savings could be made in schools with local expertise to project manage and negotiate with local contractors i.e. The St Vincent de Paul building project in Timaru. The Boards have been questioned by the local community as to why local contractors have not been asked to even tender for jobs. This causes issues in a small community.

The Boards also have serious questions over the integrity of the DEE process as evidenced at St Joseph's with the structural walls not being identified by the engineer when it was plainly obvious when an onsite inspection by a sub-contractor was carried out. The diocese is relying on these reports to be correct and is basing this plan on the engineer's assessments and yet we have already found crucial errors in our assessment.”

(7) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

In 2000 I undertook to manage my \$180 million property portfolio by way of a project management agreement with Opus International Consultants – a company with national coverage. This enables the Office of the Bishop to receive expert advice from consultants who ensure consistency of property solutions for all schools across the diocese. The wisdom of this approach has been demonstrated during the mandatory DEE process following the Christchurch earthquakes.

I note that the diocese only deals with contractors of an appropriate size and scale for a given capital project. The Diocese understands the politics of involving capable local contractors in any invitation to price work which is of a scale that does not warrant an open tender process - we have a practice of doing that on most occasions unless there is a valid reason not to. At the end of the day the decision to award a contract mostly comes down to price.

As Bishop I must ensure that the use of all Crown and other public funds within my control are committed and spent according to acceptable established public practices.

The integrity of the DEE process and the capability of the Opus structural engineers has been called into question by one South Canterbury school on two occasions previously, I do not accept the view of the school. Indeed, Mary Ann Holiday, the senior structural engineer from Opus International Consultants, who oversees all DEEs for the Diocese, was a senior consultant to the Ministry of Education's engineering strategy group in their recent (February 2014) research and publication of the report entitled *Understanding the Seismic Performance of Timber Framed School Buildings*. This report provides an overview of a programme of work and testing undertaken on behalf of the Ministry of Education to consolidate and build upon the lessons from the Canterbury earthquakes in relation to timber-framed structures.

In the absence of detailed working drawings for a building and short of destructive inspections to test connections and structures, the DEE process is necessarily based upon professional (and conservative) assumptions. When actual destructive investigations are carried all such professional assumptions are verified (or otherwise) and if necessary appropriate remedies initiated by the building contractor upon the instruction/authorisation of the structural engineer – this is standard practice.

(8) Feedback

"The Boards have also discussed that within the plan there is not any place for emerging needs and the possibility of each school having a fund to manage these lesser projects which are often health and safety."

(8) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

I have addressed this matter in (1) above:

As Bishop I have undertaken (and will continue to undertake) ongoing maintenance/upgrading of buildings as required by condition assessment to protect the integrity of the building, or by Ministry of Education (Group Special Education) requirement in order to provide a safe environment for a particular student with special needs.

(9) Feedback

"We also have concerns about your comment that it was not possible to identify the proportion of our school's fees paid in by our parish accounts. Schools would be able to determine who has paid the parish school attendance dues easily through their local parish, it therefore follows that there must be some form of accountability to where those funds have been spent and we therefore request that we are provided with the appropriate audit trail for attendance dues paid by our school families."

"This in turn raises additional concerns given your advice it is not presently possible to identify from the Diocese's accounts individual amounts of funds/dues in relation to each contributing school."

(9) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

Neither I nor the Manager of the Catholic Education Office know which individual parents pay their attendance dues.

The diocesan attendance dues collection process for primary schools is that the diocese invoices the parish for the full amount (based upon the school roll) and the parish invoices the individual parents and pays the full attendance dues invoice to the diocese – the parish makes up any attendance dues shortfall between what the parish collects from the parents and the full invoiced amount.

The diocesan attendance dues collection process for secondary schools is that the diocese invoices the secondary school for the full amount (based upon the school roll) and the secondary school invoices the individual parents. The secondary school requests an annual write off for any attendance dues unable to be collected from parents in a given year – there is no process for making up any attendance dues shortfall between what the secondary school collects from the parents and the full invoiced amount.

In addition, a parish and/or a secondary school is able to call upon the services of Ray Healey to work with families who have not paid their attendance dues.

The Manager of the Catholic Education Office did not say that "it is not presently possible to identify from the Diocese's accounts individual amounts of funds/dues in relation to each contributing school."

I have also addressed this matter in (3) above:

Revenue received by the proprietors from attendance dues shall be used solely for the purpose of paying in respect of the school or group of schools in respect of which it is received for such improvements to the school buildings and associated facilities as may be required by any integration agreement or integration agreements pursuant to section 40(2)(c), or for such capital works as may be required by the Minister pursuant to section 40(2)(d), or for meeting debts, mortgages, liens, or other charges associated with the land and the buildings that constitute the premises of the school or schools (Private Schools Conditional Integration Act 1975 section 36(3)).⁵

The attendance dues funds are audited annually and provided to the Ministry of Education.

(10) Feedback

"We request the opportunity, along with the other South Canterbury Catholic schools as indicated at our meeting, to meet with the bishop and yourself together and discuss in person our collective concerns and solutions to these concerns."

(10) Response from the Bishop of Christchurch

As per the previous seven meetings in November/December 2013, the Manager of the Catholic Education Office is always willing to talk, on my behalf, with boards of trustees when he is in a position to do so.

5

http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1975/0129/latest/DLM437585.html?search=ts_act%40bill%40regulation%40deemedreg_private+schools+integration+act_resel_25_a&p=1

Appendix C

Indicative \$ per Student Summary Table

School	1 st March 2015 Roll	Total \$ in plan	\$ per student (based upon 01/03/15 roll)
Addington	141	\$1,130,000	\$8,014
Aranui	111	\$1,100,000	\$9,910
Ashburton	217	\$1,737,500	\$8,007
Beckenham	138	\$1,120,000	\$8,116
Bryndwr	153	\$1,250,000	\$8,170
Burnside	313	\$2,600,000	\$8,307
St Mary's	71	\$1,400,000	\$19,718
Dallington*	158	\$820,000	\$5,190
Fairlie	45	\$365,000	\$8,111
Greymouth**	103	\$500,000	\$4,854
Hokitika	151	\$1,220,000	\$8,079
Hoon Hay	286	\$2,329,000	\$8,143
Hornby	121	\$1,000,000	\$8,264
Kaiapoi	120	\$960,000	\$8,000
Mairehau*	213	\$8,400,000	\$39,437
Methven	47	\$380,000	\$8,085
New Brighton	151	\$1,220,000	\$8,079
Papanui	412	\$3,300,000	\$8,010
Pleasant Point	62	\$500,000	\$8,065
Rangiora	146	\$1,171,000	\$8,021
Riccarton	159	\$1,275,000	\$8,019
Sockburn	145	\$1,160,000	\$8,000
St Albans	89	\$720,000	\$8,090
Sumner	60	\$480,000	\$8,000
Temuka	98	\$785,000	\$8,010
Timaru	179	\$1,450,000	\$8,101
Timaru North	188	\$1,506,000	\$8,011
Waimate	27	\$220,000	\$8,148
Woolston	112	\$905,000	\$8,080
Cathedral	400	\$3,250,000	\$8,125
Marian	424	\$20,500,000	\$48,349
John Paul II**	196	\$3,000,000	\$15,306
Roncalli	498	\$4,050,000	\$8,133

Mairehau Site*

Dallington	158	\$820,000	\$5,190
Mairehau	213	\$8,400,000	\$39,437
Total	371	\$9,220,000	\$24,852

Greymouth Campus**

Greymouth	103	\$500,000	\$4,854
John Paul II	196	\$3,000,000	\$15,306
Total	299	\$3,500,000	\$11,706