

Appendix One:

**ENROLMENT SCHEME - APPROVAL CHECKLIST**

**Summary of Analysis<sup>6</sup>**

Name of Schools - Avonside Girls' High School and Shirley Boys' High School

Number – 324 and 321

Date received - 8 May 2018<sup>7</sup>

Date acknowledged – 8 May 2018

There are no adjacent schools with enrolment schemes

Requirements	Checklist	Comments/Concerns	Efforts to resolve concerns	Final OK
<p><b>1. Avoiding overcrowding or the likelihood of overcrowding.</b>  <b>s11A(1)(a), s11A(2)(b)</b></p> <p>Check: Is the Ministry assessment of the school's capacity accepted by the board?</p> <p>If an optimum roll is stated, is it realistic in terms of school capacity? Is it so high that it will lead to overcrowding or so low that students will be unnecessarily excluded?</p> <p>Is the home zone so large that it is likely to create pressure on the school's facilities?</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Too high</p> <p>Too large</p>	<p>Christchurch Schools Rebuild Capacity 1000 (AGHS) and 1200 (SBHS) with Master Plan Capacity of 1200 for both.</p> <p>Both schools agreed to this build capacity as a share of 4600 over the four single sex state schools in Christchurch.</p> <p>In discussions with the Board, the Ministry suggested a zone that excluded both Marshland and Brighton. However, the inclusion of Brighton was suggested as a compromise, as the inclusion of both areas would (in the Ministry's opinion) place the schools at risk of overcrowding. Marshland is a high growth area and the rate of growth has consistently exceeded projections. It is therefore likely that projected rolls from the Marshland area will be higher than predicted.</p> <p>The schools originally consulted on S1 MOE + Brighton (supported by Ministry) plus their preferred inclusion of Marshland. During consultation, the schools became aware of the wishes of those currently in-zone for both schools and have now proposed including these areas for a period of 13 years as a Transition (as well as S1 MOE + Brighton + Marshland).</p> <p>The MOE has a view that this will cause sustained overcrowding at both schools, especially AGHS from 2019. The schools state that Marshland is "reasonably convenient" to the new site and that it is a "fair and equitable decision" to include existing residents for a transitional period of 13 years.</p>	<p><u>MOE</u></p> <p>Provision of data to both Boards, discussions over 12 months, met with Board Chairs after close of consultation to discuss new ideas.</p> <p><u>Schools</u></p> <p>Both schools indicated in consultation notes that current zones could not be included in new zone.</p> <p>Both schools claim that this proposal (Scenario C) will not cause overcrowding.</p>	<p>No</p>

<sup>6</sup> This is an analysis of the proposal from the schools (also known as Scenario C)

<sup>7</sup> Letter from the schools is dated 4 May but was not received until 8 May at 4.26pm by email. However relevant consultation documents were not attached. The Ministry requested these documents and noted that receipt of the proposal could not be acknowledged until all documentation received. Complete documentation was received on 8 May at 8am and the Ministry acknowledged receipt of this on 8 May.



Requirements	Checklist	Comments/Concerns	Efforts to resolve concerns	Final OK
<p><b>3. Ensuring that students can attend a reasonably convenient school which, as far as possible, is the local school.</b></p> <p><b>s11A(2)(a), s11E(2)(a)&amp;(b), s11I(1)(b)&amp;(c)</b></p> <p>Check: For students just outside the home zone, is there a reasonably convenient school that they can attend?</p> <p>Where an adjacent school has an enrolment scheme, are there any areas between the home zones where students are left without a right of entry to either school?</p> <p>Does the home zone unnecessarily exclude local students?</p> <p>If the home zones of adjacent schools overlap, is there a guarantee of enrolment at both schools for students in the area of overlap?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>The schools have proposed an extended zone so a significant number of students are now included. This now means the schools are at very high risk of overcrowding.</p> <p>To include the current zones means students will be travelling to attend a school that is not necessarily the closest secondary school. Students in the current zones would have had the option of enrolling at AGHS/SBHS or CBHS/CGHS as out-of-zone applicants.</p> <p>Students in all areas could currently enrol with adjacent schools as Haeata, Linwood and Mairehau do not have enrolment schemes. There is no overlap with home zones. However, it is likely that at some point enrolment schemes will be required at these schools. The current AGHS/SBHS zones are within 1.1km of Mairehau High School and within 600m of Linwood College.</p> <p>Students in the suburbs of Sumner, Redcliffs and the south of Christchurch are unlikely to have the option of applying to AGHS/SBHS as out-of-zone enrolments as there will not be room under this proposal. These students may only have the option of applying to be on the ballot for CBHS/CGHS.</p> <p>Several mentions in consultation documents of safe travel around Marshland Road. This was used as a rational for students to be able to be included in the new zones.</p>	<p>The schools have made efforts to include both new students in their new area as well as “reasonably convenient” areas such as Brighton and Marshland during consultation.</p> <p>They now wish to include current residents as well to reflect past traditions and history. They also acknowledge the wishes of their current community as people who have intended to send their children to AGHS/SBHS but would be no longer in zone once the schools open in 2019 under the original proposal.</p> <p>The schools have given consideration to a number of concerns raised by current residents who wish to be able to send their children to the schools. This is reflected in the change to their proposed enrolment scheme to include the current zones under a transitional arrangement for 13 years.</p> <p>Although both Avonside and Shirley are reasonably convenient for the proposed zone, other schools are more convenient for parts of the community.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Requirements	Checklist	Comments/Concerns	Efforts to resolve concerns	Final OK
<p><b>4. Ensuring that the selection of applicants for enrolment at the school is carried out in a fair and transparent manner. s11A(1)(b), s11B, s11F, s11I(1)(e)</b></p> <p>Check: Does the scheme attempt to write in anything about the selection of out of zone students that is inconsistent with s11F?</p> <p>If the school runs a special programme, is it of a type that has already been approved by the Secretary? (<i>See separate attachment.</i>)</p> <p>Are enrolment criteria clear?</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>The school is using the priorities as defined in the Education Act. However, the size of the proposed zone is unlikely to afford any room for out-of-zone enrolments.</p> <p>The schools are also seeking a change in legislation (or an approval letter from the Minister) to allow “consideration of a sibling at the school logically should now include a brother or sister who may be or intends to be attending the other collocated school, for those families who live out of zone”. This is not permitted under the Act.</p> <p>The schools do not run special programmes.</p> <p>The enrolment criteria are clear. In-zone students have automatic entry (and grandparented) and out-of-zone students will be enrolled based on the priorities within the Education Act.</p>	<p>The schools have proposed this in an effort to alleviate concerns from parents. However, it is not part of their current arrangements.</p>	<p>No</p>



Requirements	Checklist	Comments/Concerns	Efforts to resolve concerns	Final OK
<p><b>6. Ensuring that there has been adequate consultation. S11H(3)</b></p> <p>Check: Has the Board sought to discover the views of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents of students at the school?</li> <li>• Community in the area of the school?</li> <li>• Students and prospective students (if relevant)?</li> <li>• Boards of potentially affected schools?</li> </ul> <p>Type of consultation undertaken and copies of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters to Boards consulted</li> <li>• Copies of responses received</li> <li>• Minutes of Public meetings</li> <li>• Copy of Survey forms</li> <li>• Analysis of results</li> <li>• Boards response to Variance to its position</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes (but not in current zones)</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>The schools have provided a number of opportunities for families and other schools to make comment on the proposed home zones for AGHS and SBHS.</p> <p>However, this was only on S1 MOE, Brighton and Marshland. The schools' proposal presented to MOE now includes these areas and their current zones for a transition period of 13 years. The latter inclusion was not part of the consultation process. Their proposed transitional arrangements for existing residents (13 years from 1 Jan 2019) to attend the schools needs legal clarification.</p> <p>This zone change proposal consultation process was advertised publicly in the Christchurch Press, published to AGHS, SBHS and TwoSchoolsOneCampus websites and Facebook pages and sent to affected schools to include in their newsletters and Facebook pages. The public notice included the details of the public meetings, information pack and online survey.</p> <p>Four public meetings were held; 183 attendees. Minutes of these meetings were taken and validated as true and accurate by the independent facilitator.</p> <p>An Information Pack on the proposed enrolment home zone, including a map of the proposed area was made available through a download from the school's websites. Hard copies of this information pack were available at the public meetings and from the school offices.</p> <p>An online survey was promoted as the primary feedback mechanism. The link to the survey was advertised in the public notice and was available from the school's websites. Hardcopies of the survey were made available at the public meetings and from the school offices for those without access to the internet. 1085 responses.</p> <p>A meeting was held with affected schools' boards and principals. Minutes of this meetings were taken and validated as true and accurate by the independent facilitator. Affected schools were encouraged to document their submissions by way of a letter to the AGHS and SBHS boards. 7 written submissions received. (2 from non-schools) However, these schools have not been consulted on possibility of current zones being included.</p> <p>Consultation closed at 5.00pm on April 26th, 2018.</p>	<p>Schools responded to most concerns during the consultation process when they could. Some questions were directed at the Ministry who do not play a role in the consultation process.</p> <p>Summary of responses in consultation report. (paid for by Ministry)</p> <p>Ministry – Schools did not consult around reduction in out-of-zone enrolments if transitional current zone is applied. This will have impact on Old Girls/Boys, those across the East (Redcliffs/Sumner), those wanting single sex education but also out-of-zone for CBHS/CGHS. These groups will be unaware of the impact of a larger in zone roll.</p> <p>High rates of out-of-zone enrolments in the past at Avonside/Shirley would raise expectations of these groups to be included in future enrolments.</p> <p>Original consultation was S1 MOE, Brighton and Marshland.</p> <p>Schools did not initially include current zones in their consultation, however, following feedback, they did include current zones in their proposal. Given this is a time bound arrangement, further consultation with neighbouring schools around the inclusion of transition arrangements for current zones is deemed unnecessary.</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>Are there any unresolved complaints from other boards?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Strong support for proposal from Marshland.</p> <p>Current zone had strong voice in opposition to “being left out”.</p> <p>Little feedback from Brighton.</p> <p>Linwood College Board of Trustees - does not support the Marshlands School additional area, does not support any practices that adversely impact on the viability of neighbouring schools. However, at the time of writing the letter, Linwood had not been consulted on possibility of current zones being included.</p> <p>Mairehau High School Board of Trustees and Senior Management - In respect of the “grey” area - concerns that AGHS/SBHS out of zone students may disproportionately come from Mairehau High School’s catchment area. Increasing AGHS/SBHS in zone, by say including the “grey” area, would increase in zone enrolments therefore reducing out of zone enrolments. Want to be the co-ed High School of choice for North East families but recognise this will come from developing relationships over time. However, at the time of writing the letter, Mairehau had not been consulted on possibility of current zones being included.</p> <p>Banks Avenue School Board of Trustees - strongly opposes the proposed AGHS/SBHS home zone. Excluding BAS will have a negative impact on BAS attracting children. The proposed zone should include all the existing AGHS / SBHS existing zones, and this would not lead to overcrowding. Otakaro Kahui Ako is based on geographic locations and all three schools belong to this Kahui Ako. Feeder schools should have an automatic right of entry to the High Schools in the Kahui Ako. Siblings should have entitlement to the partner collocated school. However, at the time of writing the letter, Banks Avenue had not been consulted on possibility of current zones being included.</p>		
---	------------	--	--	--





Requirements	Checklist	Comments/Concerns	Efforts to resolve concerns	Final OK
<p><b>9. Has the next review date of the enrolment scheme been established?</b></p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the scheme being approved before 1 July – if YES then ‘next review date’ should be set for the following year? If the scheme is approved after 1 July, the annual review maybe deferred to the following year. Document the rationale for any variation from this guidance.</li> <li>Update the FIRST database with details of the enrolment scheme.</li> </ul>	No	<p>Schools are requesting three years to allow a “settling in” time.</p> <p>This is permissible under the Act as it can be deferred for up to three years. However, due to the complexity of the dual enrolment schemes, it is unlikely to be feasible to wait three years. <b>Annual reviews are more likely to start with.</b></p> <p>Scheme could be approved before 1 July to consider community concerns and student stress about their schooling for 2019. However, due to the complexity of the enrolment schemes, this is unlikely to occur.</p>	This will need to be discussed with the schools.	No