

## Appendix 2: Project plan and psychosocial scope

---

# Project description

The Ministry of Education, working in collaboration with the Board of Trustees of Redcliffs School and the Christchurch City Council, will be completing additional work on two matters which arose during the consultation process in response to the Minister's interim decision that Redcliffs School should close. These issues are described in further detail in subsequent sections, in addition to a proposed process for this investigation. This work is to be completed and reported on to the Minister by the end of September 2016.

## Background

On 7 July 2016, the Minister met with the Board of Trustees of Redcliffs School, and announced that the consultation process in response to her interim decision adequately addressed the two main reasons for that interim decision that Redcliffs School should close, which were:

- The potential for future disruption if Redcliffs School was to return to the Main Road site.
- The uncertainty of timing of a return to the Main Road site, due to there being no timeframe for the removal of houses from the cliff top behind the school.

She has not confirmed her interim decision that the school should close, and the consultation process under section 154 of the Education Act is at an end and has been set aside. Two additional matters were raised during the consultation process that require further consideration before a decision is made about whether Redcliffs School should return to the Main Road site. These are:

- The potential for negative psychological effects for the children if the school were to return to the original site given that there will be ongoing rockfall and may be land mass movement from the cliffs, and mitigation works on the school's boundary.
- The possibility of relocating the school to an alternative site in Redcliffs.

## Stakeholders and involved parties

There are a range of stakeholders who will have an interest in this programme of work. Some of these stakeholders will be directly involved in constructing the project plan, and in assisting with the implementation of this project plan, and others will be asked for input or kept informed as appropriate. The Ministry views the directly involved parties as being:

Ministry of Education – will be the report author, and the commissioning party for independent experts

Board of Trustees – will be the key stakeholder, and will be involved in communicating with the school community where appropriate (some project content will be commercially sensitive and may not be able to be directly shared)

Christchurch City Council (the Council) – as the landowner for Barnett Park (the site identified as a possible alternative site in previous studies) and Redcliffs Park (previously investigated as a possible alternative site), the Council will be directly involved in the feasibility analysis of these two sites

The Ministry expects that a number of meetings would occur between these three groups, and would expect all three groups to either be represented, or to have been given the opportunity to be represented if they wish.

Reports will be shared with the Board, and the Board's input and comments will be sought in response to these reports. Some parts of the Ministry's analysis and drafting may be able to be shared with the Board for feedback and comment, subject to the constitutional convention that protects the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and Officials.

In addition to meetings for a particular purpose and the sharing of information, the Ministry suggests the formation of a Project Steering Group. This group would meet fortnightly and would ensure that the project remains on track, and that the viewpoints of the project stakeholders are adequately considered at all stages. The Ministry suggests that the Steering Group is comprised of:

- Two representatives of the Ministry of Education
- Four representatives of the Board of Trustees
- One representative of the Council

## Feasibility analysis

In the Education Report that informed the Minister's decision on the next steps for Redcliffs School, the Minister agreed to the Ministry carrying out a feasibility analysis on whether relocation to another site within the Redcliffs area is likely to be a feasible option within a reasonable timeframe.

### Background

Both the Board and the Ministry have previously commissioned high level reports about possible alternative sites, with Barnett Park the only site identified as a possible suitable alternative. Other proposed developments for this site have been strongly opposed by the Redcliffs community. However, given the high level of community support that has been demonstrated for retaining a school in Redcliffs, including support from the CCC, the Ministry will be fully exploring the possibility of Barnett Park as an alternative site for Redcliffs School, as well as looking again for any further possible sites.

The Ministry has committed to working closely with the Council to undertake this feasibility analysis, including analysing the possibility of acquiring part of Barnett Park, and developing an agreed process for how this could occur.

### Proposed stages

The Ministry has developed the following outline for what could be contained in this feasibility analysis. It is suggested that the first steps of implementing this process should be that this outline is reviewed by both the Board and Council, and that the parties work closely together to develop the further detail of each of these stages.

Stages	Description	Notes
Commission report to identify possible sites	The Ministry and Board have previously commissioned high level reports on additional possible sites, however it is appropriate that this possibility should be explored again.	To progress the feasibility analysis, the Ministry has contracted The Property Group (TPG) to carry out this piece of work, and this will be submitted to the Ministry by July 14. (Is this date correct?)
Review of project plan by Board and Council	This project plan is a draft only – there may be stages missing and further input is required from other stakeholders to refine the detail of the stages and overall process.	The Ministry suggests an initial review by the Board, and then a workshop with the Council (with the Board represented).
Development of process for exploring revocation of reserve status and acquisition of Barnett Park	The workshop with the Council (described above) will contribute to developing a process for how reserve status could be revoked, and the options for how the Ministry could acquire part of Barnett Park.	This project plan will need to be updated when there is additional clarity about the scope and content of this part of the process. TPG will prepare a short summary on acquiring reserve land. This will be reviewed, and then triangulated with the Council's views on this process.

Community consultation	The Council may wish the Ministry/Board to conduct an informal consultation or information-gathering process during this analysis, to determine likely community response to Ministry acquisition. This is because there would be a publicly notified consultation process conducted by the landowner (the Council) if the Ministry were to attempt to acquire Barnett Park or other Council reserve land.	
Consideration of TPG report	Once the report from TPG is received, the Ministry and Board will consider the sites that have been identified, and what further information (if this is in addition to the reports outlined in the subsequent section) might be needed to assess the suitability of each of the identified sites.	For reasons of economy and expediency, reports from experts may be targeted as appropriate to the site from those listed in the subsequent section.
Commissioning reports on sites considered as possibilities	Once the TPG report has been considered, some (or all) of the following reports will be commissioned on each of the identified sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial and economic analysis</li> <li>• Geotechnical report</li> <li>• Contamination report</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Traffic / transport analysis</li> <li>• Bulk and location plans</li> </ul>	
Consideration of reports as received	The content of this stage is somewhat dependent on the results of the earlier stages.	This will be refined as further information becomes available about the feasibility of Barnett Park or any other site within Redcliffs.

## Proposed experts

The Ministry would obtain the above-listed reports from experts in the relevant field. While the following list may change due to availability, it is likely the following firms/individuals would complete the listed reports:

Legal and Planning, overall report – Chris Leech / Sue Wells, TPG

Geotechnical, rockfall and civil reports – Gordon Ashby, Tonkin & Taylor. The Ministry is open to the Board requesting that Eliot Sinclair (Nick Harwood) reviews these reports.

Land Contamination report –Tonkin & Taylor

Flooding – Tonkin & Taylor

Traffic / transport analysis – Jeanette Ward, Abley Transport. The Ministry is open to the Board requesting that Dr Darren Fidler reviews this analysis, though he may have to do so as a Board member rather than an independent expert.

Quantity Surveying – Craig Weston, BBD

Bulk and location plans – Dennis Chippindale, Stephenson & Turner

# Potential psychosocial effects

In the Education Report that informed the Minister of Education's decision on the next steps for Redcliffs School, the Minister agreed to the Ministry carrying out an in-depth investigation into the potential psychosocial implications for children (both those attending the school now, and children who will attend the school in future years) if the school returns to the Main Road site with the proposed mitigation measures in place.

The purpose of this work is to report to the Minister on the potential psychosocial impacts for children by the end of September 2016. This report will also include information on the feasibility of relocation to an alternative site in Redcliffs, and the content of this report will inform the next steps for Redcliffs School.

It is important to note that by the time the school is able to return to the Main Road site, it is unlikely that there would be any cohorts of students who have experienced the quake on the Main Road site still attending the school. The last cohorts of post-quake births have already entered school. It is therefore important that the potential psychosocial effects are considered in the longer term context of students who may not have experienced the Christchurch earthquakes, and who did not experience them on the Main Road site.

## Background

Redcliffs School has been located at its site at Main Road in Redcliffs since 1907. According to the Board, generations of children have received a high quality education at the site during that time without any psychological effects researched or formally documented. Throughout that time rockfall has occurred behind the school site. Students have been aware that the land beyond the fence at the back of the school bordering the base of the cliffs is out of bounds, in the same way that the boundaries of any school, particularly roadside boundaries, are out of bounds.

The school continued to operate from the site during the Canterbury earthquake sequence until June of 2011. The significant earthquakes of February and June occurred during school hours. No injuries to school children have ever occurred as a result of rockfall.

Extensive engineering analysis has now been completed which provides for a very high degree of understanding of how the cliffs may behave in future earthquake events. In addition sophisticated design work to build a low bund structure has been completed. The net outcome of that work is that any future physical risk from rockfall at the site is effectively nil and the risk of disruption to schooling on the site is negligible.

The Board's submission in response to the Minister's interim decision raised the potential negative psychosocial effects of closing the school on the wider Redcliffs community. The Board's view was that closure would have a negative psychosocial impact on the resiliency of the community and the ability to fully recover from the effects of the earthquakes.

The Ministry sought advice from an independent expert (Dr Harith Swadi, Clinical Director of Child, Adolescent and Family Services at the CDHB) on that issue. The Ministry also asked Dr Swadi to comment on the potential psychosocial impact on children if the school returned to the Main Road site. Dr Swadi raised the possibility that exposure to ongoing rockfall on the site could be a psychological risk for children attending a school on that site.

The Education Report to the Minister recommended further investigation was carried out in relation to the possible psychosocial implications.

## Proposed scope

The investigation will involve consideration of relevant literature, and seeking opinions from experts in this area. There is a wide body of literature considering the effects of trauma on children and young people, including the effects of natural disasters.

It is generally clear that the effects of trauma can be worsened by both the severity and persistence of the exposure to trauma. What is not yet clear is the extent to which awareness of, and exposure to, ongoing rockfall, could cause trauma, chronic stress or other negative responses or outcomes for children attending school on this site. It is also not clear what positive or negative effects the mitigation works on the school boundary could have.

As part of the briefing for this investigation, Nick Harwood (the author of the Eliot Sinclair report) will present information to the experts including, but not limited to, the likely frequency and scale of rockfall events adjacent to the site, how the site relates to surrounding land zones, the size and visual effects of the planned mitigation, and how rockfall risk compares to other relevant risks.

The Minister has requested that the in-depth investigation and write up of that investigation be completed by 26 August 2016.

In providing their views on the above, the experts will be asked for their opinion on the key questions, as follows:

1. What is the likelihood of any significant negative psychological or psychosocial effects on children of returning Redcliffs School to the Main Road site, having regard to the context of living in the Bays area and the expert technical advice that, while there will be ongoing rockfall, with the mitigation in place, there is no actual physical danger to people on the school grounds?
2. If any such effect is possible, can it be adequately mitigated?

In considering their response to the key questions above, experts may also wish to comment on the following matters as relevant to their experience or expertise:

#### **Methodology**

- (1) What methodology should be adopted to investigate the issues raised?
- (2) Is the timeframe allowed sufficient to provide an "in depth" opinion of the issues raised?

#### **Potential psychological effects from rockfall**

- (3) What are the potential negative and positive effects on primary school aged children of attending the school close to the cliffs where there are likely to be ongoing rockfalls to the extent predicted in and as contextualised by the geotechnical background information, in particular the expert technical advice that, with the mitigation in place, there is no actual physical danger to people on the school grounds?
- (4) How is that assessment affected by the fact that the children attending the school will be living in the local area?
- (5) What are the potential negative and positive effects on primary school aged children of exposure to the visual and auditory impacts of falling rock adjacent to the school, as contextualised by the geotechnical background information, in particular the expert technical advice that, with the mitigation in place, there is no actual physical danger to people on the school grounds?
- (6) To what extent is it possible to distinguish the effects of rockfall (as predicted in and as contextualised by the geotechnical background information) from exposure to other potential earthquake effects in a significant event, such as liquefaction, ground movement or building collapse, disruption of services, extreme noise, separation from loved ones etc?
- (7) If there is likely to be a negative effect on children of experiencing future rockfall on the site, is this affected by whether they have suffered previous stress or negative effects from the prior earthquake sequence in general and, if so, is it possible to distinguish the ongoing negative effect of experiencing future rockfall from prior negative effects?

#### **Potential psychological effects from mitigation**

- (8) What are the potential negative and positive effects on primary school aged children of the mitigation works that will be erected on the school boundary?

- (9) What are the potential negative and positive effects on primary school aged children of attending school immediately next to an area of ground which will be prohibited as contextualised by the geotechnical background information?

**Potential effects**

- (10) What are the potential short-term effects of the above? What are the potential medium to long-term effects? What is their likelihood? How serious could the impact on individual children be in the short, medium or long-term?

**Potential solutions and strategies**

- (11) To what extent, and through what means, can potential negative effects be mitigated or eliminated?

**Other areas of consideration**

- (12) What other factors may be relevant to the psychosocial wellbeing of primary school aged children attending a school on this site?
- (13) Are there likely to be differences in effect for children who experienced the February and June 2011 earthquakes (both on and off the Main Road site), and future students of the school who did not experience these earthquakes, either on site or within their lifetimes?

**Proposed stages**

The Ministry has developed the following outline for how the content required for this feasibility analysis could be obtained.

Stages	Description	Notes
Review of project plan by Board	This project plan is a draft only – there may be additional questions which should be included in the proposed brief for experts outlined above, or additional experts added to the list below.	The Ministry suggests an initial review by the Board, and for the plan to be updated accordingly following this report.
Commissioning reports from experts	Once a scope is agreed, the Ministry will approach the agreed experts to commission a report within the required timelines.	It is possible that the timeframes will mean that not all experts are able (or willing) to be involved. If this applies to a significant number of experts, the Ministry and Board will discuss whether additional opinions should be sought.
Providing appropriate context	It is important that the experts have an informed and consistent knowledge of the Redcliffs context, both in terms of the community and in terms of the Main Road site in particular.  A context briefing would involve a briefing from Nick Harwood on the proposed mitigation strategy, followed by a visit to the Main Road site. Nick Harwood will be available to the experts for any additional questions of a technical nature.	The Ministry is particularly interested to hear from the Board about the appropriate content for a context briefing prior to the experts commencing their programme of work.
Defining psychosocial and psychological risk	Experts will workshop and develop an agreed definition, rationale and parameters for the use of psychological versus psychosocial. This will ensure a consistent	Psychological usually references outcomes for an individual, while psychosocial references outcomes as embedded in a social construct. In this context, there are both effects for the

	understanding and approach, and allow direct comparability of the opinions for purposes of analysis.	individual, and how these are influenced / impacted / mitigated by the wider social construct of the school and wider community.
Consideration of reports as received	The content of this stage is somewhat dependent on the reports received.	This will be refined as reports are received, but may include clarification of reports where required, and will include the analysis of reports.

